



Re: sample conclusion template

Bill Lehr o Franklin Shaffer

06/07/2010 07:53 PM

ira leifer, Poojitha Yapa, Paul Bommer,
"savas@newton.berkeley.edu", antonio.possolo, "Pedro I. Espina",
Cc: Chris Barker, "Wereley@purdue.edu", Alberto Aliseda, James J
Riley, Juan Lasheras, Mark K Sogge, Marcia K McNutt, Anthony
Cugini, George Guthrie
Please respond to Bill.Lehr

Franklin,

You will note that the conclusions will say most, not all of the experts. As always, I will include your independent conclusions and report along with those from the other experts. I accept full responsibility if I did not make clear to you that each expert was to provide his best estimate today as we needed to provide an updated answer to the Incident Command. With regard to Secretary's Chu's request, this was news to all of us, including Dr. McNutt. Marcia has been pleasantly straightforward in letting us know these things as soon as they happen. But happen they do when you are responding to an emergency.

There will be a later time period when there will be ample time to perform this analysis using all the data from all sources. Only then, will one be able to give a final estimate. In the meantime, I encourage you to look at the new videos of the post riser severing that is up on the ftp site.

Best Regards,

Bill Lehr

On 6/7/10 3:53 PM, Franklin Shaffer wrote:

> Dear Plume Analysis Team,
> I would like to make a statement regarding our conference call today.
>
> Our Plume Team has been working on an independent estimate of the
> maximum rate at which oil could be leaking from the BP Horizon oil
> spill. Our conference call today was to discuss our analysis of the
> maximum oil leak rate.
>
> During the latter part of the conference call, Marcia McNutt, the USGS
> Director and Leader of the government's Flow Rate Technical Group
> (FRTG), informed us that Secretary of Energy Steven Chu was waiting for
> oil leak rate numbers from our Plume Team (in fact that he was
> postponing an Executive Order to BP until we could produce numbers), and
> that Sec. Chu would use our Plume Team's numbers to order BP to have a
> certain minimum level of compliance for the oil spill. The conference
> call today was the first time I heard anything about this matter.
>
> The Plume Team was then asked to achieve a consensus that our best
> estimate of the oil leak rate was 20000 to 34000 bpd, or numbers in that
> range. Marcia McNutt also asked the team if it would be appropriate to
> report to the Secretary of Energy that the Plume Team had achieved
> "surprising consensus" on the numbers of 20000 to 34000 bpd.

>
> I feel that I should state that I did not agree that these numbers be
> attributed to the Plume Analysis Team. Again, I did not agree to a
> consensus on these, or any other numbers, for the Plume Team's estimate
> of the maximum oil rate leaking from the BP site.

>
> No one warned me that I would be asked for a final number for maximum
> oil leak rate today. I have sent more than one email to the team
> leader, Bill Lehr of NOAA, informing him that the analysis of maximum
> oil leak rate that I and several colleagues at NETL are performing would
> not be ready until tomorrow, June 8, and that my NETL final report would
> not be ready until COB June 9.

>
> I understand that this is a crisis and the government must act
> immediately. I do not want to cause any delay. So I will present the
> numbers we have for maximum oil leak rate as of today. Our analysis is
> producing a number of 35,000 bpd for the maximum oil leak rate. This
> number does not include analysis uncertainty. The Plume Team member
> from NIST has advised us that the uncertainty associated with our "PIV"
> analysis of BP videos is +/- 40%. So to account for uncertainty in our
> analysis, the maximum oil leak rate based on NETL's analysis is 50,000
> bpd (36000 + 40% of 36000). To account for the full range of
> uncertainty, this number could also be presented as an estimate of 34000
> to 50000 bpd for the maximum oil leak rate.

>
> Anyone who is given these numbers should informed that our analysis was
> entirely based on a few hours of video of oil leaks provided by BP.
> Furthermore, that BP alone chose the video samples from more than 50
> days of video of oil leak jets. It should also be noted that the
> quality of video provided to us was degraded (compressed), and that
> although we have continually asked BP for copies of the original
> unaltered video, BP has not provided it to date.

>
> Finally, since the issue of funding of Plume Team members came up
> during the call today: I would like to state that I am a civil servant,
> a federal employee of the USDOE, and I have been a research engineer
> with DOE for 25 years. I am paid solely by U.S. taxpayers and my
> paycheck comes directly from the U.S. Treasury. I accept finding from
> no one else.

>
> Sincerely,
> Franklin D. Shaffer

>
>
> Franklin D. Shaffer
> Senior Research Engineer
> USDOE National Energy Technology Laboratory
> Computational Science Division, Model Validation Team
> Mail Stop 84-202
> 626 Cochran's Mill Road
> Pittsburgh, PA 15236

>
> Franklin.Shaffer@netl.doe.gov
> Office phone: 412-386-5964
> Cell phone: 412-833-3849

>
>
>
>>>> "Bill Lehr"<Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov> 6/7/2010 1:34 PM>>>>
>>>>

> CONCLUSION TEMPLATE

>
> As with earlier estimates, the conclusions in this report are only to
> aid the Response, not to determine the fi
> nal Federal estimate of
> spillage. Because of time constraints, assumptions were made that may
> through later information or analysis be shown to be invalid. For
> example, the Team assumes that the average flow between the start of
> the
> incident and the insertion of the RITT was relatively constant and the
>
> time frames that were included in the examined videos were
> representative of that average. If this were not true, then the actual
>
> spillage may differ significantly from the values stated below.
>
> Most of the experts have concluded that, based upon the limited data
> available and the small amount of time to process the data, the best
> estimate for the average flow rate for the leakage prior to the
> insertion of the RITT is ??? (could be a range). However, it is
> possible
> that the spillage could have been as little as ??? and as large ???.
> Further analysis of the existing data and of other videos not yet
> viewed
> may allow a refinement of these numbers.
>
>
>
>>