

141245.1.1

From: Inglis, Andy G (UPSTREAM)
 Sent: Mon May 31 23:15:44 2010
 To: Durlley, Robert; Wells, Kent
 Subject: FW: Deepwater Horizon slide pack - May 31st 2010
 Importance: Normal

Bob/Kent,

In our communications tomorrow we need to make sure we acknowledge both scenarios below but are acting in a conservative way.

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

From: Verchere, Christina C On Behalf Of Inglis, Andy G (UPSTREAM)

Sent: 01 June 2010 00:15

To: 'SCHU'

Cc: david_hayes@ios.doi.gov; mcnett@usgs.gov; Hunter, Tom (Sandia); OConnor, Rod

Subject: RE: Deepwater Horizon slide pack - May 31st 2010

Mr Secretary,

I agree. There are two scenarios that could explain the observations from the Top Kill:

- a) collapse disk failure during the initial event;
- b) mud down the well to the reservoir with counter flow of oil/gas upwards.

In line with our approach not to make the situation worse, our forward actions are being governed by scenario "a". We will ensure our communications capture this.

Hunter and myself. However, I didn't give you a heads up regarding communications or the possible issue of the well. Trevor, Paul and Kent were just sent the following message:

Tom and Sheldon,

We should let BP as soon as possible that there is a modified scenario 2 (mud going down the well to the reservoir with counter flow of oil and gas upward) that is equally plausible without more detailed calculations. This can explain the fast appearance of oil and gas after pumping is stopped and also is a plausible reason of where the lion's share of the mud went during pumping.

CONFIDENTIAL

BP-HZN-2179MDL06847528
 TREG-141245.0001