



Re: Reporter's Query Re: Upper Bounds 

Marcia K McNutt  Espina, Pedro I.  
:

06/08/2010 08:59 AM

Pedro-

Please explain that despite the best attempts of the FRTG and members of the press who have taken the time to understand what a lower bound is our first results were widely misinterpreted. We do now have an upper bound we will be releasing shortly along with a post riser cut rate.

Marcia

---

**From:** "Espina, Pedro I." [pedro.espina@nist.gov]  
**Sent:** 06/08/2010 08:44 AM AST  
**To:** Marcia McNutt  
**Subject:** Fw: Reporter's Query Re: Upper Bounds

Marcia,

Any advice on how to proceed?

Thank you,

Pedro

---

**From:** Dan Froomkin <froomkin@huffingtonpost.com>  
**To:** Espina, Pedro I.  
**Sent:** Tue Jun 08 08:08:39 2010  
**Subject:** Reporter's Query Re: Upper Bounds

Dr. Espina,

I am hoping you can help me clear up a widespread misunderstanding.

Despite some attempts at clarification by myself and others ([http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/06/03/gulf-oil-spill-latest-fed\\_n\\_599615.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/06/03/gulf-oil-spill-latest-fed_n_599615.html)), your flow group's findings have been widely interpreted as representing the entire range of possibilities, rather than -- explicitly in the case of the plume modeling group, and implicitly in the case of the mass balance group, which made a conservative guess about subsea oil, for instance -- the range of the lower bounds.

I think the only way to alter this misperception is to at least estimate the range of the upper bounds. I realize that data isn't forthcoming to do that in a fully satisfactory way, but surely you must have some sense of what those numbers may be.

Is there a good time for me to call you today? Or could you possibly e-mail me back?

Dan

--

Dan Froomkin | Senior Washington Correspondent | The Huffington Post | (202) 567-2633