

From: mark_sogge@usgs.gov
Sent: Saturday, July 31, 2010 3:53:45 PM
To: Matt_Lee-Ashley [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: FOR REVIEW - draft release: why suggest continued refinement of numbers

Attachments: Attachment

Just to be sure you have the latest....

Mark

Mark Sogge
Deputy Chair, NIC Flow Rate Technical Group
Chief of Staff, USGS Western Region
2255 Gemini Drive, Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Cell: [REDACTED]; FAX: 928-556-7266
mark_sogge@usgs.gov

From: "Lee-Ashley, Matt" <[REDACTED]>
To: "Sogge, Mark K" <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>, "Hines, Vic" <vhines@usgs.gov>, "Kelly, Kate P" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "Wainman, Barbara W" <bwainman@usgs.gov>, "Hayes, David" <[REDACTED]>, "Barkoff, Kendra" <[REDACTED]>, "Hsieh, Paul A" <pahsieh@usgs.gov>
Date: 07/31/2010 01:24 PM
Subject: Re: FOR REVIEW - draft release: why suggest continued refinement of numbers

This is the latest draft with edits from this morning's back and forths. I added one more sentence that would aim to clarify the estimate of how the flow rate has changed (pls check this new statement to see if it is accurate).

Mark: when the current call is done, can you either give me a ring at 202 340 6946 or provide final edits to this release?

We'll then send it over to DOE press team and Rod O'Connor for their final review and edits.

Thanks,
Matt

From: Mark K Sogge <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>
To: Hines, Vic; Kelly, Kate P
Cc: Wainman, Barbara W; Hayes, David; Barkoff, Kendra; Lee-Ashley, Matt; Hsieh, Paul A
Sent: Sat Jul 31 12:00:29 2010
Subject: Re: FOR REVIEW - draft release: why suggest continued refinement of numbers
No objection to that wording from my end.

**Exhibit No.
8844**

**Worldwide Court
Reporters, Inc.**

CONFIDENTIAL

IGS635-015055

TREX 008844.0001

Mark Sogge
[REDACTED]

* Sent from my Blackberry *

From: Vic Hines [vhines@usgs.gov]
Sent: 07/31/2010 08:49 AM MST
To: Mark Sogge; Katherine Kelly
Cc: Barbara Wainman; David Hayes; Kendra Barkoff; Matt Lee-ashley; Paul Hsieh
Subject: Re: FOR REVIEW - draft release: why suggest continued refinement of numbers

Mark, Kate,

If we want to leave the door open for future announcements on estimates but don't want to create the expectation, how about using something like this:
"Government scientists will continue to analyze data and may in time be able to further refine this estimate."

Vic

Vic Hines
Office of Communications
U.S. Geological Survey
206-220-4573
vhines@usgs.gov

On Jul 31, 2010, at 8:39 AM, Mark K Sogge wrote:

Kate,

Because the FRTG final report is not yet completed, I hate to close the door on final refinements by saying that this the final FRTG estimate. That would lock us into "final" numbers prematurely. I don't expect additional changes, but we should retain the flexibility to do so. Especially if the peer-review process (still to come) leads to suggestions for a tweak to the rates.

Mark

Mark Sogge
[REDACTED]

* Sent from my Blackberry *

From: "Kelly, Kate P" [REDACTED]
Sent: 07/31/2010 11:07 AM AST
To: Mark Sogge
Cc: Barbara Wainman; David Hayes; Kendra Barkoff; Matt Lee-ashley; Paul Hsieh; Vic Hines
Subject: Re: FOR REVIEW - draft release: why suggest continued refinement of

CONFIDENTIAL

IGS635-015056

TREX 008844.0002

numbers

Thanks, Mark. So it would be accurate to say something along the lines of: while this rate represents the final estimate from the frtg, govt scientists will continue to analyze data to provide the most accurate number.

From: Mark K Sogge <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>
To: Kelly, Kate P
Cc: Wainman, Barbara W; Hayes, David; Barkoff, Kendra; Lee-Ashley, Matt; Hsieh, Paul A; Hines, Vic Sent: Sat Jul 31 09:41:19 2010
Subject: Re: FOR REVIEW - draft release: why suggest continued refinement of numbers

Hi Kate,

I suggested including the "future refinements are possible" message because there was a lot of discussion in yesterday's flow team meeting about the need to firm up some of the engineering data and the model assumptions. This includes figuring out how to account for the well flow being multi-phase (composed of both liquid oil and natural gas), which affects how to interpret the pressure readings. The flow modeling also includes different scenarios and assumptions about well condition, how the flow is moving up the well, etc. The well kill process may shed light on these, but we don't have that information now.

Getting more information on these "unknowns" will help tighten the estimate and provide even higher confidence in the numbers (which will face challenges from varying groups). The group realized that there was no way to do this by today's deadline, but the engineers and scientists indicated that they will continue to work on this over time. So unless they are told to stand down and stop work after today's meeting, I think we will see additional estimate refinement over time. I think this is especially true of the DOE team. Hence, I hate to send a public message now that implies "this is it." The FRTG itself is still in wrap up phase. The final report is being written, and will include the latest consensus estimate. Once completed and released (hopefully in a week or two), I think the FRTG will ramp down. Marcia and the team leads will probably have some occasional follow up tasks, but I don't see them conducting additional flow analyses. However, as noted above, other groups or individuals may continue looking to work on estimate refinement.

If you would like to have a quick call to discuss this, just let me know.

Mark

Mark Sogge
Deputy Chair, NIC Flow Rate Technical Group
Chief of Staff, USGS Western Region
2255 Gemini Drive, Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Cell: [REDACTED]; FAX: 928-556-7266
mark_sogge@usgs.gov

From: "Kelly, Kate P" <[REDACTED]>
To: "Lee-Ashley, Matt" <[REDACTED]>, "Sogge, Mark K" <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>, "Hsieh, Paul A" <pahsieh@usgs.gov>, "Hayes, David" <[REDACTED]>

CONFIDENTIAL

IGS635-015057

TREX 008844.0003

Cc: "Barkoff, Kendra" <[REDACTED]>, "Wainman, Barbara W" <bwainman@usgs.gov>, "Hines, Vic" <vhines@usgs.gov>
Date: 07/31/2010 08:16 AM
Subject: Re: FOR REVIEW - draft release

Good morning, folks -

I think Matt may be on an epic bike ride this am so I'm going to attempt to keep the dialogue going...

The WH is pushing back on our wording in McNutt's quote and at the end of the release which suggests that scientists will continue to refine the numbers (ie. this isn't the end of it).

Mark - I know we talked about this a bit last night, but can you be more specific? Will the frtg continue to exist and meet in its current form and will they officially issue another number down the line? In other words, in what form will this continued analysis take place?

Thanks!

From: Lee-Ashley, Matt
To: Sogge, Mark K; Hsieh, Paul A; Hayes, David
Cc: Kelly, Kate P; Barkoff, Kendra; Wainman, Barbara W; Hines, Vic
Sent: Fri Jul 30 20:05:52 2010
Subject: FOR REVIEW - draft release

Based on Vic's first draft and my conversation tonight with Mark, here is a first draft of a release for tomorrow afternoon. This release has blanks for the actual flow rate estimates, and may need to change if the scientific teams reach additional conclusions or estimates. Please review and, if possible, get me edits by 10 AM tomorrow. I'll also send a first cut over to DOE's press shop so they can start to think about this, too.

Mark, Vic, or Barbara, can you see if Marcia is still reachable, so she can put her eyes on this (particularly on her quote).

Thanks,
Matt

[attachment "07-31-10_Refined Flow Rate Estimate_v4.doc" deleted by Mark K Sogge/DO/USGS/DOI]

CONFIDENTIAL

IGS635-015058

TREX 008844.0004