

From: Tim Robertson <timrobertson@nukaresearch.com>
Subject: Fwd: [SPAM] Proposed Risk Assessment Methodology comments
Date: June 3, 2009 9:55:58 AM AKDT
To: Kathleen George <kathleen@nukaresearch.com>

Tim Robertson
timrobertson@nukaresearch.com
907 399-3598
www.nukaresearch.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: Gary Newman <gary@chena.org>
Date: June 2, 2009 8:14:56 PM GMT-08:00
To: aracommments@nukaresearch.com
Subject: [SPAM] Proposed Risk Assessment Methodology comments

Hello,

I've read through the assorted documents and comments with a fresh look. It seems apparent that the methodology is less than empirical - no field studies, no interviews with operators, little cooperation from the companies who own the infrastructure.

Cascadia had the most comprehensive analysis and I would echo their major concerns with the methodology as has been presented. Without a real world analysis of how this infrastructure is operated, the educated guesses do not meet the criteria for protection/analysis that the risk assessment was intended to provide.

As such, I would recommend that this contract be halted until such time as real world data and input can be received with the cooperation of those who own and operate this infrastructure.

While I don't make any allegations of actual conflict, I do also have some concern over the appearance of conflict in that Doyon, a partner in this assessment, is involved in the oil industry that this assessment seeks to analyze.

Sincerely,

Gary Newman
1083 Esro Road
Fairbanks, AK 99712
gary@chena.org