5/8/2019

Representative Baseline and Future Fire Scenarios Working Group

Meeting Notes

Welcome and Roll Call – Tom

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tom Moore | **x** |
| Matt Mavko | **x** |
| Ryan Templeton |  |
| Mark Fitch | **x** |
| Farren Herron-Thorpe |  |
| Rhonda Payne |  |
| Kristen Martin |  |
| Molly Birnbaum | **x** |
| Paul Goodfellow | **x** |
| Tina Suarez-Murias | **x** |
| Pat Brewer |  |
| Bob Kotchenruther | **x** |
| Paul Corrigan | **x** |
| Sara Strachan | **x** |
| Rene Nsanzineza |  |
| Gail Tonneson | **x** |

**Feedback for Matt on Representative Baseline fire inventory method described in whitepaper (**[**https://drive.google.com/open?id=1p2WQAG\_Pg1iQH\_xEh3rx9jgYC2bZFcP6**](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1p2WQAG_Pg1iQH_xEh3rx9jgYC2bZFcP6)**)**

Bob: -if EPA metric is working well, then wildfire differences between 2014 base inventory and 5-year baseline won’t matter much

 -however, this might not be the only reason to develop the baseline method

 -the sensitivity in RH modeling outcome for the base vs. baseline inventories might inform the usefulness of conducting model sensitivity analysis using the future fire scenarios

Matt: -obviously, we don’t want to do something that’s unnecessary

Tom: -it would add a layer of understanding

 -a carbon signal remains after removing large fires

Gail: -not sure why there is the effort to spread fire data over 5 years, is it regulatorily useful (should just use 2014)?

Mark: -thinks 2014 is not robust

 -metric takes out carbon, not wildfire

 -thinks Matt’s method is impressive and a good step forward

Gail: -has no problem with the method as laid out in the memo but not sure how it fits into the planning process

Matt: -confused, thought we were developing a base year, a baseline, and a future year

Sara: -for fire, 1 year is not nearly as representative as 5 years because of fire’s variability in space/time/magnitude

Tom: -further discussed the importance of understanding current and potential future fire impacts to haze and PM2.5, not just for haze planning but also for public awareness

Bob: -on memo, thinks method is more advanced than first round, has no objective to method

Mark/Tom: -discuss need to do baseline

 -was it assigned?

 -confusion on EPA modeling vs. WRAP modeling

Gail: -discussed differences between EPA 2016/2023/2028 efforts and WRAP. For baseline inventories, it’s hard to know what impact it will have in the modeling results until we look at them.

Tom: -discussed the need for a 5-year planning inventory, not just because of large year-to-year variation in fire activity, but also because of variability in other sectors like EGU and oil&gas.

Bob: -One indication of how useful developing the 5-year planning inventory is might come from comparing the 2014 vs. 5-year monitored average 20% most impaired days & differences in chemical speciation between the 1-year and 5-year averages. Exploring the sensitivity of 2014 vs. 5-year baseline modeling at each IMPROVE site might inform how useful this step is in the future (next SIP rounds).

Sara: -let’s pivot to giving Matt needed feedback on technical aspects of baseline method

 -pg. 2, Fig. 2: surprised that there is no climate change signal in area-frequency curves calculated for two time periods

Matt: -noticed that as well – perhaps it’s buried in the SOC relationship, maybe the time periods aren’t long enough…

?: Do the ecoregions used cross state and other borders?

Matt: Correct, they do not relate to political jurisdiction at all. If and when we want the information by state, by county, etc. we could resolve it to that level.

< see <https://www.fs.fed.us/land/ecosysmgmt/> and <https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/54244abde4b037b608f9e23d> and

 [https://www.fs.fed.us/rm/ecoregions/products/map-ecoregions-united-states/#](https://www.fs.fed.us/rm/ecoregions/products/map-ecoregions-united-states/)>

Eventually…

Consensus reached. No members objected to method. Matt given go ahead to implement.

**Wrap up and Action Items**

* + May 22 (10-11 pm MT) – next call