

From: mark_sogge@usgs.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2010 11:22:04 AM
To: mcnuttt@usgs.gov
CC: vhines@usgs.gov
Subject: Plume Team report cleared and posted

Hi Marcia,

The Plume Team report was cleared for posting yesterday. I will work with OC to get it posted to the USGS oil spill web page today. The Department has put it on their DWH page as well (URL below: warning - it is a long download).

Mark

Mark Sogge
Senior Science Advisor (acting)
USGS Pacific Southwest Area
2255 Gemini Drive, Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Cell: [REDACTED]; FAX: 928-556-7266
mark_sogge@usgs.gov

----- Forwarded by Mark K Sogge/DO/USGS/DOI on 10/26/2010 08:16 AM -----

From: "Lee-Ashley, Matt" <[REDACTED]>
To: "Sogge, Mark K" <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>
Cc: "Wainman, Barbara W" <bwainman@usgs.gov>, "'Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov'" <Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov>, "Wade, Anne-Berry" <abwade@usgs.gov>, "Barkoff, Kendra" <[REDACTED]>, "Kelly, Kate P" <[REDACTED]>
Date: 10/25/2010 01:53 PM
Subject: RE: Finishing up the Qs & As for the Plume Team report

The plume team report can be found here.

<http://www.doi.gov/deepwaterhorizon/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&PageID=68011>

From: Lee-Ashley, Matt
Sent: Monday, October 25, 2010 4:11 PM
To: Sogge, Mark K
Cc: Wainman, Barbara W; 'Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov'; Wade, Anne-Berry; Barkoff, Kendra; Kelly, Kate P
Subject: RE: Finishing up the Qs & As for the Plume Team report

We are cleared to post the final peer-reviewed plume team report at 4:30 Eastern. Attached are the final, cleared internal-use only Q and A in case we get any media questions. Note that these Q and A are NOT for posting on the website.

Barbara and A.B.: can you please post the final plume team report somewhere on your website? We'll do the same on DOI.gov.

Thanks,
Matt

From: Lee-Ashley, Matt
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2010 12:45 PM
To: Sogge, Mark K
Cc: Wainman, Barbara W; 'Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov'; Wade, Anne-Berry
Subject: Re: Finishing up the Qs & As for the Plume Team report

Thanks, Mark. I'll work on pushing this through for a Friday posting.

From: Mark K Sogge <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>
To: Lee-Ashley, Matt
Cc: Wainman, Barbara W; Bill Lehr <Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov>
Sent: Wed Oct 20 11:43:56 2010
Subject: Re: Finishing up the Qs & As for the Plume Team report

Hi Matt,

On Monday, I sent Bill some draft text for that final Q&A (dealing with peer-review changes). I have not heard back yet... he was on leave the early part of the week and may still be.

Attached is the revised version of the Plume Team report. We made the two text edits you indicated, and included a note at the bottom of page 1 that explains that the report was edited past-July 21. We also changed the font color of the date (on the front cover) to white, so we could readily know if we were dealing with the revised edition.

I would still really like to get this posted by Friday, but we may need to wait until next week to provide time for Bill's feedback on the Q&As.
Mark

Mark Sogge
Senior Science Advisor (acting)
USGS Pacific Southwest Area
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>
Cc: "'Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov'" <Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov>, "Wainman, Barbara W" <bwainman@usgs.gov>
Date: 10/20/2010 06:53 AM
Subject: Re: Finishing up the Qs & As for the Plume Team report

Mark and Bill:

Do you have any edits or additions to the Q's and A's I sent you this weekend?

Also, would you please send me the final pdf of the Plume Team report?

We should still aim to post it on Thursday or Friday pending final clearance.

Thanks,
Matt

From: Lee-Ashley, Matt
To: Sogge, Mark K
Cc: 'Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov' <Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov>; Wainman, Barbara W
Sent: Sat Oct 16 20:21:55 2010
Subject: Re: Finishing up the Qs & As for the Plume Team report

Thanks, Mark.

These look great. I have combined these two Q's and A's with the other Q's and A's that Dr. McNutt developed. This document would serve to help us answer media questions, but the document itself would not be released.

If you and Bill think this document is on the right track (we need help on one more answer, which is highlighted), let me know and I'll move ahead with getting final clearance through the OMB process.

I think we should aim to post the report on Wed or Thu if it is ready to go. Does that work?

Thanks again,
Matt

From: Mark K Sogge <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>
To: Lee-Ashley, Matt
Cc: Bill Lehr <Bill.Lehr@noaa.gov>; Wainman, Barbara W
Sent: Fri Oct 15 19:36:41 2010
Subject: Finishing up the Qs & As for the Plume Team report

Hi Matt,

Here are draft answers to the final two questions you had relative to the Plume Team report. The answer for question #2 may still be too technical; if so, you can take a crack at clarifying or ask me to give it another go.

TOUGH Q AND A #1: The plume team report makes clear that the scientists involved were reliant on "BP provided (and BP selected) data." Why didn't the FRTG or the National Incident Command require BP to supply all available data sets, rather than simply the data that BP chose to provide?

When making the request for video footage of the spill flowing from the damaged riser, the Flow Rate Technical Group specified the criteria for acceptable video. These criteria were based on getting video during the right period (e.g., when flow conditions were simplest and most readily captured) and the video quality requirements necessary for a successful analysis via PIV (image resolution, clear views, correct distance). We have no indication that BP did not give us all the video that met our criteria.

TOUGH Q AND A #2: The plume team report references the IPCC standard for uncertainty. Why would an uncertainty standard used for climate change studies

be applicable to flow rates?

The Plume Team used the IPCC standard because the approach allows conversion of levels of expert confidence, such as "medium to high confidence" and "very high confidence", into quantitative uncertainty levels. The interpretation of such confidence levels is not specific to studies of climate science (nor to studies of oil spills). It was used because it represents a published consensus view held by scientists from several different fields about how the expressions of confidence may be "translated" into specific values of probability. The members of the Plume Team agreed with using this translation approach for the confidence terms they provided for the ranges of discharge flow rate.

Once you have a full set of draft Qs &As, I would like to pass quickly by Marcia McNutt and Bill Lehr. Is it possible we could have these firmed up next week, so we could set up the web release of the report?

Mark

Mark Sogge
Senior Science Advisor (acting)
USGS Pacific Southwest Area
2255 Gemini Drive, Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Cell: [REDACTED]; FAX: 928-556-7266
mark_sogge@usgs.gov