

141784.1.1

From: bill.lehr@noaa.gov
 To: "Marcia K McNutt" <mcnut@usgs.gov>
 Cc:
 Bcc:
 Date: Sun, 01 Aug 2010 02:41:08 AM
 Subject: Re: Flow Rate Calculation
 Attachments:

Marcia,

Considering the uncertainties we have in determining the other oil budget terms, I think that the DOE estimates for flow are satisfactory. The 53 K bbl/day at shut-down seem pretty solid. As you point out, if we use the WHOI liquid-gas ratios, then the Plume Team numbers are compatible with the new standard. I would like to

From: bill.lehr@noaa.gov
To: "Marcia K McNutt" <mcnut@usgs.gov>
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sun, 01 Aug 2010 02:41:08 AM
Subject: Re: Flow Rate Calculation
Attachments:

Marcia,

Considering the uncertainties we have in determining the other oil budget terms, I think that the DOE estimates for flow are satisfactory. The 53 K bbl/day at shut-down seem pretty solid. As you point out, if we use the WHOI liquid-gas ratios, then the Plume Team numbers are compatible with the new standard. I would like to see more details someday on the 4% reduction due to riser impedance (as compared to the BP guess of 20%) and justification for the use of a different compressibility than the reported value of 6.

> Sent: 07/31/2010 03:19 PM AST
 > To: "O'Connor, Rod"
 > Cc: "hmsaker1@comcast.net"; "Hunter, Tom
 > (Sandia)"; Marcia McNutt; "Ken Salazar
 > (slv@ios.doi.gov)"
 > Subject: RE: Flow Rate Calculation
 >
 >
 >
 > I am OK. Tom, Marcia and Ken should weigh in.
 >
 > Steven Chu

CONFIDENTIAL

NOA017-000069
 TREX-141784.0001