

Attachment B

Inland recovery somehow did not make it into the printed report. I added that as a task for the next "cleanup" version.

Thanks.

<(((
Sky Bristol
sbristol@usgs.gov
Office: 303-202-4181

████████████████████
(
████████████████████

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Stephen E Hammond"
<sehammon@usgs.gov>
Date: August 1, 2010 6:59:04 AM MDT
To: Sky Bristol <sbristol@usgs.gov>
Cc: Mark Miller <mark.w.miller@noaa.gov>
Subject: Re: Need feed back from USCG and NOAA on potential changes to oil budget tool

Sky,

Can you add my name to that of Kevin & Matha as an executive sponsor?

Also, I suggest that the definition of "Inland Recovery" be added to information in the executive summary output.

Stephen E. Hammond
US Geological Survey
Chief Emergency Operations Office,
National Geospatial Program
Reston, VA
703-648-5033 (w)
████████████████████
703-648- 5792 (fax)

-----Sky Bristol <sbristol@usgs.gov> wrote: -----

To: Mark Miller <mark.w.miller@noaa.gov>
From: Sky Bristol <sbristol@usgs.gov>
Date: 07/31/2010 09:36PM
cc: Stephen Hammond <sehammon@usgs.gov>
Subject: Re: Need feed back from USCG and NOAA on potential changes to oil budget tool

010898

I don't mean to be picky and it's not a huge deal, but I made some modifications to the credits section here to better represent the folks involved with the Oil Budget Tool.

<.(((<<<N~N~N<.(((<<<N~N~N<.(((<<<

Sky Bristol
sbristol@usgs.gov
Office: 303-202-4181

<.(((<<<N~N~N<.(((<<<N~N~N<.(((<<<

On Jul 31, 2010, at 4:14 PM, Mark Miller wrote:

Thanks Steve. Look forward to the call. I have attached the latest that has incorporated comments from many reviewers.

Stephen E Hammond wrote:

Mark, Bill, Sean,

We have received guidance on how to proceed with changes to the Oil Budget Tool. EPA has made some suggested modifications that we need your input on to proceed. USGS as the developer and implementer of the product we need your direction and your guidance on exactly how the tool should describe the data that are used. We'd prefer your comments in writing to document changes. If you want to meet by phone we can use the bridge.

EPA suggests in the interest of getting these out this weekend that we:

- 1) combine natural and chemical into one category of dispersed oil on charts and in narrative.

I think that is good to keep them separate. We can then include chemical dispersion with skimming, burning and collection (in the text) as our "response success" while still allowing us to lump chemical and natural dispersion together for both underwater oil and likely biodegradation.

Sent: Sun Aug 01 10:03:52 2010

Subject: Fw: Oil Budget Tool Update Complete - Draft Final with Report

Heather, see below.

From: Mark Miller <mark.w.miller@noaa.gov>

To: Jane Lubchenco <Jane.Lubchenco@noaa.gov>; Margaret Spring <Margaret.Spring@noaa.gov>; William Conner <William.Conner@noaa.gov>; Jennifer Austin <Jennifer.Austin@noaa.gov>; Kristen Sarri (doc) (KSarri@doc.gov) <KSarri@doc.gov>; Scott Smullen <Scott.Smullen@noaa.gov>; Parita Shah (Pshah@doc.gov) <Pshah@doc.gov>; Kevin Griffis (kgriffis@doc.gov) <kgriffis@doc.gov>; 'Sgilson@doc.gov' <Sgilson@doc.gov>

Sent: Sun Aug 01 06:44:19 2010

Subject: Oil Budget Tool Update Complete - Draft Final with Report

Dr. Lubchenco,

USGS completed the update late last night. Here is a draft final from Jen and I. The only thing missing from the Where is the Oil paper is the citation for the flow rate estimates.

Mark

Mark Miller wrote:

Subject: Re: Oil Budget - EPA Comments - follow up and a request

From: Perciasepe.Bob@epamail.epa.gov

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 2010 22:10:55 -0400

To: Stephen E Hammond <sehammon@usgs.gov>

To: Stephen E Hammond <sehammon@usgs.gov>

CC: mark w miller <Mark.W.Miller@noaa.gov>, bill lehr <Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov>, Sky Bristol <sbristol@usgs.gov>, Mark K Sogge <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>, sean k o'brien <sean.k.o'brien@uscg.gov>

Thanks Steve.

I will try to get some language but NOAA science folks like Steve Murawski know this better than I. The basic idea is that this will be the first government input into the fate of the oil issue and biodegradation is a big part of that. That should be pretty easy to discuss. I will think how I can help on the other item 2. I agree it is a tough one.

I think you are making a mistake on the separate estimates of dispersal but I have no additional arguments other than it is not verifiable and we will be trying to explain it for the rest of our time on this. I will take it up with white house.

I greatly appreciate your attention to our concerns.

Bob Perciasepe
Office of the Administrator
(o)202 564 4711

010819

(c) 202 368 8193

From: Stephen E Hammond [sehammon@usgs.gov]
Sent: 07/31/2010 07:53 PM AST
To: Bob Perciasepe
Cc: mark.w.miller@noaa.gov; bill.lehr@noaa.gov; Sky Bristol <sbristol@usgs.gov>; Mark K Sogge <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>; sean.k.o'brien@uscg.gov; Stephen E Hammond <sehammon@usgs.gov>
Subject: Fw: Oil Budget - EPA Comments - follow up and a request

Hi Bob,

I'm with USGS and serve as a member of the Interagency Solutions Group as a liaison between the FRTG and the the NIC. USGS spent some time this afternoon with NOAA and USCG discussing the three suggestions you made below in preparation to update and modify the oil budget tool that has been developed. I'll give you a quick update on the discussion of suggestion 1 & 3, then ask you to provide some additional feedback on suggestion 2.

Suggestion 1 - combine natural and chemical into one category of dispersed oil on charts and in narrative.

Decision - Based on how NOAA is developing a communication product with the WH, the dispersion types (Natural & Chemical) will not be combined. We appreciate the case for combining them however the goal is to show chemical dispersion as part of the Federal response to the spill.

Suggestion 3 - if no estimate can be made of biodegradation at least have a robust discussion about it both in terms of oil that will remain in marshes to be biodegraded and in terms of our expectations and evidence of the dispersed oil subsea.

Decision - NOAA is in general agreement that more is needed here. They indicated that they tried to make this explanation as robust as possible. We believe that a second document will be prepared in the near future that addresses biodegradation as the primary focus. It will include as much as it can on biodegradation rates.

Suggestion 2 - clear up the dissolution and dispersion potential confusion with some additional explanation.

Decision - There is agreement on this yet we have found it difficult to describe in a short paragraph. We'd like to ask you to provide a short write-up that we can consider for this explanation in the oil budget tool.

We are working to get tell toll updated by this evening. Any feedback you can offer quickly is greatly appreciated.

Steve

Stephen E. Hammond
US Geological Survey
Chief Emergency Operations Office,
National Geospatial Program
Reston, VA
703-648-5033 (w)
[REDACTED]
703-648- 5792 (fax)

-----Forwarded by Stephen E Hammond/GEOG/USGS/DOI on 07/31/2010 07:24PM -----