

“not feasible”, “not possible” or “previously considered”, the submittal was not escalated to stage 2 and an email was sent to the project submitter, thanking them for their submittal.

Stage 2: This stage categorized proposals in two ways: The first categorization determined whether the proposal addressed stopping the oil release at the “source”, or subsequent oil “spill” cleanup. The second categorization further delineated the “spill” proposals into the following-categories: dispersant, chemical, sorbent, mechanical, skimming, bioremediation, or other.

Stage 3: A review by more specialized technical expert(s) was conducted at this stage. The goal of this phase was to determine which project would assist in achieving response objectives most efficiently. A scoring method was used to facilitate the prioritization of submittals. The methodology, adapted from the Carver Scoring Method,<sup>3</sup> provides rankings based on criteria derived for each category. **Attachment #7** is an example of the Carver Scoring Sheet used to score and rank all the spill categories, except for the scoring of bioremediation and biochemical products, which can be found as **Attachment #22**. Proposals were scored and prioritized in Stage 3B for testing based on operational needs.

Stage 4: This was the holding place for projects that were formally evaluated and/or tested.

A summary of the 5 month program is provided below.

- The ART team received and evaluated nearly 123,000 individual ideas, suggestions and proposals for ending the MC252 well flow (80,000 suggestions) or cleaning up the resulting spill (43,000 suggestions)
- Approximately 470 suggestions were found by the expert reviewers to meet the criteria for possible formal evaluation & field testing. The remainder generally fell into these categories:
  - Already considered / duplicate submissions – three-quarters of all suggestions were substantially similar to ones already submitted/identified
  - Not possible – e.g., ideas not physically feasible at 5,000’ water depth, 2240 psi and 39 degree F sea floor pressure and temperature, the well’s high flow rate or several thousand psi well flowing pressure
  - Not new technology (existing product, service, equipment) – these were sent to a database to be immediately available to response personnel
  - Adverse impacts – suggestions that had undesirable side effects, e.g. hay or hair (which sinks with time), introducing new bacteria (an act not allowed by regulatory bodies)
  - Non-engineered or invalid scaling – e.g., kiddie pool demos, kitchen demos, use of garden hose as simulated well flow
  - Not a solution – comments only, frivolous ideas, complaints, etc.
- Of the 470, approximately 170 suggestions were related to bioremediation and the other 300 addressed booming, skimming, mechanical equipment, sand cleaning, etc.
- Nearly 100 suggestions were formally evaluated and/or field tested, and 25 of these have seen significant use during the current response operations.

---

<sup>3</sup> CARVER stands for Criticality, Accessibility, Return (or Recuperability), Vulnerability, Effect, and Recognizability. This is a scoring and prioritization method used by the military to evaluate projects in terms of their overall importance.