

From: Austin, Meredith CAPT
Sent: Tuesday, June 08, 2010 11:37:08 AM
To: Hanzalik, James CAPT
Subject: RE: Request for 32,000 gallons of surface dispersant application

Amen James!

Really, you're leaving us? Who's going to take your place?

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

From: Hanzalik, James CAPT
Sent: Tuesday, June 08, 2010 10:07 AM
To: Lloyd, Anthony CAPT
Cc: Gautier, Peter CAPT; Caplis, John CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT; Laferriere, Roger CAPT; Perry, Raymond CAPT
Subject: FW: Request for 32,000 gallons of surface dispersant application

Anthony,

Sunday, I received a request from BP to possibly get approval for aerial dispersants for several large slicks off the coast of LA. In an attempt to consult with our EPA "partners" I requested that RADM Watson speak to ADM Allen to notify Administrator Jackson of the potential for us to use aerial dispersants. ADM Allen requested that RADM Watson speak to Jackson. He did that night. She requested that the request be routed to the RRT -I suppose/suspect for their approval...

Yesterday, We convened an RRT call at 1030. We had a request from BP to conduct surface dispersant operations to attack a large slick that skimmers or other means could not effectively respond. The FOSC asked the RRT for concurrence for the use, even though he is preauthorized but wanted the RRTs "approval." All agencies including trustees with the exception of the EPA gave their concurrence because the EPA Co-Chair had to "run it up the flag pole." I requested that they provide an answer by 1115 (the meeting adjourned at 1100). At 1314 I received an email without providing an approval and adding additional information before they could proceed (below). We have a checklist that had been previously completed about 288 aerial sorties ago...

We get on a conference call last night with EPA and the best they could do is attack the response based on the lack of data...which we have mounds of and they are not reviewing.

Don't you think that it is odd that the EPA would be directing the FOSC when and when not to use dispersants? We have a 2 mile x 6+ mile slick offshore that skimmers cannot get to and we have the EPA telling us to justify our use of surface dispersants which are already preapproved/preauthorized by the RRT. We also have an agency that is "outside" the response calling the shots at the national level. We have senior leadership intimidated by the repercussions of their decisions and the unwillingness to make them based on what EPA's desires are and the potential to alleviate/prevent interagency tensions.

At this point in time 33,516,000 gallons of oil has been released. We have applied 1,121,696 gallons of dispersant subsea and surface to the Gulf of Mexico that contains 6.23×10^{17} (superscript) quadrillion gallons of water. Which is fed by the Mississippi river which dumps an average of 33 million gallons/sec into the Gulf - this does not include the other watersheds/ rivers that add to the Gulf. I'm sure that there is an affect...on the oceans, already noted by RRT6 trustees but willing to go forward with aerial application. It would be a travesty if the oil hits the beach because we did not use the tools available to fight this offshore. This responsibility needs to be placed squarely in EPA's court if it does hit the shoreline. There was tripling of response resources after it hit LA, the consequences will be much worse it hits FL and AL, and LA again.

CONFIDENTIAL

Ex 12495
Worldwide
Court Reporters, Inc.

HCG873-002270

TREX-012495

TREX-012495.000001

We can't go to the well again for resources...there will be no water in the well to draw from this time.

Oh and by the way, OSHA (Dr. Michaels) is sending emails to BP concerning the safety procedures/rest periods for workers directly.

We cannot continue to run an emergency response in this fashion. I'm demobing today and going back to the district. I apologize for venting.

CAPT James Hanzalik
RRT VI CoChair

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

From: Tulis.Dana@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Tulis.Dana@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 07, 2010 6:01 PM
To: Watson, James RADM; Hanzalik, James CAPT; doug.suttles@bp.com; EasleyM@bp.com
Cc: Perciasepe.Bob@epamail.epa.gov; Armendariz.AI@epamail.epa.gov;
Thompson.Diane@epamail.epa.gov; Stanislaus.Mathy@epamail.epa.gov; Lynch.Mary-Kay@epamail.epa.gov; Coleman.Sam@epamail.epa.gov; Carroll.Craig@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Re: Request for 32,000 gallons of surface dispersant application

As reflected by the RRT, EPA believes BP must provide much more robust explanations to approve surface application. The following additional information was requested and still has not been received.

- * Operational conditions that merit - e.g. weather, VOC levels in and around rig and supporting data
- * Capacity issues that require it - e.g. lack of spotters, lack of skimming vessels
- * Subsurface dispersant injection issues that contribute - e.g. stopped due to capping of BOP therefore increased oil was released to surface.
- * Tactical issues that require it - e.g. slick cannot be reached in time by skim/burn vessels before it weathers too much
- * Rationale for why particular slicks were prioritized for dispersion rather than mechanical recovery.
- * Monitoring - e.g. Type of monitoring that will be conducted; date/time SMART data which demonstrates effectiveness of application will be provided

Therefore the request to go forward with surface application of 32,000 gallons of dispersant is not approved.

Dana S. Tulis
National Incident Coordinator
Office of Emergency Management
Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-8600