

Subj: RE: Charleston
Date: 8/10/07 14:51:52 Eastern Daylight Time
From: ken.farmer@dhs.gov
To: JGRoutley@aol.com, ken.farmer@dhs.gov
CC: charlie.dickinson@dhs.gov



CONFIDENTIAL

Gordon:

I would agree. I will await Charlie's comments. I will see him Monday morning at a 10AM meeting on the Baltimore Recruit Death.

Ken

From: JGRoutley@aol.com [mailto:JGRoutley@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, August 10, 2007 2:46 PM
To: Farmer, Ken
Cc: Dickinson, Charlie
Subject: Charleston

Ken and Charlie

I want to give you an update on my thoughts for the production of a unified Charleston report and case study.

After talking to Tim Merinar at NIOSH and Nelson Bryner at NIST, I think there is a good possibility of working toward the production of a consolidated report on the Charleston Incident. NIOSH and NIST would each develop an individual report, using their own policies and procedures and following their specific mandates. The City of Charleston would produce a full documentation and analysis of the incident, including some background information. Each component could "stand alone" ---however the work would be coordinated among the three teams in order to eliminate gaps, conflicts and ambiguities and to resolve terminology issues --- and to make use of each other's information --- so that a reader could look at all three reports and understand how they relate to each other.

All three reports could all be distributed on a single DVD, including photos and possibly video segments...everything anyone would ever want to know about what really happened in Charleston, including lessons learned (and relearned) as well as "newly discovered information".

The USFA could further expand on this material to produce a comprehensive case study of the incident. This would include the incident documentation --- plus background information, a discussion of codes and code enforcement issues, and follow-up information, such as the City of Charleston's Strategic Plan to make changes resulting from the incident. Any code or policy changes enacted by Charleston or South Carolina should also be included. All of the information relating to counselling and psychological impacts could also be included in the full case study.

The case study itself would have to be produced after the other components have been completed, but the designated person/team could begin gathering information and monitoring developments now. The actual writing would come later.

It might be a good idea to have a panel of national experts look at the information and guide the development of the case study, as the information comes together. They could provide high level overview comments to make the case study more useful for educational purposes.

Those are my thoughts. Does that make sense to you?

Gordon

J Gordon Routley