

Emission Reduction Techniques T2B6

- How should emission reduction techniques be reflected in the EI process?
- How can we quantify impacts of emissions reduction measures?
- How do we capture the costs of using ERTs?

Emission Reduction Techniques T2B6

- Discussion 1: What are the data to be collected in EIs to capture the ERTs in a consistent manner (eg specific moisture or broad categories like wet, normal, dry)
 - need same data for ERTs that been collected for EI. (i.e fuel moisture content, acres blackened, etc)
 - is forestry held to a higher standard vis a vis other sources? Need to capture data from overall forestry management practices that affect emissions (I.e. diesel product from a chipper, air curtain incinerator)
 - need wildfire/Rx fire EI monitoring to indicate trade-offs
 - Arizona will track ERT data on a day by day basis
 - List of ERTs captured from the burn plan or NEPA document
 - data to support impact determination method (Blue Sky or other)
 - Use WRAP methods for activity tracking

Emission Reduction Techniques T2B6

- Discussion 2: What processes are currently being used to quantify the impacts and costs of emissions reductions measures (state database, source database)?
 - laundry list of ERTs identified for each burn and then check off which was used - NM, AZ
 - permitting or activity tracking system needs to be in place
 - ERTs need to be geographically specific, ie. What are acceptable ERTs in an RPO
 - Blue Sky modeling to assess impact. Add algorithm?
 - Apply CONSUME to quantify emissions reduced thru utilization of ERT (ie Oregon's use)
 - Need holistic approach to include avoidance techniques (not just ERTs)
 - 2001 Smoke Mgt Guide
 - Refer to WRAP alternatives to burning to reference costs
 - FOFEM can be used to compare treatment alternatives
 - wildfire is worst case scenario

Emission Reduction Techniques T2B6

- Discussion 3: What are emissions tradeoffs (net reductions) of ERTs (covering piles, woodstoves, chipping)?
 - High intensity burning increases NO_x. Seasonal use of fire may not result in NO_x being an issue.
 - Rx emissions relatively low, so are they important
 - Low temperature fires increase HAPs? More of an impact from ag burning
 - Already have a cost data base for different treatment alternatives (i.e handpiles vs broadcast)
 - NFPORS
 - Related to permits: assess costs of different treatment alternatives
 - cost of litigation and potential outcome (primarily private land)

Emission Reduction Techniques T2B6

- Discussion 4: How should alternatives to burning be tracked and fire emissions not generated (averted) be accounted for? What are the benefits of alternative practices and how may they be quantified?
 - AZ SMP data base
 - Tracking system needs to be in place (EDMS as region wide tracking system)
 - OR SMP data base provides annual tracking and assessment of reduction tracking, but doesn't account for emissions averted
 - Go beyond management objective to determine whether ERT is applied (when do you give credit?)
 - Midwest: other sources of pollutants overwhelm fire effects. Fire ERTs are not an issue.
 - MN smoke mgt plan but not ERT
 - Encourage research to cover existing data gaps