

**WRAP FEJF Meeting**  
**June 7-8, 2005**  
**Denver, CO**

**COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF ATTENDEES**

FEJF Members:

Darla Potter, WDEQ-AQD, FEJF Co-Chair; Mark Fitch, USDA-FS, FEJF Co-Chair; Dave Randall, Air Sciences Inc.; Bob Palzer, Sierra Club; Andrea Boyer (representing Angel McCormack), Nez Perce Tribe; Bob Habeck, MT DEQ; Pat Shaver, USDA NRCS; Paul Schlobohm (representing Mike Wallace), BLM NIFC; Tom Webb, USEPA R9; Rich Fisher, USDA-FS

Outer Circle Participants:

Don McKenzie, USDA-FERA; Pete Lahm, USDA-FS; Suraj Ahuja, USDA-FS; Lisa Bye, BLM/FWS/NPS; Thomas Dzomba, USFS; Brian Mitchell, NPS; Christi Gordon, USDA-FS; Deb Wolfe, MT DEQ; Chet Sergeant, NV BAQP; Ron King, AK DEC; Coleen Campbell, CO APCD; Brian Finneran, OR DEQ; Gail Tonnesen, UC Riverside; Amber Soja, NRC NASA Langley; Judith Logan, USDA-FS; Doug Fox, CIRA

Other WRAP Participants:

Don Arkell, WESTAR, State Caucus Coordinator; Ken Cronin, NTEC, Tribal Caucus Coordinator; Tom Moore, WGA, WRAP Technical Coordinator; Lee Gribovicz, WDEQ-AQD, TOC Co-Chair;

By Phone:

Jeff Stonesifer, City of Albuquerque; Melissa Lunden, Lawrence Berkley National Laboratory; Zac Adelman, UNC/CEP

***PLEASE NOTE: These meeting notes have been prepared to capture questions, comments, and discussion on the various meeting topics. Please refer to the presentations and documents posted in association with this meeting for greater detail.***

**JUNE 7, 2005 8:00 am – 5:00 pm**

**Introductions (All) & Agenda Review**

**FEJF Status**

- Membership Announcements
  - Jeff Stonesifer, City of Albuquerque, is now the Local Government FEJF member. He administers the open burning program for Bernalillo County and forecasts smoke incursions from prescribed burns and wildfires.
- Membership Vacancies

- A Tribal position is open.
- An Academic position on the wildland side is open.
- A General Public position on the wildland side is open.
- Emphasis for alternatives to attend if FEJF Members cannot attend the meetings.
- Co-Chair Announcement
  - Mark Fitch has transitioned from AZ DEQ to a position with the USFS effective May 2005. He is the Air Quality & Smoke Management Interagency Coordinator in Arizona.
  - The USFS has not yet made a decision as to Mark's continued participation in the FEJF.
  - The meeting participants were asked to express their thoughts or concerns about Mark retaining the Co-Chair role as a Federal Government member. Mark has actively participated in the FEJF since inception, first as an outer circle participant, then as a member, and lastly as a Co-Chair. General support was expressed for Mark retaining the Co-Chair role as a Federal Government member.
- Planning Team Meeting
  - March 9-10, 2005 San Francisco, CA
  - Original FEJF Proposal to the Planning Team was a \$110,000 increase in funding from that allocated to the FEJF in the 2005 WRAP Workplan. It became evident at the Planning Team meeting that the funding request was to reflect that for both CY 2006 and 2007. Therefore, Mark and Darla requested an additional \$100,000. In the end, an additional \$115,000 increase in funding was allocated to the FEJF to fund contractor support of FEJF tasks in CY 2006 and 2007.
  - The only task discussed at the February FEJF meeting that was not funded was that for the Agricultural Alternatives to Burning Report Expansion. Should additional RPO funding become available to fund contractor support. The FEJF will request funding for that task.
- WRAP Board Meeting
  - May 17-18, 2005 Phoenix, AZ
  - The WRAP Workplan was approved by the Board. Two changes to the FEJF portion of the Workplan were proposed and approved.
    - FF9 (after the sentence ending in "within and across") "Avoiding cumulative smoke impacts to cultural resources is also critical."
    - FF2 (after the sentence ending in "reduction of visibility impact." "Furthermore, as described in the IOC transmittal letter regarding the 2001 Fire Categorization Policy, implications to cultural resources will also be examined."
  - 309 SIPs
    - The 309 states and the City of Albuquerque have been working with EPA headquarters and regional staff on rulemaking and other adjustments that address remaining issues related to EPA approval of the 309 SIP submittals and court decisions on the Annex SO<sub>2</sub> milestones. In April, EPA and Environmental Defense amended the date for final rulemaking on BART from April 15 to June 15, to allow time to develop additional guidance on alternatives to BART and to propose rules affected by the CEED decision. EPA believes it will be able to issue the final guidance,

and the proposed rules on schedule. The final rule, specific to the CEED decision, is anticipated in November.

- EPA Open Burning Workgroup
  - The Air Quality Management (AQM) Workgroup was formed by the Clean Air Act Advisory Committee (CAAAC) to develop recommendations for improvements in the air quality management program. The AQM Work Group is comprised of representatives from EPA, State and local agencies, Tribes, industry, and environmental and research organizations. In January 2005, the AQM released a report containing its recommendations, one of which concerns open burning. Region 8 (Laurel Dygowski) has the lead in putting together an intergovernmental workgroup to address the recommendation on open burning. The group has had two conference calls and there are a number of governmental agencies that participate in the FEJF also participating in the Open Burning Workgroup.
- STI & USFS Proposal to NASA
  - Proposed project for enhancements to the Blue Sky Rains fire emissions and smoke impacts forecasting system.
  - Through the grapevine we have heard that the proposal was approved by NASA.
  - See February 2005 meeting notes for additional information regarding the invitation by Dana Sullivan with Sonoma Technology Inc. for the WRAP-FEJF to participate as a technical advisors.

### **Task Status**

- Phase II EI
  - Some end user (Regional Modeling Center and Pechan) issues have arisen with the emissions inventory files, which has delayed the finalization of this task. Air Sciences is working to resolve these issues. Upon resolution, the final emissions inventory files and the final report will be prepared. This should occur during June 2005.
- FETM Project
  - Darla dropped the ball in getting the draft final report out to those who expressed interest in reviewing the report at the February Meeting. The draft final report was finally circulated in May for the last round of review and comment. Comments will be sent to Air Sciences shortly to finalize the report.

### **Fire Environment Working Team (Paul Schlobohm)**

*[See presentation posted on the FEJF website.]*

- Fire weather systems discussion
  - A challenge is in thinking about fire weather systems for regional coordination for both the meteorology and predictive services capabilities. In the past the use of fire weather systems for smoke management decision making has not been an emphasis.
  - Those who are interesting in providing input regarding fire weather systems can direct it to either Paul Schlobohm or Pete Lahm.

- What is the involvement of regulators in the Fire Environment Working Team? None due to the structure of NWCG. However, there may be a way to involve regulators in the Fire Air Issues Coordinating Group.
- There needs to be a mechanism to get relevant information from the federal land managers to air quality regulators to adequately predict smoke impacts and trajectories.

### **Blue Sky Rains West (Pete Lahm)**

- Blue Sky Rains West is a Wildland Fire Leadership Council proposal to be commissioned for wildfire and wildland fire use.
  - Find out what it takes to run this across the west.
  - Find out what is the quality of the information.
  - Find out what is the accuracy.
- A users group is being formed. Those interested can contact Pete Lahm who is the lead on this effort.
- 1-year pilot study with limited funding
  - The Rocky Mountain FCAMMS has Blue Sky West now (without the Rains portion) with MM5. The ICS 209 information for wildfire (> 300 acres grass/day and >100 acres timber/day) and wildland fire use.
- The hope is that the location of the fires can be used to identify what and where the air quality impacts are.
- This is an experimental tool.
  - There is not a lot of validation on the ground.
  - There is limited validation of the wind fields.
- New Mexico has been using the FCAMMS and is manually inputting the prescribed fires. The wildfire are already there.
- Other suggestions to access the wildfire and wildland fire use information for smoke management is to go to the NIFC website or to get a password to be able to view the ICS 209 forms.

### **Fire Occurrence Reporting Systems Update (Paul Schlobohm)**

*[See end of FEWT presentation posted on the FEJF website.]*

- Baby steps are beginning to move toward where the federal land managers want to be (i.e., single fire occurrence reporting system).
- The intent of a single fire occurrence reporting system would be to cover all fire from all federal agencies in a national system.
- There is a high level of support from within the various federal agencies as well as congress.

### **Phase III & IV Emissions Inventories (Dave Randall, Air Sciences Inc.)**

*[See presentation posted on the FEJF website.]*

- RFP March 2005
  - Two consultants called in to bidders call
  - One proposal received from Air Sciences Inc. & ECR
  - The proposal was found to be responsive and the contract has been awarded to Air Sciences Inc. with ECR as a subcontractor

- A draft workplan will go out for review ~ June 15.
- Projection Scalars (2018) – a lot of discussion
  - Two options presented in the proposal and the workplan
  - Projection scalars can take into account meteorology in coming up with the low, medium, and high scenarios. Use of climate change can be used to inform the activity levels on the projection side.
  - Two different approaches to develop the scalars identified by Don McKenzie: one preconditions the result (top down aggregation of scalars in advance), the other does not (bottom up to develop scalars individually). Knowledge base required for the bottom up approach is exponential compared to the top down approach. How the matrix of scalars are assembled will determine whether there is a bias built in.
  - How resolved to states and tribes need the high, medium and low scenario scalars.
- Constraints (time and funding) demand a focused task team and technical group (to be assembled to agree on 2018 projection scalars).
- Key audience for the planning inventories is the states and tribes for the SIPs and TIPS.
- Make sure to look at the red items on the schedule slide where review and input will be key to this project. Also need to schedule conference calls and include them in the schedule.
  - August 10 – timeframe proposed for 1 day technical meeting
  - QC Binder review – Sept./Oct.
  - October 18 – timeframe proposed for 1 ½ day technical workshop
- The EI deliverable dates work well with the WRAP modeling schedule as proposed.
  - Tom Moore will be preparing a description of how the emissions inventories (all source sectors, not just fire) will fit together with the modeling.
- Need to submit QC plan to EPA for feedback.
- Active Review Group: Tom Moore, Mark Fitch, Darla Potter, Don McKenzie, Aaron Worstell, Mike Ziolk, Colleen Campbell, Chet Sergeant, Pete Lahm, Tom Webb, Suraj Ahuja, Joan Hardesty, Thomas Dzomba, need tribal representative (Andrea Boyer will check with the Nez Perce, Ken Cronin will pursue a representative), Implementation Workgroup (detailed review can be coordinated by Don Arkell), review by IOC/TOC
  - IWG involvement – August 1 White Paper on 2018 projections
  - IOC/TOC via a briefing for weigh in on policy and technical aspects (Sept 1 EI scenarios, Sept 15 QC binders – possibly in conjunction with a fall planning team meeting where Forum co-chairs as well as IOC and TOC members are present OR separate conference call on this topic)
- Modeling Discussion
  - Substitute baseline emissions inventories for actuals and label as planning
  - How to account for prescribed fires occurring under certain conditions (poor dispersion)? To make sure prescribed fires are only occurring on good dispersion days in the model would be a daunting task at the meteorology is held constant so that the focus is on the change in emissions.
  - The key will be the relative difference of application of on the ground tools (regulatory programs, application of ERTs) to prescribed fire.
  - Concern about misinterpretation of the results from the model.

- Attribution of Haze project will be comparing the meteorology in the model as compared to actual meteorology.

### **Inter-RPO National Wildfire Emissions Inventory (Dave Randall, Air Sciences Inc.)**

*[See presentation posted on the FEJF website.]*

- Three additional tasks may be added to this contract at the request of the WRAP to increase the usefulness of the Inter-RPO National Wildfire Emissions Inventory for the WRAP.
  - Apply FCCS fuel model instead of NFDRS
  - Add fire characteristics (e.g., 10-hour fuel moisture) to facilitate plume models
  - Enhance analysis section of final documentation
    - Numerical effects of new/revised technical methods
    - Recommendations to RPOs on appropriate use of emissions inventory

### **Schedule Next Meetings**

- September 28-29, 2005 – Missoula, MT (DoubleTree)
  - Breakout sessions Sept. 29 AM
  - Emissions Forum meeting Sept. 27-28, 2005
  - Possible tour of fire lab Sept. 27 PM
- Winter 2005 – WA (Seattle, Spokane, Tacoma)
  - November 30 – December 1
- The next WRAP Board Meeting is scheduled for December 14-15, 2005
- FEJF Meeting Topics
  - Based on task deliverables
  - Consider interactions with other Forums or Workgroups
  - Topics
    - Inter-RPO Wildfire Emissions Inventory, including additional tasks
    - ERT Technical Tool Development
    - Regional Coordination of SMPs
    - Fire Tracking System
    - Model Assessment Tasks: RMC Sensitivity Runs Phase II
    - Phase III & IV Emissions Inventory
      - Model predicted impacts – differences between Phase II EI and Phase III EI (Sept. mtg)
    - Status Updates
      - N/A Guidance
      - FETM Project
      - Phase I/II EI
    - Testing of EDMS with the fire EI (Tom Moore)
    - How the emissions inventory and modeling fit together (Tom Moore)
  - Other Workplan Topics
    - Assessment of Apportionment Methods
    - Smoke Management Technical & Policy Workshop
    - User Guidance and Review of Feasibility Criteria for WRAP Fire Policies

- Computer approval system in ID/MT (Scott Keuhn & Dave Grace)
- Wei Min Hoa (NASA grants), Colin Hardy (ERTs)
- Tour fire lab - Sept 27? – Pete can arrange, would have to coordinate transportation
- Thomas Dzomba is also willing to help with arrangements as needed
- Suggested presentations
  - Paul Ervin on ag burning and emissions credits/tradeoffs, possibly even via a virtual presentation, Cathy M. contact him.

#### Monthly conference calls

- The idea of having monthly conference calls to check on the status of the active FEJF tasks was discussed and supported. Schedules will be consulted and the FEJF will start having monthly conference calls.
- The monthly conference calls will be held the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of the month at 10 am MTN, starting on July 26, 2005.
- The concept is for these calls to last 1 hour and focus on status updates for ongoing tasks.

### **Natural & Anthropogenic Guidance**

#### Overview (Darla Potter)

After development of six versions of the *Guidance for Categorizing Natural vs Anthropogenic Fire Emissions* (Guidance) by the Natural and Anthropogenic Task Team (chaired by Bob Habeck), the sixth version was sent out in October for a directed outreach / targeted review. The WRAP Board was briefed on the Guidance at the meeting in Salt Lake City on November 10, 2004 and concerns were expressed by one WRAP Board Member regarding the classification of escaped prescribed fire. The seventh version of the Natural & Anthropogenic Guidance was distributed in early December for approval during the December meeting. At the meeting a few issues were raised, mainly focused on escaped prescribed fire, requiring the preparation of an eighth version of the Guidance. The eighth version of the Guidance was distributed to the Task Team as well as those persons that raised concerns at the December meeting. With one exception, the comments received were either editorial in nature or supportive of the revisions made to resolve the issues raised on escaped prescribed fire. What was thought to be the “final version” was prepared by the Task Team and distributed to the FEJF in preparation for a February 9 conference call for FEJF Members for the purposes of achieving consensus approval of the Guidance. As Mike Ziolkowski could not be on the call to represent his concerns on escaped prescribed fire, a commitment was made to coordinate with him after the conference call to resolve his concerns. Mike’s concerns were resolved while at the February FEJF meeting by incorporating additional language in regard to technical challenges that may arise out of distinguishing impacts due to prescribed fire and escaped prescribed fire. It became apparent at the February FEJF meeting that additional work was still necessary to provide some clarification regarding the following text "...with oversight by the designated tribal air quality regulatory authority or EPA..." that appears in the *Policy for Categorizing Fire Emissions* (Section 3.2.3, page 18, last paragraph) and is quoted in the *Guidance for Categorizing Natural vs Anthropogenic Fire Emissions* (Section 2.10, page 7, 2nd quotation).

#### Tribal Concerns (Ken Cronin)

- Since the February FEJF meeting, Ken Cronin has been working with the Tribal Caucus to identify tribal concerns with the *Guidance for Categorizing Natural vs Anthropogenic Fire Emissions* (Guidance) prepared by the Natural vs Anthropogenic Task Team for the FEJF. Upon identification of the tribal concerns, Ken and the Tribal Caucus have been working together to propose changes to the FEJF to resolve those concerns in the Guidance.
- The most substantive tribal concerns are
  - Remove the section on Native American Prescribed Fire. The WRAP *Policy for Categorizing Fire Emissions* (Policy) does not separate it out from prescribed fire and the tribes do not feel it is appropriate to separate it in the Guidance.
  - An additional quotation from the Policy needs to be brought forward for Native American Cultural Fire
    - Page 18 –“This policy does not apply to Native American cultural non-vegetative burning for traditional, religious, or ceremonial purposes (e.g., cremation, sweat lodge fires).”
  - The Guidance at this point does not succeed in addressing the IOC transmittal letter issues of the need for further clarification in distinguishing between the concepts of “managed” and “controlled” nor between “ecosystem maintenance” and “ecosystem restoration” and how they relate to “natural” and “anthropogenic”. If that information is indeed in the FLM documents FRCC, WFIP, and WFSa sufficiently for all the types of fire described in this guidance, it would be helpful to add more narrative to that effect and either attached the documents as appendices or if too long, cite them by reference along with where to obtain them (e.g. website). The main concern is that for a relative newbie who manage smoke but not using these documents, it would be helpful to explain them and their applicability to fire categorization, along with some narrative on how to use the Figure 1 Process.
  - In regard to tribal concerns with the Policy language “...with oversight by the designated tribal air quality regulatory authority or EPA,...” a note has been added in the Guidance to indicate that for the purposes of determining the categorization of Native American Cultural Burning, the “designated tribal air quality regulatory authority” is that entity so designated by the Tribe.
- There are other minor changes that have also been proposed in the tribal review of the Guidance.
- The proposed changes to the Guidance have been circulated to the Tribal Caucus by Ken and no additional feedback has been received. Darla can now circulate the proposed changes to the FEJF for stakeholder review and feedback. Darla will then coordinate with Ken to resolve any further modifications to finalize the Guidance in respect to the tribal concerns that have been identified.

In regard to add more narrative for FRCC – FRCC is an evolving science. There is a website ([www.frcc.gov](http://www.frcc.gov)) that is updated on a regular basis and is maintained on a national level. A reference to that website can be added to the Guidance.

- Process Question on how tribes review WRAP Forum work products
  - Tribal Caucus Meetings

- Face to face meetings twice a year prior to the WRAP Board meetings
  - Conference calls will be resumed on a monthly basis
- There is a comprehensive e-mail list for all the tribes (446)
  - There is a core of 20-30 tribes that actively participate
    - There are 4-5 tribes that have an expressed interest in fire
- Historically the FEJF has also performed targeted review by tribes to get some feedback ahead of time during document development as well as prior to document review.

### Escaped Prescribed Fire (Tom Webb)

- Classification issues persist for escaped prescribed fire
- The problem is the quotation referring to EPA's Interim Policy
- A change needs to be made to the Guidance so that the WRAP does not undermine or incorrectly interpret EPA Policy.
- The focus of EPA's Interim Policy is NAAQS and Nonattainment areas.
- Two of the underlying basic issues with respect to escaped prescribed fire are trust and accountability
- It makes sense to classify escaped prescribed fire as "natural" due to the controllability of the escaped prescribed fire.
- In the future EPA will be opening up several Policies, which may undergo specific changes in regard to fire.
- Recommendation to resolve EPA's concern is to
  - Minimize the linkage to the Interim Policy in the Guidance by removing the top paragraph on page 10.
  - Ok with the escaped prescribed fire portion being "natural" in the context of controllability and accountability.
  - Ok with the pre escape prescribed fire portion retaining the original classification.
- It is acceptable to minimize the reference to EPA's Interim Policy in the Guidance in recognition of the fact that EPA Policies will be changing.
- Actual implementation and practicability of the Guidance is key.
- Is there an arbitrary boundary between the pre escape fire and the escaped prescribed fire?
  - In regard to land management practice, once a fire is deemed an escape it is managed as a wildfire and cannot revert back to a prescribed fire. This change in definition is ensconced in land management policy. The funding also changes.
  - There is a specific review process within the federal land management community for escaped prescribed fires.
  - The federal land management agencies manuals dictate these procedures.
- Concern was expressed in regard to the protection of the NAAQS and inconsistencies in application of EPA Policies across EPA regions.
- The Guidance will be reviewed to make sure that it is clear that the Guidance only applies to classification for Regional Haze purposes. It does not change the NAAQS procedures.
- The Guidance does not abridge or compromise a jurisdiction's authority to perform a review of a fire.

## Next Steps

- Ken will provide the proposed changes by the Tribal Caucus to Darla.
- Darla and Bob Habeck will work together to prepare a proposed final version to circulate for FEJF stakeholder review and feedback.
- Darla and Bob H. will also prepare a 1-2 page whitepaper on the ramifications in actual implementation and practicability for the classification of escaped prescribed fire.
- Darla and Bob H. will coordinate to resolve any further modifications to finalize the Guidance.

## Model Assessment Tasks

### Plume Rise (Tom Moore)

*[See presentation posted on the FEJF website.]*

- It should be noted that the same person developed both the FEJF and SMOKE approaches.
- For small fires, the PTOF is two times higher than the SMOKE approach.
- To what affect does the layer depth play into differences between the two approaches?
- In the real world, the SMOKE predictions were higher than the real observations at the SW Research lab.
- Is there a southeastern bias in SMOKE?
- How do the emissions in each layer affect visibility? You would have to run a subset through FEPS, then run the model to see if there is a difference in visibility impacts.
- What is the long range transport sensitivity to the plume rise differences?
- A proposal was made to reconvene the Inter-RPO group to look at plume rise based on the good response to that topic in previous discussions. That may be the way to resolve the issues we're dancing around now. Pete Lahm agreed to lead this effort. Tom Moore will follow-up.

### Sensitivity Runs Phase II: Regional & Mesoscale (Gail Tonnesen)

*[See presentation posted on the FEJF website.]*

- Is it valuable to look at the differences of changing the grid resolution?
- Will CAMx or CMAQ be used for the regional modeling? Both, depending on the results of the 2002 final emissions inventory runs. Then either CAMx or CMAQ will be used for the projection runs.
- Should we look at the best and worst days instead of just a three month simulation? It would not be that much more work.
- UCR needs the following in order to proceed
  - Any changes to the Workplan outlined in the presentation
  - Emissions inventory data
  - The small fires work is well underway
  - The bigger question is plume rise sensitivity, which sounds like it is a national issue.
- Another option discussed was to run FEPS to develop heat flux look up tables instead of running it for each fire.
- The ETT needs to have a conference call to move this forward.

- Tom Moore will follow-up on an ETT conference call w/ Gail as well as an Inter-RPO plume rise conference call w/ Pete.

### **Using Satellite-Based Products to Enhance Existing Area Burned Data (Amber Soja)**

*[See presentation and documents posted on the FEJF website.]*

- There are limitations in the use of satellite based products when cloud cover is present.
- Amber has not yet done distribution statistics but did add buffers corresponding to the satellite resolution. There is more coincidence in the fires after you buffer them.
- Larger buffers would account for the point response function of the satellite. There may be even more coincidence in the fires with larger buffers.
- Amber has not looked specifically into why satellites did not detect certain specific ground truthed information.
- Concerns were expressed about the quality of the 2002 Florida burn record database.
- There are three suspected reasons why the statistics don't match up well in terms of spatial resolution and area burned.
- Point response function
- Quality of the Florida burn record database
- Arbitrary center of county locations in Florida burn record database for some records
- Low severity fires can be detected (citing her work in Siberia) as it is the thermal energy you are detecting. The issue then becomes how large is the fire. There is also a timing issue with detection of fires depending on when the satellite is overhead.
- It may be difficult to distinguish smoke versus clouds if they are coincident at the same time.
- Can get burned area from burn scar signatures from another satellite mode.
- Think about doing a similar study with the WRAP's 2002 fire emissions inventory. Amber would like to do that because additional validation in various ecosystems is necessary.
- NCAR may be already looking at the WRAP data.
- This may be informing the quality of the ground data versus the accounting and quality of the satellite data.
- Until people use the satellite data for fire, the fire community cannot exact changes to the satellite design to provide additional benefit.

Remember that at the FEJF Meeting held in Santa Fe, NM March 18-20, 2003 we had a session on the use of satellites for fire and smoke characterization and reporting. Relevant documents and presentations can be found on the FEJF website

<http://www.wrapair.org/forums/fejf/meetings/030418m/index.html>

**JUNE 8, 2005**

### **Regional Coordination Task Team Breakout Session (Deb Wolfe) 8:00 AM – 3:00 PM**

*[See version 3 document posted on the FEJF website.]*

Breakout Session participants: Deb Wolfe, Bob Habeck, Coleen Campbell, Christi Gordon, Brian Finneran, Andrea Boyer, Tom Webb, Ken Cronin, Darla Potter, Don Arkell, Judith Logan, Chet Sergent, Lisa Bye

- Round-robin on everyone's expectations for regional coordination
- Discussion and revision of version 3 document
- Process
  - Those with examples of regional coordination within smoke management programs please submit a brief description to Deb.
  - Deb will incorporate all of the changes discussed as well as the new information including examples and send it back out to the task team for review.
  - Breakout session at the next FEJF meeting in September in Montana.

### **ERT Task Team Breakout Session (Mark Fitch) 8:00 – 11:00 AM**

Breakout Session participants: Dave Randall, Mark Fitch, Suraj Ahuja, Ron King, Brian Mitchell

- Refinements were made to the ERT presentation and spreadsheet during the breakout session.
- Process
  - By June 30 – add ERT definitions, clean up spreadsheet, prepare Executive Summary and instructions for expert review
  - July 27 – ERT feedback from experts
  - August 10 – ERT TT conference call (10 am PAC) to discuss expert reviewed ERT package
  - September 12 (at the latest) – distribute ERT package to the FEJF for review and discussion at the Sept. 28-29, 2005 meeting in MT.
  - Obtain FEJF approval of the ERT package for distribution to the regulatory community (state, tribal, local).

### **Fire Tracking System Task Team Breakout Session (Mark Fitch) 8:00 AM – 12:45 PM**

Breakout Session participants: Mark Fitch, Darla Potter, Suraj Ahuja, Ron King, Brian Mitchell, Paul Schlobohm, Coleen Campbell

- Discussion focused on the following topics
  - Tracking System Elements
  - Tracking System Focus
  - Calculation
  - Documents to look at to inform develop of the FTS RFP
  - Software
  - Translators
  - QA issues
  - Operation
  - Some options
  - Process
    - FTS TT conference call July 11 10 am MTN