

## **Fire Emissions Joint Forum Meeting**

### **September 6, 2000 Wednesday - Boise Idaho**

1. New members were introduced
2. New Agriculture Member needed probably from California
3. Opening remarks on the Market-Trading forum for SO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Public meeting findings presented to the WRAP on the SO<sub>2</sub> ceilings proposed. Returned to the public forum for additional public input in Boise tonight. Submission of Annex findings to EPA on October 2nd. Finalization of the findings at the WRAP meeting scheduled Sacramento on Sept. 25th.
4. Regional technical center concept from the modeling forum proposed to establish a center to deal with issues over the entire WRAP. Included the establishment of a technical director as part of the tech. center. A technical working group has now been established to better research the need for a tech. center/director. The creating of these two entities would not take place until the Phase 2 funding is made available. Will go to contractor for initial tech. support and look at the needs of modeling forum in the future. More precise time scheduling will be a product of this decision in that contacting for services will extend the period for meeting milestones.
5. Emission Task Team reply due date will involve staged submission for 1996 for July emissions to test MM5 data at the 4 kilometer level. Data framework will have to be established for the initial submission as the part of the process.
6. Funding/budget between Phase 1&2 of WRAP. EPA will be able to fund most of the \$8MM Phase 2 funding with WRAP getting \$2.8MM of that funding target in FY01. We will be now be back to our original budget funds.

Long-term WRAP viability is assured with additional funding request for the 2002 budget year for all regional planning bodies. EPA is now making RH an emphasis.

7. Key emphasis for this meeting is to allow for more cross over into different groups by the various forum members. This meeting will look at the RFP for Agriculture Alternatives Contract. The Alternatives to Wildland Burning RFP that Shelley Nolde was developing will not be presented because Shelly is still involved in wildfires.

### **Task Team Discussions**

Alternatives to Wildland Burning - needs to happen in a timely manner. All comments need to be back to Shelley to allow for final submission. Look at the web site for latest update.

### **Natural Background Task Team -** (Co-chairs Carl Gossard and Darla Potter)

The NBTT covered the last meeting and conference calls from the last three weeks. Significant event of the NBTT has been to recharter our task orders. From the Portland meeting we identified three charges.

The first charge from the modeling forum was to categorize the sources of smoke emissions, the methodology for tracking fire emissions based on the source category, and the third charge was something that the team took on to determine how the smoke would be apportioned between the source categories related to their impact on the Class 1 Areas. The NBTT decided that all three tasks could not be done within the established time frames.

Completing the Task 1 by April of 2001 combined with the tracking systems has forced the NBTT to drop Task 2 for quantifying the source impacts. The NBTT felt that the EPA National Guidance Team could cover this aspect of the task and NBTT would make input to the that team through Sam Sandberg and Pete Lahm.

Workshop Schedule (See NFFT Outline for inclusion into notes from Darla Potter)

Senior Staffers Workshop scheduled for January 24-25, 2001 in Denver – to review content team outputs on the category classification and accounting direction for inclusion into the annual attainment of the visibility reduction goal. Consensus on this topic must be accomplished for use throughout the WRAP. Workshop participation is broken out into all stakeholders.

The results will be consolidated for a Policy Makers/Opinion Leaders Workshop scheduled for Phoenix in March of 2001. We will selectively include participants in this workshop to assure that the needed policy direction is produced and all stakeholders represented. The content for review in this workshop has yet to be developed. The NBTT must coordinate with the Emissions Task Team to instruct what emissions must be tracked to determine whether the reasonable progress goal is being met.

The overriding question still exists as to what is considered to be anthropogenic and natural for tracking smoke emissions. Our first step is to get a placeholder announcement out to both workshop participant lists.

The NBTT has decided to contract for facilitation and coordination of the workshops. Rebecca Reynolds has been hired to facilitate the preparation and facilitation of the workshops. A scope of work statement is being developed for approval by the FEJF.

The Northern Area Managers who have been the primary funding source for the proposed workshops should be briefed on the change in dropping Task 2 (Quantifying how much smoke will be considered part of the natural background conditions). The same level of briefing needs to be done for the Modeling Forum.

**NBTT Alternative Briefings** (Gossard) – Discussion of three alternatives:

**Two dimension matrix -**

Proposed that between natural and anthropogenic there is a middle ground called anthropogenic offset.

**Tier/Continuum** - (Judgmental) starting from Naturally Ignited Wildland Fire to Unauthorized Malice Fire. It is either anthropogenic or natural.

**Decision Tree Model - Natural** Ignited Wildland Fire ----->No Purpose Not Controllable----->Natural

Natural Ignited Wildland Fire--> controllable--> Smoke Mgmt. Plan in Place >

Yes-->Natural

No->Anthropogenic

Concerns Expressed About the Approach being taken by the NBTT:

\*Without a consensus at the NBTT level to invite additional workshop members to gain consensus may not work very well by simply adding additional folks in a workshop environment.

\*Need very specific objective statements and goals for the workshops from content team.

**NBTT Invitation List- (Darla Potter)** - See draft list for participants listed by state, tribes, federal, industry, environmental, agriculture, misc. and other WRAP forum members for both senior staff meeting and policy makers workshop meetings.

**NBTT Scope of Work Contract Review** by FEJF (Rebecca Reynolds) - Gossard See statement of work paper prepared by Carl and reviewed at the Forum Meeting. FEJF agreed to the scope of work and to contract for Rebecca's services.

**ITEP Survey** , Paul Mountcastle Flagstaff, Az. – Working to gather basic data on tribal lands for smoke emission data. Phase 1 completed earlier this year with 240 tribes contacted for basic information. Question from Basic Smoke Management Plan Task Team where addressed to the tribes from an earlier questionnaire. FEJF-BSMP posed a second scope of work for the next round of questions. Still sorting through the data with no preliminary results as of this date. The tribes will continued to be contacted.

Questions posed are emission inventories in place, smoke management plan in place, and are the tribes impacted by prescribed burns (smoke). Also what contacts through BIA have been made. The questions posed to tribes are the exact same surveys as those posed to states. Question on how much interest in the report by the tribes. Some of the tribes are interested in the findings of the report.

September 15, 2000 will be the delivery date of the report. All of the responses from the tribes should be in by the end of the month.

**Basic Smoke Management Plan** – Diane Riley and Scott Kuehn

Status of Wildland Survey (Handout) on responses received as of 8/14/00 by contractor EC/R. How best to go about getting the unresponsive states, given this fire season, to meet the deadline for reply due to fill in the blanks.

Wyoming reports that EC/R left blanks in the questionnaire and should have said fill in the blanks. Was this understood by all states and local agencies. EC/R was approached on this issue. A conference call is needed with the task team and EC/R on the completion of the surveys.

Surveys status - who is the contact person for each state?

Arizona. –done; California - unknown (Brian to follow up), Colo. – (Dave to follow up), Hawaii (unknown), Idaho (will be done) New Mexico (Pete to follow up), North Carolina (Scott to follow up), Texas (Pete will follow up).

Bay, North Sierra AQMD and South Coast (Larry Biland to follow up), Colo. Spring (Dave to follow up with Colleen), Missoula County (Scott), Bernalillo County (Pete to follow up), Western NC Region (Scott to follow up), Harris County, Texas, (Pete to follow up).

**EC/R Agriculture Survey** - The group reviewed the 15 potential survey sites. (See handout for Agricultural Burning Smoke Management Program Survey). Add Kansas and Nebraska to the survey plus four additional county programs. The agriculture survey are suppose to be mailed by September 8, 2000 but will probably be delayed because we have not responded to the proposed agriculture smoke programs to be a part of the survey.

**Requirments for Basic Smoke Management Program Guide** - Proposal to develop a new task group to produce the requirements for a basic smoke management plan guide was given. Tier 1 Smoke Management Program is a minimum program while Tier 2 is common basic smoke management plan. Consolidation of survey data into a recommendations of what the task group feels are the needs of an establish smoke management plan. Recommendations and other potential writers and reviewers as to how to complete the guide. The final product review will be done by FEJF. The guide will address basic smoke management requirements for tribes, counties, and states as one

document. This guide will serve as the basis for the Enhanced Smoke Management Plan.

**Alternatives to Burning for Agriculture** – Bryan Jenkins The RFP went and modification to the solicitations was made and three replies were received. A decision point on award is September 11, 2000 as to who should be awarded the contract.

**Emissions Task Team** – Pete Lahm Meet with ER/C on emissions calculations and documentation at Missoula's Intermountain Fire Lab. They have an outline on approach and how to pursue the task. Pete will supply the results and findings of the meeting including the fact that automated systems such as FASTRAC was not supplied to the contractor. All leading to an emissions characterization workshop in the future sponsored by EPA. All data acquisition and analysis to lead to the revisions of AP-42 Emission Factors for the WRAP States.

**Public Education and Outreach TT** – Larry Biland for John Kennedy Request a review of the products prior to final publication. This includes the brochure and writeup. Kevin McKernan, Dave Randall, and Tim Rodgers to assist in the final review.

### **Thursday September 7, 2000**

**Emission Task Team Breakout** – with Tom Pace (OAQPS EPA) on conference call and

First deliverable is the July 1996 (12km resolution with MM5 Data) Emission Inventory for the Modeling Forum by the end of January 2001. The remainder of the 1996 fire emission (36km resolution) years data will be supplied as the next deliverable.

We will need to gather all agricultural burning information that is available to supply as part of the emission submission (Ore., Cal., Utah, Wash. Wy. ). Does the agricultural burning happen in July?

Review Scope of work for OAQPS contract on the web site that defines the workshop objectives scheduled for November.

The wildfire, prescribed fire, fire for resource benefit, and agricultural land fire use will have to be grided and located in the order of preference:

1. UTM Grid
2. Lat and Long
3. Township, Section, and Range
4. County
5. State

The question is continually raised as to what the standard data format and framework needed by the model. The modeling forum needs to validate (direct) the ETT in how the

data sets need to be assembled. The fire occurrence data that we will be generating from our existing inventory is the best available for the period (1996) in question.

We will use the Grand Canyon Commission emission factors for the 1996 July and yearly total. The occurrence data will be from the S&P Annual Summary for both federal and state fires greater than 100 acres. Pete will use the hard copy data to develop the interim data set for the month of July and then 1996 for the WRAP States. We will need to add South Dakota and Nevada (state) data to the inventory.

The data base will be defined by individual fire by size, duration(detection date to containment), fuel model/fuel type, and/or cover type, by legal description. Fuel moisture will be generally based on occurrence date (seasonal severity). We will compare fuel types at the NIFC level and at the individual fire report level for relative accuracy of the data base.