

## **Miller, Diane M. (CDC/NIOSH/EID)**

---

**From:** exlasd@msn.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 05, 2009 9:55 PM  
**To:** NIOSH Docket Office (CDC)  
**Cc:** Chen, Jihong (Jane) (CDC/NIOSH/EID) (CTR)  
**Subject:** 141 - FFUS Comments

**Name**  
Jerry Boyd

**Organization**  
Fire Chief (retired)

**Email**  
exlasd@msn.com

**Address**  
14452 Hunt Mountain Lane  
Baker City, Oregon 97814  
USA

### **Comments**

Quite frankly with very rare exception I do not support any interior attacks on unoccupied structures. Property is important but not as important as the life of even one firefighter. Property owners should carry insurance. If property is lost insurance coverage applies.

I liken firefighters entering unoccupied structures to what used to happen in law enforcement where officers would enter structures after armed suspects who were not holding anyone hostage. Hundreds of law officers were killed in such pursuits and nearly 40 years ago law enforcement administrators said "enough"! If no life other than the shooter is threatened we won't enter and we will wait for specially trained and equipped SWAT teams. As a result hundreds of officer lives have been saved.

It is time for the fire service to adopt the same approach. Only if failure to enter an unoccupied structure will create a more serious risk to life (NOT PROPERTY) should such entry be made and then only with RIT in place and all possible safety precautions implemented. If there is no added risk to life from the failure to do an interior attack on an unoccupied structure then the attack should be 100% defensive from the exterior. If this "policy" that I am suggesting had been in place for the past 5 years at least a hundred firefighters lives would have not been lost due to structural collapse etc.