

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/2/2024 8:21:14 PM

First name: Tony

Last name: Hull

Organization:

Title:

Comments: 1. Even though there was a large crowd at PCL, many did not know of this meeting, and many were turned away because the space was far too small. May I request another Placitas meeting in the Comment Period but fully publicized and in a much larger venue (Elem. School, Pres. Church, for example.)

2. Having owned a house in logging country in Oregon (Newport), clearly it is possible to clear even very hilly terrain without fire. Is this an economic/resource decision to go to "controlled burn"? If so, please reveal the economic differences. How do these compare to the risk of losing control of the fire.

3. I am experienced in doing risk analysis for NASA. There, it is NOT sufficient to simply say "we have run models" as mentioned in the meeting in response to my question.

Part of this is concurrent evaluation of PROBABILITY OF FAILURE (POF) & CONSEQUENCE OF FAILURE (COF).

3a. Models may assist in evaluating each, POF and COF.

3b. Generally, each is put on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being minimal and 5 being catastrophic. 3c. 3d. These may be model based.

3e. Then COF is plotted as a function of POF, an x-y chart.

4. This is what I am asking for. I would be happy to assist with either methods used in Oregon Logging on hilly terrain or evaluating risk and producing the Government Format Risk Chart with $COF = \text{function}(POF)$, or both.

5. It would be useful to discuss in meetings risk summarized in this manner!