From: Marcia K McNutt <mcnutt@usgs.gov>
Sent: Wed, 4 Aug 2010 15:12:30
To: GS FOIA 0105 <foia0105@usgs.gov>
Subject: Fw: experts statements

***************************************
Dr. Marcia McNutt
Director
US Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, MS 100
Reston, VA 20192
(703) 648-7411
(703) 648-4454 (fax)
(571) 296-6730 (cell)
mcnutt@usgs.gov
www.usgs.gov
***************************************
----- Forwarded by Janet N Arneson/DO/USGS/DOI on 08/04/2010 03:11 PM -----

From: "Wereley, Steven T." <wereley@purdue.edu>

To: Alberto Aliseda <aaliseda@u.washington.edu>, "Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov" <Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov>

Cc: Marcia K McNutt <mcnutt@usgs.gov>, James J Riley <rileyj@u.washington.edu>, "Espina, Pedro I." <pedro.espina@nist.gov>,
"pete@gso.uri.edu" <pete@gso.uri.edu>, Paul Bommer <pmbommer@mail.utexas.edu>, Poojitha Yapa <pdy@clarkson.edu>, Juan Lasheras <lasheras@ucsd.edu>, "savas@newton.berkeley.edu" <savas@newton.berkeley.edu>
I agree--it's fine with me to distribute the appendices too. I thought maybe the appendices would give the press ammunition that there really isn't a consensus in the group. in any case, I'm happy to go either way.

Steve Wereley, Professor of Mechanical Engineering
Birck Nanotechnology Center, Room 2019, 1205 West State Street
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
phone: 765/494-5624, fax: 765/494-0539
web page: http://engineering.purdue.edu/~wereley

From: Alberto Aliseda [mailto:aaliseda@u.washington.edu]
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 12:18 PM
To: Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov
Cc: Wereley, Steven T.; Marcia K McNutt; James J Riley; Espina, Pedro I.; pete@gso.uri.edu; Paul Bommer; Poojitha Yapa; Juan Lasheras; savas@newton.berkeley.edu
Subject: Re: experts statements
Hi Bill, I personally don't see any problem with distributing the report with Appendices. That way the report reflects the various methods and calculations that we worked with. The body of the report represents the final consensus, while the appendices represents different approaches that took us to that consensus.

Talk to you soon.

Best,

On May 27, 2010, at 9:16 AM, Bill Lehr wrote:

On it right now. I would encourage everyone not to distribute the draft. There is a reason why it is called a draft. Hope to get the final done today so if you have additional comments, send them to me. I like Steve's idea of a short version without the the appendices for public release but, as I have said all along, no one will be censored and the final report includes everybody's clarifying comments and calculations. Let me know what you think.

On 5/27/10 9:01 AM, Wereley, Steven T. wrote:

Should we distribute this document if asked? I would suggest at a minimum chopping off the attachments that show a diversity of opinion before distributing. Also I would suggest getting something official posted before the press extracts different stories from all of us...
Steve Wereley, Professor of Mechanical Engineering  
Birck Nanotechnology Center, Room 2019, 1205 West State Street  
Purdue University  
West Lafayette, IN 47907  
phone: 765/494-5624, fax: 765/494-0539  
web page: http://engineering.purdue.edu/~wereley  

-----Original Message-----  
From: Marcia K McNutt [mailto:mcnutt@usgs.gov]  
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 11:56 AM  
To: Wereley, Steven T.; Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov  
Cc: James J Riley; Espina, Pedro I.; pete@gso.uri.edu; Alberto Aliseda; Paul Bommer; Poojitha Yapa; Juan Lasheras; savas@newton.berkeley.edu  
Subject: Re: experts statements  

The press is going nuts. We haven't distributed the report as it didn't look like your final so up to you all. Here were my talking points  

Three independent estimates (plume, mass balance, RITT) indicate that the flow rate is at least 12000 barrels per day  

Two independent estimates (first two) are indicating that the flow could be as high as 19,000 barrels per day  

The plume team is only looking at lower bounds. Flow rates of 25,000 barrels per day or higher are possible. The team is still working to improve estimates and determine time scales of variability in flux.
We also are awaiting results from reservoir modeling.

Good luck with the media, everyone!

----- Original Message -----
From: "Wereley, Steven T." [wereley@purdue.edu]
Sent: 05/27/2010 11:47 AM AST
To: "Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov" <Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov>
Cc: Marcia McNutt; James J Riley <rileyj@uwashington.edu>; "Espina, Pedro I." <pedro.espina@nist.gov>; "pete@gso.uri.edu" <pete@gso.uri.edu>
; Alberto Aliseda <aaliseda@uwashington.edu>; Paul Bommer <pmbommer@mail.utexas.edu>; Poojitha Yapa <pdy@clarkson.edu>; Juan Lasheras <lasheras@ucsd.edu>; "savas@newton.berkeley.edu" <savas@newton.berkeley.edu>
Subject: Re: experts statements

Bill and Marcia, will our report be distributed or has it been distributed? I'm getting requests to distribute it. Can or should I do that?

Marcia said she's send talking points. That would be helpful. I don't know about the others but I'm getting media requests now.

Steve Wereley, Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering
Birck Nanotechnology Center, Room 2019, 1205 West State Street
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
Dear Dr. McNutt,

Attached is the statement agreed to by the flow experts regarding estimating the leak rate from the Deepwater Horizon spill.

Alberto Aliseda
Assistant Professor
Phone: (206) 543 4910
Department of Mechanical Engineering
8047
MS 352600
aaliseda@u.washington.edu
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-2600