

545904759-13487-20030-157-222

From: "Roger N. Clark" <rclark@usgs.gov>  
Sent: Thu, 02 Sep 2010 14:49:25  
To: FOIA0105@usgs.gov  
Subject: [Fwd: Re: large figure for oil volume in abstract and conclusion]

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Re: large figure for oil volume in abstract and conclusion  
Date: Wed, 9 Jun 2010 00:18:50 -0600 (MDT)  
From: Roger N. Clark <rclark@speclab1.cr.usgs.gov>  
Reply-To: rclark@speclab.cr.usgs.gov  
To: gswayze@usgs.gov, rclark@usgs.gov  
CC: elivo@usgs.gov, vlabson@usgs.gov

> Vic was wondering how you derived the 500,000 barrel figure used in  
> the abstract and conclusions. From table 2's "possible" volume total of  
> 150,962 barrels and the 28.7% coverage of AVIRIS over the core spill, I  
> calculated about 520,000 barrels extrapolated to the whole core spill.

Your calculation is correct. I just felt the uncertainty is too great to give 2 significant figures, so rounded it to 500,000.

> Another reason to use a lighter color for the trace areal fraction category on  
> the oil:water ratio map is that it currently "looks" like a low oil:water category  
> below 1.3wt% given its purple color. This may be correct in some instances but  
> most pixels mapping into this category are likely partially covered with emulsions  
> with much higher oil:water ratios. I still like my "yellow" color for this  
> category as it is mid level in your color scale.

The 60:40 trace fraction is purple because purple is a mix of blue and red, blue being low oil and red being high oil. The color scheme makes scientific sense and the color distribution will print well. The trace is low levels of patches containing high oil content,

thus red + blue.

545904759-13487-20030-157-222

Roger