

Region 3 Breakout Group¹

Land Management Planning (LMP)

Participants: Rich Fisher, Roy Hall, Bob LeFevre, Pete Lahm, David Martinez, Jerome McDonald, Mike McConnell, Debby Potter, Pete Stewart

LMP Breakout Notes

1. What are the leadership and/or organizational changes at the WO, Research and/or RO level that would encourage increased Fire and Air collaboration?

Forest Supervisors decide how to acquire and use human resources (staff or contractors) to do PSD, smoke, other air duties. Process and technical matters of air (NSR or Smoke) are so challenging for most Forest people that they need go-to experts. Fire/smoke is not exactly the same since the some analyses and all decisions and recommendations should occur locally but some technical analyses could be done elsewhere by experts because of increasing complexities. Fire/smoke duties and capabilities differ from Forest to Forest.

Discussion:

- Pete Stewarts LMP guidance on the web looks a lot like Acheson proposal today. Everyone in R3 follows it.
- Draught and beetle mortality is adding to the fuels problem. Need to educate the public that the problem is getting worse. Either wildfire or Rx there is going to be more smoke in R3.
- Fires use is going to be more and more limited as the draught continues towards the situation of a no-burn – risks are too high for fire escape and danger to the resource itself if we were to Rx fire burn.
- Rx fire yields less smoke so it is desired.

LMP, R3 Key Points

- R-3 NEPA/smoke guidelines (R1-4)
- New LMP director
- Cibola is lead R-3 Forest
- LM planner has lead
- Activity that is generating impact should take lead in project. Not LMP on specific projects
- LMP delegated impact analysis to air or fire staff depending on Forest

¹ *These notes have been slightly edited for style but remain largely as originally received from the breakout group reporters. Discussion questions that were provided to the groups, but that were not addressed, have been removed. The original list of questions can be found in a separate document entitled "Breakout Handout" on the Fire & Air Workshop web page.*

- FAST Team – National team to make assessments on non-smoke/emissions impacts – Modeling Centus. Tech. Team in Central location for AQRV impact assessment.
- Beetle/Disease/Drought Mortality – more fires and more emissions
- Extended drought means reduced fire use. 3 points – bodies, risk, window

Land Use Planning – Fire Effects on Air Fire and Air Quality Issues and Tasks	Current State			Optimal State		
	Fire Prog.	Air Prog.	Other	Fire Prog.	Air Prog.	Other
ID team lead for issue.			LMP Lead			LMP Lead
Execution of fire projects	Involved		Variety Of Staffs Involved	Lead		
Description of Affected Environment (general meteorology, sensitive areas, current air quality, etc.).	Involved	Involved	LMP Lead but delegate to air, fire, others			same
Alternative Description (fuel treatment options, justify use of fire, timing of any proposed burning, mitigation measures, etc.).	Lead		Wildlife & other involved	Lead	Partner	Wildlife & other involved
Environmental Consequences (quantify emissions; describe potential short and long term effects on health, nuisance, and/or visibility; worst-case analysis; dispersion modeling, etc.).		Lead		Co-lead	Co-lead	
Describe requirements and effectiveness of state smoke management plans and/or visibility SIPs.	Involved	Lead		Involved	Lead	
Monitoring	Co-lead	Co-lead	Research Co-lead	Co-lead	Co-lead	Research Co-lead

Flipchart notes from report back:

Roles – (See Matrix)

Leadership/Organizational Changes:

R3 is more decentralized than other Regions

FAST TEAM concept – for Forests AQRV

? AARV emphasis in recreation – possibly?

At Forest level, they like decentralized approach to smoke management.

Messages:

- 1 Drought limits fire use and reduced window for burning
- 2 Burning now will increase smoke (due to tree condition)
- 3 Prescribed fire is less risky than wildfire

Region 3 Breakout Group

State Implementation Plan (SIP) and Smoke Management Plan (SMP)

SIP/SMP Breakout Questions

1) Increased Fire and Air collaboration on RPO/SIP/SMP maximizes our ability to meet FS objectives. What other advantages are there?

It changes the perception with the public and States as to what objectives we have for the public good. Chances to add advocacy for the FS mission on a broader scale. Initiate relationships/coordination with Tribes to facilitate their development of TIPs so that through “peer pressure”, atmospheric loadings from wildland fire are reduced. With Fire as picking up more of the RPO responsibility (in an ideal world), the air staff could place greater emphasis on other AQRV issues important in the Regional Haze/RPO arena. But this will be somewhat compromised because of the greater emphasis on WIU rather than wilderness among the fire community.

2) How can we best interact with States/what are our opportunities to do so? (e.g., RPO involvement, etc.).

Get to know and love your regulators. Most are no longer threatened by regulators. Facilitated by placing a FS person in the State office. Do show-me trips in the field to demonstrate wildfire and Rx fire ops. Invite States as speakers in FS training. Conduct regularly scheduled meetings to exchange information. National Fire Plan provides a vehicle to pay for the support (salary and travel) to attend RPO meetings. Reg Forester makes decision on this spending – take a proposal for added RPO participation to him/her.

AZ State Land Commissioner head of a group that coordinates fire activities. NM nothing similar.

SIPs and SMPs Fire and Air Quality Issues and Tasks	Current State			Optimal State		
	Fire Prog.	Air Prog.	Other	Fire Prog.	Air Prog.	Other
SMPs						
▪ SMP review team member	Lead NM Co-lead AZ	Co-lead AZ		Co-lead	Co-lead	
▪ Wildfire/Rx fire tradeoffs				Co-Lead		Research Co-Lead
▪ Current and future fire use projections and emissions	Co-lead	Co-lead		Co-lead	Co-lead	
▪ Definition of appropriate prescribed fire BACM	Lead AZ Co-lead NM	Involved AZ Co-lead NM		same	same	
▪ Appropriateness of various smoke management techniques	Co-lead	Co-lead		Co-lead	Co-lead	Involved Research
SIPs						
▪ SIP (NAAQS and RH) review team member	Involved NM Co-lead AZ	Lead NM Co-lead AZ		Co-lead	Co-lead	
▪ RPO participation		Lead		Co-lead	Co-lead	
▪ Definition of appropriate prescribed fire BACM	Lead AZ Co-lead NM	Involved AZ Co-lead NM		Lead AZ Co-lead NM	Involved AZ Co-lead NM	
▪ Conformity analysis (if needed)		Lead		Involved	Lead	
▪ Analysis of new PM2.5 NAAQS on Rx fire	None	None	State Lead	Research Partners hip	Research Partners hip	Research Partners hip
▪ Analysis of the effects of the Regional Haze rule on Rx fire		Lead		Involved	Lead	States Involved

Flipchart notes from report back:

1. Advantages to increased collaboration:
 - a. Help state air regulators answer stakeholder questions
 - b. Help to achieve goal of protecting air quality
 - c. Consistent message to public – especially with Tribes
2. Best interaction with States:
 - a. Make them our friends
 - b. Help make rules – participate
 - c. Cooperative agreements – help develop
 - d. Liaison positions (e.g. G. Barkmann)
 - e. Take them to field during burn.
3. Leverage National Fire Plan funding for positions, etc. (e.g., Pete Stewart)
4. Need more help from Fire – do more of #3 to get this. This will enable Air staff to focus on Air issues, i.e., AQRVs, etc.
5. Matrix (see it)
 - a. In general: fire = SMP; air = SIP
 - b. But matrix assisted them in seeing some distinctions
 - c. Noted where Research fits.
 - d. Common theme: more collaboration between air & fire.

Region 3 Breakout Group

Data Needs/Strategies

Data Needs Breakout Notes

1) What are some information and/or data gaps in your region that limit your ability to estimate emissions for fire tracking, emissions estimation, and emissions inventory?

Live loadings. Wildland fire and wildfire activity information. Acres blackened vs. fire perimeter is overestimated. Fire severity by sub-area. Better temporal resolution (daily reporting). Emission inventories needed by fuel types. Take credit for utilization reduction techniques within a fire perimeter.

Meteorology and dispersion data gaps. On-site meteorology. Upper air data.

2) What information needs have been identified in your region for LMPs, SIPs, SMPs, and/or RPOs?

How much credit should be taken for mechanical removal. Redundant data collection requirements that are also too comprehensive, i.e., asks for data that is not routinely used.

3) Does your region need to collect new data or develop new processes to meet these information needs?

Calculate emissions averted by mechanical removal and integrate reporting these data into NFSPORS. Start time and duration not now collected – but it needs to be. Too many disparate website links with too little training on how to use them.

4) How far along is your region's FCAMMS and what can you do to help it advance? (I.e., What is needed in preparation for the FCAMMS products and what will the FCAMMS need from your region?) How will you do LMP, SIP, and SMP analyses until FCAMMS products are ready?

R3 hasn't seen much from Zeller – Model-T.

5) Will FCAMMS tools change or evolve existing LMP, SIP, and SMP processes? How?

Yes but not after the current planning round. Need more attention paid to stable met conditions. Consider adding a tool such as RAMS that handle stable meteorology better. Use ensemble forecasts.

6) What did you see in the BlueSky example that would work in your region and what would not?

All of it is useful and BS provide analytical tools that will be helpful but so much of it seemed complex and technical and we wouldn't understand how to use it most effectively without a lot of training.

7) What are the leadership and/or organizational changes at the WO, Research and/or RO level that would encourage increased Fire and Air collaboration?

Educate executives about requirements and needs. Need national direction at the inter-departmental level for uniform event and emissions tracking. Need a recognition by Executive leadership that the "spotted dog" (prescribed fire activity) that emissions and activities tracking is needed. Try to encourage balance within the fire program b/w suppression, fuels and all other interests competing for funding and management attention.

Data Needs/Strategies Fire and Air Quality Issues and Tasks	Current State			Optimal State		
	Fire Prog.	Air Prog.	Other	Fire Prog.	Air Prog.	Other
Prescribed fire data collection for emissions estimation	Lead			Lead	Involved	RSAC Partner
Wildland fire data collection for emissions estimation Emissions estimation methods	Lead Lead	Involved		Lead Lead	Involved Involved	RSAC Involved
Dispersion modeling expertise	Lead		State Involved	Lead		Research & State Partner
Development and maintenance of emissions inventories	In AZ Partner NM Lead	In AZ Pete is Partner	State is partner	AZ Status Quo Lead	AZ Status Quo Involved	
Emergency event (wildfire) smoke monitoring	Involved	Lead		Co-lead	Co-lead	
Prescribed fire smoke monitoring networks	Lead	Involved		Co-lead	Co-lead	
FCAMMS participation	None	Lead		Co-lead	Co-lead	Research Partner

Flipchart notes from report back:

- Redundant data requirements for LMP, SIP, etc.
- FCAMMS Staff will not help in this round – they will in the future.
- SLC Remote Sensing can be a significant Partner (See Matrix)
- Significant differences between R3 and R6 and NM/AZ.

Region 3 Breakout Group

Regional Action Plan/National Priorities

Participants: Rich Fisher, Roy Hall, Bob LeFevre, David Martinez, Mike McConnell, Debby Potter, Pete Stewart

National Priorities

1. Cache of DataRAMs – better if some monitors are available out of the region. WO monitors could be used as back-up for what the Region has during wildfire, etc.
2. Satellite Guard website – who should control this private site? We want the control to continue to be by the WO, a centralized approach. There could be a separate page for regions, but the site needs to remain managed by one person (WO). We support the design changes to improve the ease for retrieving data. There's a new site under development that is password protected. [Get URL to David Martinez, others.]

Note: Blanket TA is available for us to use. Call Rich Fisher, give him a management code or 6500-46 for interagency transfer of funds to buy the equipment.

Should the data delivery system be GOES or SATGUARD, or a combination site? WO needs to research that and present pros and cons.

4. Remote Sensing Application Center to continue to provide services for remote sensing, e.g., smoke tracking by satellite.

Support and fund our FCAMM in Colorado (Karl Zeller) so we can meet the expectations of our partners, implement the National Fire Plan, populate our smoke models, etc.

Promote an event/activity tracking system that is web-based. RSAC can assist with this, with Brad as point of contact for hosting the system on their USDA site.

Flipcharts from report back:

- Fire event activity tracking system
- Funding support for FCAMMS
- Satellite web-based retrieval
- Maintain cache of monitoring equipment (e.g., data rams), SOPs, protocols, guidance for national.

Region 3 Regional Action Plan

GOAL: implement National Fire Plan and Forest health objectives while protecting / maintaining air quality and managing nuisance smoke

1) Increase the capability of our regional modeling consortium to provide us tools to implement the National Fire Plan.

Letter from RF to Al Riebau and Jim Saveland closer --- presentation: skills, partners why we need it, products; more funding (wasn't funded as initially planned). Use presentation from Athens. Karl Zeller to help us write the letter. Input from Chuck Maxwell (GACC). We need products we can understand and use on the ground by fuels techs.

2) Foster relationship with Air Quality Bureaus – daily interactions, support them, keep on the good path we're on with the staff relationships.

3) Fill the National Fire Plan position. Jointly develop work plan for the position covering NM and AZ. They can help fill the gap in the RPO workload.

4) *Technology transfer* -- we're doing a lot with smoke monitoring, and need to keep going: making DataRAMS available (4), trading in old equipment for DataRams next step is more satellite linkages (currently using WO equipment to do that). 2 FRMs monitors (one not sequential).

Strategic co-placement of DataRAMs with RAWs (Chuck Maxwell has the prototype operating).

5) Interagency Coordination

- BLM position in NM will be the smoke data steward (Bye) for all agencies. Therefore we need to continue our database working group in NM with increasing leadership from the state.

- Our partners want interagency availability of equipment, training, etc.

- Continue working on rule making for smoke management with state agencies and other stakeholders.

6) Public Outreach

7) More discussion about how to “work with” Ceclilia Abeyta NM Farm Bureau, Paul Seeby of CEED (Center for Energy and Economic Development).