

**From:** Marcia K McNutt/DO/USGS/DOI  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 30, 2010 8:08 PM  
**To:** 'Castle, Anne'  
**Subject:** RE: Team Leads -- Request  
**Attachments:** OIL SPILL WORKSTREAMS AND PRIORITIES\_mkm.doc

Anne -

Thanks for doing this. I just made a few suggestions and clarifications. Gary's team only met for one week as a pilot project. After the presentation to you and David and Tom, we can consider whether any follow-up is warranted.

Best,

Marcia

---

**From:** Castle, Anne <[REDACTED]> [mailto:Castle, Anne [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 30, 2010 4:44 PM  
**To:** "McNutt, Marcia K" <mcnutt@usgs.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Team Leads -- Request

Marcia, in response to David's request, I've put together the attached list of workstreams and suggested future actions. I've included the two issues you mentioned in your email to David on Friday. Please take a look and let me know what you think. Thanks.

Anne

---

**From:** Hayes, David  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 30, 2010 11:15 AM  
**To:** marcia\_mcnutt@usgs.gov; Suh, Rhea; Henderson, Chris; Lee-Ashley, Matt; Strickland, Thomas; Castle, Anne; Ishee, Mary Katherine; Lewis, Wilma; Mansour, Christopher; Faeth, Lori; Black, Steve; Abbey, Robert V; Tompkins, Hilary C  
**Cc:** Davis, Laura; Screnar, Brian; Stone, Renee; Hildebrandt, Betsy  
**Subject:** Team Leads -- Request

As a follow-up to the meeting that we had on Friday, I would appreciate each team lead to identify in an email their top priorities in terms of work flow in the coming 10 days or so, and to offer your suggestions regarding how we might ensure full team coordination and coverage of the many demands that are, and will continue to be, placed upon us.

As we discussed on Friday, many of the workstreams that are being undertaken by various team leads are converging in important respects, and I think that additional clarity may be needed on how we are handling a variety of issues ranging from the MMS reorg and the preparation of organic legislation to the implementation of the 30 day report, and many other topics -- including how we manage DOI involvement in cross-Department initiatives on science issues and on the response side (e.g., the science forums that are popping up from NOAA and EPA's cleanup technology initiative).

I would appreciate it if you could send your email response to this request by noon tomorrow (or sooner). Please copy Laura and Brian on your email to me.

Also, feel free to editorialize as you see fit in your email, and provide whatever input you think would be useful as we reorient ourselves for what looks like it will be a long haul.

Thanks.

-David

David J. Hayes  
**Deputy Secretary**  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Washington, D.C.  
202 [REDACTED]

CONFIDENTIAL

IGS606-013335

TREX 008833.0002

## OIL SPILL WORKSTREAMS AND PRIORITIES

1. Secretary's BP liaison
  - a. Team lead – Marcia McNutt
  - b. Issues – Marcia needs staffing in Houston to allow her to focus on the science and engineering and coordination functions. Mark Sogge of USGS is being dispatched to Houston on Tuesday, June 1 to serve this purpose. Catherine Cesnik from PMB has been providing coordination and communication support.
  - c. Staffing – Marcia, Mark Sogge, Catherine Cesnik
2. DOI Strategic Science Working Group
  - a. Team leads – Marcia McNutt and Gary Machlis
  - b. Status – This group looked at science issues associated with the spill that are beyond the scope of the tactical issues that are being dealt with on a day-to-day basis. The Strategic Science Working Group put together a number of scenarios of how this spill could evolve, made some guesses at what the likelihood is of the event actually happening, looked at worst case scenarios if it did, and then how we could mitigate impacts. Examples are heavy oil getting into the Loop Current and then entering the Gulf Stream or a hurricane pushing the oil up the Mississippi and into the intake for New Orleans's municipal water system. These studies considered scenarios that are perhaps low probability but high impact should they occur, and thus it is best to have a "game plan" if they do.
  - c. Possible continuation of this effort beyond the one-week pilot – See #5 below
  - d. Staffing – Marcia, Gary, a team of scientists from the relevant DOI agencies and academic institutions. The exercise suffered from lack of F&WS participation. The group met for an intense week in Mobile, but plans to continue to interact and follow up informally.
3. Refinement of oil flow rate and volume estimates – Flow Rate Technical Group (FRTG)
  - a. Team lead – Marcia McNutt
  - b. Status – Initial estimates provided. Working on communications for a non-scientific audience. Plume subteam is still working on the upper bound. Estimates will be refined as more information, particularly from LMRP, becomes available.
  - c. Issues – Information concerning the impact of the failed top kill procedure and proposed cutting of the riser on the flow rate has been requested and provided (20% increase due to removal of kink in riser; no impact from top kill operations). The report issued on May 27 stated that this information was to be used to inform the ongoing response effort and that other uses of the estimates are not valid. Several scientists relied on a representation that this work would not be used for Natural Resources Damage Assessment. There are concerns with the confidentiality of the work. These are being worked on through the Solicitor's Office and DOJ.
  - d. Staffing – Marcia, FRTG, legal team (Rachel Jacobson, Lori Caramanian, DOJ)
4. Provide latest information on location of oil on surface (and subsea to extent known)
  - a. Team lead – Anne Castle



- b. Status – Daily or more frequent imagery from NOAA, USGS, and NGA is obtained and provided to the DOI Gulf Leadership Team. As questions arise, they are directed to the USGS Geospatial Information Response Team (GIRT) led by Steve Hammond and the Interagency Remote Sensing Coordination Cell (IRSCC) which includes the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, DOD, USGS, DHS, and NOAA.

#### **ADDITIONAL AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION**

- 5. Ongoing science development and coordination (within DOI and inter-agency)?
  - a. Need – Manage DOI involvement in inter-departmental initiatives that should be informed by science. Coordinate with other federal agencies to avoid duplication of effort but ensure DOI issues and science are considered.
  - b. Consider possible science strike teams, to deal with science questions concerning response measures (e.g., berms, steam cleaning, hair booms), long-term impacts, ocean productivity, long-term mitigation plans, natural resource damage assessment, development of science and technology to assist future spill responses.
  - c. Issues – Overlap with NOAA/EPA/USCG ongoing work? Coordination is key
  - d. Staffing – Staff with DOI bureau scientists and scientists from NOAA, EPA, DHS, DOD as appropriate. Team leads from each department.
- 6. Assist with MMS science and engineering issues?
  - a. Need - Questions at congressional hearings concerning efficacy of MMS Environmental Sciences Program. Concerns continue to surface about adequacy of MMS science, whether justified or not. There are a number of engineering issues raised in the recommendations for further MMS regulation in the 30-day report.
  - b. USGS could assist in review of MMS Environmental Sciences Program and lead a team of scientists from DOI agencies and NOAA.
  - c. Engineering issues - The 30-day report indicates that strike teams will be established in DOI to address the issues raised and those teams will obtain input from academia, industry, and other technical experts and stakeholders. Engineering isn't USGS's forte, but USGS and Marcia as the Secretary's Science Advisor could help assemble a panel of outside experts for the strike teams to assist in advising DOI concerning these issues.