

From: Tieszen, Sheldon R
Sent: Mon May 31 21:41:58 2010
To: Hill, Trevor; Wells, Kent; Tooms, Paul J
Cc: SCHU@hq.doe.gov; Hunter, Tom; Tieszen, Sheldon R
Subject: FW:
Importance: Normal

Trevor/Paul/Kent,

FYI - See message below.

Thank you,

Sheldon Tieszen

From: SCHU [mailto:SCHU@hq.doe.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 3:30 PM
To: Majumdar, Arun; Poneman, Daniel; George Cooper; Holdren, John (John_P._Holdren@ostp.eop.gov); Hunter, Tom; Hurst, Kathleen T; jean.chu@stanford.edu; 'Marcia K McNutt'; Ray Merewether; Richaard Garwin; OConnor, Rod; Slocum, Alexander ; Tieszen, Sheldon R
Cc: Ken Salazar (slv@ios.doi.gov)
Subject:

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.

This is important since we are asking BP to make available to the public the possibility that the rupture disk were blown in the accident.

Steve

Steven Chu
Department of Energy