Re: Reporter's Query Re: Upper Bounds

Espina, Pedro I. to: 'mcnutt@usgs.gov' 06/08/2010 09:05 AM

Marcia,

I appreciate your prompt response and all your leadership throughout this effort.

Pedro

From: Marcia K McNutt <mcnutt@usgs.gov>
To: Espina, Pedro I.
Sent: Tue Jun 08 08:59:11 2010
Subject: Re: Reporter's Query Re: Upper Bounds

Pedro-

Please explain that despite the best attempts of the FRTG and members of the press who have tken 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), 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