

ICF-Houma

Nash, Roy RDML

---

From: Laferriere, Roger CAPT  
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 7:24 AM  
To: Zukunft, Paul RADM; Poulin, Steven CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT  
Cc: Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Parker, Robert VADM; Loebel, Gordon CAPT; Knapp, Nathan CDR; Auth, Nicole LT  
Subject: RE: Request for CG Forces *ORC*

Admiral,

My bad, I should have screened this closer when it came up from ops....

I will take 87's if 110's are not available. We want to ensure they have their small boats operational. We have no need for Over-the-horizon boats. My justification for this is to have assets available for rapid response to act as sentinels for new oil coming ashore (winds are shifting back our way this week) and to quickly identify search and mark oil that can't be reached by 25's.

A Group is a functional element under the ICS construct. Groups are named after functions such as the Search and Rescue Group, the Environmental Protection Group, the Decon Group. Branches are elements above Groups, i.e. the Branches supervise the Groups. Underneath Branches are Groups, underneath Groups are Task Forces or Strike Teams.

Sir, please understand the Branches are 'not' under the control of the Parish Presidents or Parishes in general. I have 9 Branches and in each Branch, the Coast Guard is in charge with 1 Branch Director. Each of the Branches are performing tactical planning under the ICS construct and completing the ICS 215 Operational Planning Worksheet for the identification of resources. This Tactical Planning is "unified" and the Parish Officials are participating directly in this process to ensure their needs are being addressed. Please be clear however, our Coast Guard Branch Directors have 51% of the vote and if there are issues, I get involved (and there have been). President Billy Nungesser is the only Parish President that refuses to be fully integrated into our process. I met with him yesterday and he has agreed to more integration. The 215 is then sent up to Houma and used for developing the one and only one Incident Action Plan and for the processing of resources sent to the field. The IAP is completed overnight and sent to the Branches in the morning for execution.

Sir, I set this organization up to increase connectivity with the parishes and to ensure their needs were being addressed. I also wanted to push tactical planning down to the field level. I believe it is working well.

I have received a number of questions in regards whether my system is within the ICS construct. Although unique, it is without question aligned with ICS principals and rules.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

V/r  
Roger

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

From: Zukunft, Paul RADM  
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 10:31 PM  
To: Laferriere, Roger CAPT; Poulin, Steven CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT  
Cc: Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Parker, Robert VADM; Loebel, Gordon CAPT; Knapp, Nathan CDR; Auth, Nicole LT

: RE: Request for CG Forces

ger,  
you mean 87' CPBs? (110 WPBs are scarce given AMIO activity.) Neither have over the horizon boats.

What is the distinction between a "branch" and a "group"? The briefing your Ops Section provided to me in New Orleans last week indicated 3 groups, and apparently "branches" are under Parish control. pfz

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

From: Laferriere, Roger CAPT

Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 5:29 PM

To: Zukunft, Paul RADM; Poulin, Steven CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT

Cc: Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Parker, Robert VADM; Loebel, Gordon CAPT; Knapp, Nathan CDR; Auth, Nicole LT

Subject: RE: Request for CG Forces

Admiral Zunkunft;

Here is our CONOP for CG Forces needed in support of Ops in LA at this time:

A. To execute Operation Search and Respond (SARES, see below email):

(2) 110 ft CPBs with over the horizon boats.

(18) 25' RBS's & crews - (2) at each branch, (2) additional RHIB's & crews in Plaquemines

(8) Dedicated Quick Response Vehicles

(8) DART Flood Punts

(8) SATCOM - 1 per branch

When not performing the SARES mission, the CPBs and RBSs can be executing boat/vessel safety patrols and ensuring coordination of the VOOS.

I am working with DOG on 18 RBS's currently in theatre for boating safety. Sector NOLA will TACON to IC Houma. Still waiting response from UAC on other assets.

B. For VOO coordination, to increase navigational safety recommend a roving team of 5 BM1s who could alternate on each of the VOO Task Forces (we have 12 now, working toward 20). They could act as a VOO RFO Team in essence and also ensure operational safety.

C. For directing offshore, nearshore and inshore (Barataria Bay) skimming operations, request 4 USN Airships. The fourth USN Airship is for monitoring skimming and marsh oil removal operations. This of course is predicated on a successful test of the proof of concept for these assets.

D. We have a flotilla of airboats we are using in the marshes. We are starting to see a surge in safety incidents with these assets. Request D9 Airboats (4) with CG crews for deployment in Barataria Bay and other battle fronts as they surface.

Support: We have assigned another dedicated CG helo to Barataria Bay. Airsta NOLA Air Operations Branch are working on standardized shoreline grids for conducting searches of stranded oil. Spoke with AIRSTA today on preparing for oil movement east with new forecast of easterly winds scheduled Wednesday night. We have sufficient assets at this time for saturating area of advancing oil currently in Barataria Bay, West of Grand Isle and East of Chandeleurs.

Let me know what else you need.

V/r

Roger

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

From: Laferriere, Roger CAPT

Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 9:56 PM

To: Watson, James RADM.

Cc: Nash, Roy RDML; Allen, Thad ADM; Neffenger, Peter RDML; Brice-O'Hara, Sally VADM; Poulin, Steven CAPT

Subject: RECOMMEND RESPONSE STANDARDS AND RFF TO SUPPORT LA THEATRE OPERATIONS

FOSC,

Held a ops-planning meeting this evening for developing response performance standards and the RFF to support.

We decided to use the SAR Addendum as a model for our response times, basing our standards on response times vice arrival and completion times. Instead of Search and Rescue, we are calling it Search and Respond (SARES).

A. T0: Situation Unit Receives Report. If there is a high degree of uncertainty at T45 minutes: Consult with IC for determination of launch or not launch. If report has any degree of certainty or if there is any doubt and we have datum: Launch at T30 minutes.

B. Options at T30 minutes:

Option 1: Launch Aerial Asset

Assets Available:

1. Dedicated Helicopter at Houma, currently in place and ready for Rapid Assessment Team (RAT: already in place).
2. Dedicated Helicopter at 8 Branches, currently available at each Branch Forward Operating Base.
3. Air Station NOLA

Option 2: Launch Afloat Asset

1. Launch RBS 25 Prepositioned at each Branch. Asset may also serve response function (currently unavailable).
2. Launch VOO at Branch with Coast Guard responder onboard (currently available).
3. Launch small boat from CG CPB 110. Asset may also serve response function (currently unavailable).

C. Time Oil Confirmed (TOC) time dependent on arrival time of Search Asset.

D. TOC+15 minutes: Launch Response Asset. Mission: Mark and Secure.

1. Oil discovered on water:

; Launch rapid deployable surface asset. Located at each branch. RBS 25 outfitted sorbent, flag, stakes, sorbent pads, snare, anchors, gps, cameras, binocs, PPE. Unit surround floating oil with sorbent boom and mark area with flag to vector in response team.

Option 2. Launch PB small boat with Rapid Response Kits (RRK) which contains all materials listed above. Complete inventory listed below.

Option 3: If water is accessible by land: deploy by vehicle with RRK.

2. Oil discovered on land: Deploy either by vehicle or boat to secure and flag impacted area.

Option 4: If RAT determines that a more robust immediate response is required: Launch Quick Response Force (QRF). Base: Houma. Pers: 20. Equipment: 10K of Hard Boom, 50K of Sorbent Boom, 2 Skimmers (currently available).

E. TOC+2 Hours:

1. Oil confirmed within an existing Branch: Launch minimum advanced recovery equipment including skimmers, portable vacuum barges to attack new found oil. (This will be further defined).

F. TOC+12 Hours (Daylight only): Launch full scale recovery equipment to ensure maximum cleanup effort. (This will be further defined.)

In addition to the respond standards listed above, today I instituted a first light search to be conducted by all 8 Branches, each of which has a dedicated helicopter. They are to conduct a shoreline search and a parallel search within 3 miles of their battle front shorelines.

In the event oil is forecasted or found to be heading toward LA coast in a new direction, we will conduct operations similar to AMIO Panga ops in Southern California. We will deploy our 110's in the projected path of the oil migration to act as sentinels. We will employ aircraft with FLIR capability to track oil coming toward the shore at night. We will deploy roving land patrols by vehicle, scouring the shorelines in much the same way our sister CBP agents do to detect intruders. We will leverage local auxiliary as foot patrol units to ensure rapid detection of incoming oil. We will ask the Auxiliary to employ the American Waterways Watch program to assist us in using the public to detect the oil.

The following is the RFF needed to support this operation (note this is in addition to RFF submitted 6/16):

Assets:

(2) 110 ft CPBs with over the horizon boats.

(18) 25' RHIB's & crews - (2) at each branch, (2) additional RHIB's & crews in Plaquemines

(8) Dedicated Quick Response Vehicles

(8) DART Flood Punts

(8) SATCOM - 1 per branch

Simple Units

g) Cameras

RBS/Vehicle Go-Kits (26 kits) to include (supplies to be provided by BP and or OSTLF):

- Sorbent Boom
- Radios
- Bike Flags
- PVC Stakes
- Sorbent Pads
- Snare
- 2 small danforth anchors
- Camera w/ GPS

V/r,

Roger

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

From: Zukunft, Paul RADM

Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 9:02 AM

To: Poulin, Steven CAPT; Drelling, William CAPT; Laferriere, Roger CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT

Cc: Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Parker, Robert VADM

Subject: Request for CG Forces

Steve et al,

I need to see a CONOPS - a paragraph or two, on your resource gaps and requirements that could be filled by CG forces.

My sense is that C2 is your most significant gap, and as you refine the V00 composition in Mobile and expand Task Forces in Houma, we are getting a better grip on C2.

So first look at what it would take to better leverage the forces assigned. For example, can you tighten C2 by placing a cadre of CG personnel on some of our larger V00s such as OSVs?

With respect to air support, we are fast tracking the air ship that will be launched as a proof of concept, but in my estimation, has the potential to bear much fruit in spotting streamers and vectoring skimming operations. That will close some of our aviation (helo gaps).

The reason for this second review is that the aggregate requirements you have identified will cause significant operational and political risk at the supporting District level, particularly in the SAR readiness mission.

We can better articulate risk management on the MSST side of the house, as long as those forces are used to enhance C2 among your collective V00s, and not to conduct oil recovery operations.

This will be a discussion topic with the CCG today, and I ask your planners to conduct a final and deep scrub on the requirements. Thanks, and I sincerely appreciate the outstanding work you have accomplished in leading a "come as you" force of 32K+ personnel and fleet of more than 5000 vessels, excluding barges. pfz

CG/Forces (AOC)

Nash, Roy RDML

---

From: Zukunft, Paul RADM  
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 5:23 PM  
To: Laferriere, Roger CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT; Poulin, Steven CAPT; Drelling, William CAPT; Pearson, Drew CAPT  
Cc: Emerson, Michael CAPT; Sareault, Kevin CAPT; Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML  
Subject: Air Operations Center

Captain Mike Emerson has set the watch at Tyndall Air Force Base to stand up the Aviation Function Command that will directly support each of the ICPs. I acknowledge that I have been a forcing function in bringing this research to bear and my sense of urgency has been driven by the now 8 near mid-air collisions and the inefficient use of air space and aircraft in meeting your operational requirements. At the same time, we are planning to surge additional CG helos and bring a Predator B and airship into nthe aviation force lay down.

This initiative is designed to correct these two deficiencies, download flight information (including information from the non-aligned aircraft plying the TRFs) and populate that data into ERMA.

Recognizing the human element in resisting change, I have directed Captain Sareault to visit with the operation section and air operations branch chiefs in Houma and Mobile to socialize this concept of operations. He and Colonel Jeff Feibig will be in Houma tomorrow.

Organizationally, Captain Sareault will serve as the Deputy Area Commander for Aviation and will serve in a coordinating, but not in an operational nor tactical capacity. The ICPs shall continue to drive the operations and requirements, while the AOC will provide you a magnitude of greater safety, efficiency, and situational awareness. pfz

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Rayos, Carlito C LTJG  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 23, 2010 5:18 PM  
**To:** Rayos, Carlito C LTJG; Lauer, Daniel LCDR; Watson, James RADM; Neffenger, Peter RDML; Laferriere, Roger CAPT; cefe65@yahoo.com; joe.higgins3@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Campbell, Lisa CDR; Austin, Meredith CAPT; Forgit, Robert CAPT; Hanzalik, James CAPT; Worst, Nicholas LT; Penoyer, Brian; Moland, Mark CDR; Auth, Nicole LT; Martin, Beau; Tate, Gail; Nash, Roy RDML; Rooke, Connie CDR; sarah\_e\_peterson@ios.doi.gov  
**Subject:** Governor Brief 23JUN10

Good Afternoon Senior Staff,

At 1025hrs we provided an operational brief to Governor Jindal and his cabinet. Also briefed were takeaways from yesterday including high sea boom Heavy Weather Plan, specifically, how/when ocean boom would be tethered to stream in place during possible hurricane evacuations. Although there is not a specific trigger point or this strategy to be activated, an approximate time of T-96 to T-72 was given. This time frame was determined by the class of vessel conducting this function per CDR Merlin. We also brought Governor Jindal up to speed on ICP Houma's offensive booming strategy provided by CAPT Laferriere. We noted that CAPT Laferriere had discussions with Parish Presidents, Tafaro & Nungesser. The Governor tasked us with 4 takeaways;

1. Governor continued to push for the permit for the "rocks" on Grand Isle as part of the protection plan with the barges and piling.
2. Have the CG be an advocate to the state so that the ACOE would allow them to continue dredging operations on Chandeleur Island.
3. Ensure that VOOs increase in working numbers with the C2 improvements.
4. \*Work on the boom numbers to reduce the % boom complete on the "at a glance" white house report each day. It is currently over 180%. My (LCDR Lauer) recommendations have been sent via several emails and conference calls. Again this alludes to coming to agreement with the required number of feet of boom on the UCCP with Plaquemines & St. Benard officials. Refining the numbers between the UCCP and 215s at Houma to establish common ground with the required number of feet of boom. Verifying the approx 80k feet of inadequate boom in St Benard and removing that number from the boom deployed number in the UCCP.

(LCDR Lauer) I was bumped from the overflight to Chandeleur Island and waited for the return trip at the Lakefront Airport. At the press conference, Governor Jindal responded to a question citing ADM Allen's quote today that the Federal Government has not stopped the state's dredging operations. He clearly stated that the Federal Government had stopped operations and that the state had diligently worked with the ACOE (including agreeing to quickly backfill the sand at the littoral area) but that the federal government had forced the state to cease. He commented that there must be some miscommunication between ADM Allen and the White House. This statement was probably made because the WH stated on the conference call this morning that the ACOE would speak for the feds as the SME whether the state could continue to dredge. Billy Nungesser chimed in and request that ADM Allen use his authority & leadership as the NIC to keep the dredging going. He stated (paraphrased) that federal beauracracy shouldn't stop progress.

I communicated this immediately to RDML Neffenger via Solange Hubble and have since communicated with CDR Rooke. I will try to obtain a copy of the transcript from the Governor's press conference via the JIC and forward.

v/r  
LCDR Lauer & LTJG Rayos

ICP Houma  
94 sk

Nash, Roy RDML

From: Parker, Heather  
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 11:02 AM  
To: Laferriere, Roger CAPT  
Cc: Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Loebel, Gordon CAPT; 'Louis.Weltzer@bp.com'; 'Mutschler, Jackie C'  
Subject: RE: FLASH REQUEST: WX FORECAST TO SHIFT OIL EAST, MORE SKIMMERS ARE NEEDED

CAPT LaFerriere,

Sir, in response to the request email that was forwarded to CRU by RADM Watson:

1. WRT ICP Houma's need for 94 smaller, in-shore skimmers, as mentioned in our reply to your Barataria Bay email:

Drum, Disc, Brush, inclined Plane Skimmers: more than the requested 50 have already been ordered by CRU. Over 22 were recently delivered to LA, another 22 due in to LA by the end of this month, with 90 more expected in to theater by 05JUL.

2. WRT the process for ICPs to request Critical Resources (skimmers, hard boom and fire boom at this time), we need a 213RR, signed by the requester (with legible names and contact numbers) to be sent up to Critical Resources Unit (preferably an emailed scanned copy).

- Once received, CRU will review the request against what is already on order and the UAC-approved planning standards (which we have sent to you in slide pack).

- CRU will then provide a response to when the ICP can expect to receive the requested items, or will coordinate with the ICP to determine if there is a suitable alternative option.

I hope this provides some clarity.

Please let us know if you have any further questions.

Thank you,  
v/r,  
Heather

--  
Heather A. Parker  
Critical Resources Unit  
Unified Area Command  
Deepwater Horizon Response  
New Orleans, LA  
desk: 504-335-0950, -0949  
cell: 206-510-0943

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

From: Watson, James RADM  
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 10:20 PM  
To: Louis.Weltzer@bp.com; Parker, Heather  
Cc: Mutschler, Jackie C; Nash, Roy RDML



Subject: FW: FLASH REQUEST: WX FORECAST TO SHIFT OIL EAST, MORE SKIMMERS ARE NEEDED

Capt Laferriere called to reinforce this request. Any possibility of providing the 94 inshore skimmers he's looking for?

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

From: Laferriere, Roger CAPT  
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 8:55 PM  
To: Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Neffenger, Peter RDML  
Cc: Gautier, Peter CAPT; Loebel, Gordon CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT; Linsky, Scott CDR  
Subject: FLASH REQUEST: WX FORECAST TO SHIFT OIL EAST, MORE SKIMMERS ARE NEEDED

Admiral Watson,

We were alerted today by our weather forecaster that later this week winds are shifting to the East. These winds look like they will be sustained in that direction over a period of 4 to 6 days.

I am assuming the worst and that we will have oil returning to LA. Talking with my Operations and Planning Staff we need to have the capability to at least fight a two front battle. We are using the Battle of Barataria Bay as our standard. We have a lack of in-shore skimmers: brush, drum, incline-plane, weir etc. to be able to accomplish this. In order to duplicate our capacity to fight another Barataria Bay we need 94 in-shore skimmers. We were successful to some degree to get skimmers from the other Parishes to flow into the Bay. However, this leaves us scant amounts in our other Parishes. If the oil heads East, we will have no way of convincing the Parish Presidents to release their skimmers.

Recommend National Incident Commander waive East Coast Ports of requirement to maintain this capacity for Vessel and Facility Response Plan and then task BP UAC to purchase these and flow in LA theatre by Friday 25 June.

I can't over emphasize the urgency of this request. We have made great strides in building our alliances here in LA. However, these alliances are contingent on our continued commitment and bias for action. If we are not able to demonstrate this capacity, we will lose their faith in our ability to respond to this in a timely fashion. We have been telling all our Parish Presidents that we are waging a war on this spill. Now we need to show our commitment to this promise by demonstrating action.

We need to unplug our national inventory. Let me know what I can do to help.

V/r.

Roger

S  
T

ENV

Nash, Roy RDML

From: Armendariz.AI@epamail.epa.gov  
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 11:41 AM  
To: Nash, Roy RDML; Nolan, John CDR  
Cc: Coleman.Sam@epamail.epa.gov; Mason.Steve@epamail.epa.gov;  
Tulis.Dana@epamail.epa.gov  
Subject: issue from the NIC/EPA call

Roy and John,

I wanted to bring up an issue that was discussed in the Tuesday night call. After EPA found out about the operation of the evergreen burner on the Q4000, I asked Steve Mason and Sam Coleman to track down the permitting and also any environmental documents produced by BP for that burner.

Steve's detective work resulted in us getting a large quantity of documents that had passed between BP Houston and MMS Houston to get the MMS permit. After that, we (EPA) had several discussions between our air modelers and the air modelers hired by BP to model the air quality impacts of the burner. These discussions resulted in a big data transfer from BP to EPA HQ, and right now we have a modeler verifying the air quality impacts work done earlier by BP. I don't anticipate any shoreline impacts. We can and will certainly keep you posted on what we find.

So, this gets us back to the Tuesday call. I think neither Adm. Allen or Administrator Jackson were completely aware of the extent to which we EPA already had some (a lot) of the documentation collected over the last week about the air quality impacts of this burner. This was my bad. Moving forward, it wouldn't make too much sense for us to order BP to do something they have already done (prepare a health and safety plan for the Q4000, submit air modeling for the burner exhaust).

There is still interest at EPA in some short-term tests to verify whether or not trace pollutants (dioxins) are being produced by the oil burner. This is what I would propose, to satisfy what was said on the call and EPA interest in nailing down the dioxin issue from the burner: we ask BP to (1) for a 7-day period conduct actual dioxin personal exposure air sampling on a select group of workers on the Q4000 [standard IH stuff], (2) short report to USCG health and safety officer and EPA a summary of results of safety air monitoring performed on the Q4000 for all other pollutants over the last few weeks, (3) have the BP air modeler incorporate dioxin emissions to his existing work of the standard pollutants, to see what the computer models predict in terms of air concentrations outside the 5 mile zone and at the nearest shoreline receptors.

I think these items should be relatively straight forward for BP to implement.

Thoughts?

Best,

AI

-----AI Armendariz/R6/USEPA/US wrote: -----

>To: "John CDR Nolan" <John.P.Nolan@uscg.mil>  
>From: AI Armendariz/R6/USEPA/US  
>Date: 06/23/2010 07:10PM  
>Subject: Fw: Hello and Question

>  
>  
>Al Armendariz  
>Regional Administrator  
>U.S. EPA  
>Region 6  
>[armendariz.al@epa.gov](mailto:armendariz.al@epa.gov)  
>mobile: 972-467-5506

>  
>  
>----- Original Message -----  
>From: Al Armendariz  
>Sent: 06/23/2010 06:35 PM CDT  
>To: Roy.A.Nash@uscg.mil  
>Cc: Steve Mason  
>Subject: Hello and Question

>  
>  
>  
>Hi Roy,

>  
>I stopped by your office a minute ago, but as you weren't in, I thought  
>I'd sent an email.

>  
>(1) Have you produced the meeting minutes for the call yesterday  
>between Administrator Jackson and Adm Allen? EPA would like to start  
>planning on the action items, and we'd like to make sure both  
>organizations are singing from the same music.

>  
>(2) Someone from my office of congressional affairs has given me a  
>heads up that there is interest in gathering all the documents that  
>have come forward requesting FOSC approval to apply surface  
>dispersants. I believe that we (EPA) have all these documents, so there  
>is no immediate request on this. However, there might also soon be  
>interest from the hill in getting copies of all the communications  
>where USCG has declined to concur with the full amount of dispersant  
>use requested by the dispersant team in Houma. This could be a good  
>thing, to demonstrate the way that the FOSC has been carefully  
>evaluating and managing use. I would recommend asking someone on your  
>staff to start gathering such documents. I don't need them myself. But  
>I thought I would pass this along to you, in case a request comes in  
>through your channels (assuming it hasn't already).

>  
>Best,

>  
>Al Armendariz

ENV

Nash, Roy RDML

From: Armendariz.AI@epamail.epa.gov  
 Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 11:41 AM  
 To: Nash, Roy RDML; Nolan, John CDR  
 Cc: Coleman.Sam@epamail.epa.gov; Mason.Steve@epamail.epa.gov;  
 Tulis.Dana@epamail.epa.gov  
 Subject: issue from the NIC/EPA call

Roy and John,

I wanted to bring up an issue that was discussed in the Tuesday night call. After EPA found out about the operation of the evergreen burner on the Q4000, I asked Steve Mason and Sam Coleman to track down the permitting and also any environmental documents produced by BP for that burner.

Steve's detective work resulted in us getting a large quantity of documents that had passed between BP Houston and MMS Houston to get the MMS permit. After that, we (EPA) had several discussions between our air modelers and the air modelers hired by BP to model the air quality impacts of the burner. These discussions resulted in a big data transfer from BP to EPA HQ, and right now we have a modeler verifying the air quality impacts work done earlier by BP. I don't anticipate any shoreline impacts. We can and will certainly keep you posted on what we find.

So, this gets us back to the Tuesday call. I think neither Adm. Allen or Administrator Jackson were completely aware of the extent to which we EPA already had some (a lot) of the documentation collected over the last week about the air quality impacts of this burner. This was my bad. Moving forward, it wouldn't make too much sense for us to order BP to do something they have already done (prepare a health and safety plan for the Q4000, submit air modeling for the burner exhaust).

There is still interest at EPA in some short-term tests to verify whether or not trace pollutants (dioxins) are being produced by the oil burner. This is what I would propose, to satisfy what was said on the call and EPA interest in nailing down the dioxin issue from the burner: we ask BP to (1) for a 7-day period conduct actual dioxin personal exposure air sampling on a select group of workers on the Q4000 [standard IH stuff], (2) short report to USCG health and safety officer and EPA a summary of results of safety air monitoring performed on the Q4000 for all other pollutants over the last few weeks, (3) have the BP air modeler incorporate dioxin emissions to his existing work of the standard pollutants, to see what the computer models predict in terms of air concentrations outside the 5 mile zone and at the nearest shoreline receptors.

I think these items should be relatively straight forward for BP to implement.

Thoughts?

Best,

AI

-----AI Armendariz/R6/USEPA/US wrote: -----

>To: "John CDR Nolan" <John.P.Nolan@uscg.mil>  
 >From: AI Armendariz/R6/USEPA/US  
 >Date: 06/23/2010 07:10PM  
 >Subject: Fw: Hello and Question

>  
>  
>Al Armendariz  
>Regional Administrator  
>U.S. EPA  
>Region 6  
>armendariz.al@epa.gov  
>mobile: 972-467-5506  
>  
>

>----- Original Message -----  
>From: Al Armendariz  
>Sent: 06/23/2010 06:35 PM CDT  
>To: Roy.A.Nash@uscg.mil  
>Cc: Steve Mason  
>Subject: Hello and Question  
>  
>  
>

>Hi Roy,  
>

>I stopped by your office a minute ago, but as you weren't in, I thought  
>I'd sent an email.  
>

>(1) Have you produced the meeting minutes for the call yesterday  
>between Administrator Jackson and Adm Allen? EPA would like to start  
>planning on the action items, and we'd like to make sure both  
>organizations are singing from the same music.  
>

>(2) Someone from my office of congressional affairs has given me a  
>heads up that there is interest in gathering all the documents that  
>have come forward requesting FOSC approval to apply surface  
>dispersants. I believe that we (EPA) have all these documents, so there  
>is no immediate request on this. However, there might also soon be  
>interest from the hill in getting copies of all the communications  
>where USCG has declined to concur with the full amount of dispersant  
>use requested by the dispersant team in Houma. This could be a good  
>thing, to demonstrate the way that the FOSC has been carefully  
>evaluating and managing use. I would recommend asking someone on your  
>staff to start gathering such documents. I don't need them myself. But  
>I thought I would pass this along to you, in case a request comes in  
>through your channels (assuming it hasn't already).  
>

>Best,  
>

>Al Armendariz

**Nash, Roy RDML**

---

**From:** Allen, Thad ADM  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 22, 2010 8:10 AM  
**To:** Hayes, David; luciano.vasques@enipetroleum.com; Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Gautier, Peter CAPT  
**Cc:** gary.clifford@enipetroleum.com; Screnar, Brian; Brannon, Richard LCDR; Neffenger, Peter RDML; Looney, Bernard; Inglis, Andy G (UPSTREAM); Hayes, David  
**Subject:** RE: BP Oil Spill

I add my thanks as well. Our technical representative is CAPT Pete Gautier who represents the CG with Secretaries Salazar and Chu on behalf of the Unified Area Command and National Incident Command.  
ADM Allen.

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

**From:** David\_Hayes@ios.doi.gov [mailto:David\_Hayes@ios.doi.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 22, 2010 8:05 AM  
**To:** luciano.vasques@enipetroleum.com  
**Cc:** gary.clifford@enipetroleum.com; Screnar, Brian; Brannon, Richard LCDR; Neffenger, Peter RDML; Allen, Thad ADM; Looney, Bernard; Inglis, Andy G (UPSTREAM); Hayes, David  
**Subject:** BP Oil Spill

Mr. Vasques:

Thank you for speaking yesterday with my colleague, Mr. Screnar. We understand that ENI operates two shallow gas wells near the site of the BP Oil Spill. The two wells are:

RIGEL - MC 296, SS001, ST00BP01, OCS-G-21164 (BHL) API# 608174101801

17Hands - MC 299, SS001, ST02BP01, OCS-G-21752, API#608174401301.

Secretary Salazar, working with and through the Unified Command, appreciates your willingness to provide access to these wells for potential use in helping to contain the oil and gas that continues to leak from the Macondo well. We will contact you today and put you directly in touch with the US Coast Guard commanders who are in charge of the Unified Command, and who can work with you on the necessary arrangements.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

David J. Hayes

Deputy Secretary

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Allen, Thad ADM  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 22, 2010 8:10 AM  
**To:** Hayes, David; luciano.vasques@enipetroleum.com; Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Gautier, Peter CAPT  
**Cc:** gary.clifford@enipetroleum.com; Screnar, Brian; Brannon, Richard LCDR; Neffenger, Peter RDML; Looney, Bernard; Inglis, Andy G (UPSTREAM); Hayes, David  
**Subject:** RE: BP Oil Spill

I add my thanks as well. Our technical representative is CAPT Pete Gautier who represents the CG with Secretaries Salazar and Chu on behalf of the Unified Area Command and National Incident Command.  
ADM Allen.

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

**From:** David\_Hayes@ios.doi.gov [mailto:David\_Hayes@ios.doi.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 22, 2010 8:05 AM  
**To:** luciano.vasques@enipetroleum.com  
**Cc:** gary.clifford@enipetroleum.com; Screnar, Brian; Brannon, Richard LCDR; Neffenger, Peter RDML; Allen, Thad ADM; Looney, Bernard; Inglis, Andy G (UPSTREAM); Hayes, David  
**Subject:** BP Oil Spill

Mr. Vasques:

Thank you for speaking yesterday with my colleague, Mr. Screnar. We understand that ENI operates two shallow gas wells near the site of the BP Oil Spill. The two wells are:

RIGEL - MC 296, SS001, ST00BP01, OCS-G-21164 (BHL) API# 608174101801

17Hands - MC 299, SS001, ST02BP01, OCS-G-21752, API#608174401301.

Secretary Salazar, working with and through the Unified Command, appreciates your willingness to provide access to these wells for potential use in helping to contain the oil and gas that continues to leak from the Macondo well. We will contact you today and put you directly in touch with the US Coast Guard commanders who are in charge of the Unified Command, and who can work with you on the necessary arrangements.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

David J. Hayes

Deputy Secretary

**Significant Successes from the Past Sixty Days Spanning 4 States**  
**June 22, 2010**

**Aviation**

- Approximately 100 aircraft search for oil daily and vector in clean up resources

**In-Situ Burns**

- Longest in-situ burn in history last week – 11 hours
- Over 6.3 million gallons of oil successfully burned
- 255 burns safely conducted

**Skimmers Employed**

- Over 400 skimmers actively cleaning
- Nearly 24 million gallons of oil water mixture recovered

**Cleaned Beaches**

- Assessed nearly 1,400 miles of shoreline

**Wildlife Rehabilitation**

- Largest single release of rehabilitated pelicans at a Texas wildlife refuge

**Ingenuity / New Devices**

- Developed the new underwater recovery device resulting in recovery of over 1 ton of discharged oil during trial run
- Throughout the response operations, ensured all Gulf Area ports remained open and operational for commercial vessels
- The Unified Area Command's comprehensive website, [www.deepwaterhorizonresponse.com](http://www.deepwaterhorizonresponse.com), has accumulated 100 million hits since the beginning of the response
- The Unified Area Command's FaceBook page has over 36,000 followers
- The Unified Area Command's YouTube page for the Deepwater Horizon Response has received 2.4 million views

**Claims Process**

- 82,672 claims processed for over \$111 million

**Sub-sea containment**

- Nearly 12.4 million gallons of oil recovered at the source

**Multi-agency Response**

- Hosted 62 members of Congress in 11 separate delegations including participation by EPA, NOAA, DOI, and others
- Hosted 75 VIP visits, briefings and tours supported by many participating agencies

**Unity of Effort**

- Conducted 26 open houses in LA, MS and AL. Plan to conduct 1 in every impacted Parish / County with support from the following: BP Claims, BP outreach, USCG, DHS, EPA, NOAA, Alternative Response, Shoreline Clean Operations, LA Workforce Commission, and LA Dept of Environmental Quality
- 6 meetings with Gov Jindal by FOSC, Deputy FOSC, and Houma IC
- Conducted 52 local official conference calls to disseminate information and provide operations updates
- Conducted 54 Governors conference calls to disseminate information and provide operations updates

**Personnel**

- Lead over 33,000 people participating in the response

**Safety**

- Illness/injury recordable incident rate for the response is below the General Industry average (as of 17 June: Rate is 2.57 versus 4.2 for General Industry)
- As of 9 June, measures employed to disperse and capture oil have resulted in a total of 1240 validated, personal exposure level Time Weighted Average (TWA), benzene samples collected throughout the AOR that are below both OSHA TWA Permissible Exposure Limits (PEL) and the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH) Threshold Limit Values (TLV)



## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Lauer, Daniel LCDR [Daniel.D.Lauer@uscg.dhs.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 24, 2010 6:32 PM  
**To:** Nauta, David; Forgit, Robert CAPT; Laferriere, Roger CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT; Poulin, Steven CAPT; Lauer, Daniel LCDR; Jillson, Donald CAPT  
**Cc:** McCabe, Alan LCDR; Zukunft, Paul RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Wiedenhoeft, Paul CAPT; Rooke, Connie  
**Subject:** RE: HOT NIC RFI: Top 5 Political Issues for ADM Allen - DUE: 0700 Friday

The top 5 issues for the state and the Governor are:

1. Cessation of the drilling moratorium. Governor held a large rally at Gulf Island Marine Fabricators in Houma today. Yesterday at the press conference both the Governor and Parish Presidents (Nungesser & Tafaro) requested ADM Allen use his position as NIC to advocate for the state to cease the moratorium.
2. Allow the state to continue dredging for the berm project off Chandeleur Island until the new dredge pipe is constructed at the new borrow site. Underlying issues here are that the either the ACOE or F&W looked at an old (pre Katrina chart) and that a comment was made on the white house conference call this morning about 7000 ft of pipe in Houma that the state could/should have already used. Evidently this pipe was actually in Morgan City and the state already has used it.
3. Receive permit for the "rocks" for the Grand Isle protection plan with the barges and pilings. The state would like the CG to be an advocate to have the ACOE issue the permit.
4. Access to the database from BP for % of Louisiana residents hired for the spill (this is listed in the at a glance white house brief each morning) and claims information.
5. Reconciliation of the boom numbers found on the at a glance report. Today's report showed LA at more than 180% complete for UCCP boom deployment and there is disparity because 2 parishes (St. Benard & Plaquemines) have not agreed to the required number of feet of boom and the operational requirement (per UC) for protection boom is far above the UCCP/ACP. The Governor addressed this with RADM Watson during his visit today.

Others that compete:

All other gulf states received an additional \$25 million grant except LA. The Governor consistently requests the BP LNO at the state to reach up her chain of command for an answer.

Increase the number of VOOs working as the more robust C2 allows more vessels to work. The Governor does not want the boats sitting at the dock.

v/r  
LCDR Dan Lauer

---

**From:** Nauta, David [mailto:David.Nauta@dhs.gov]  
**Sent:** Thu 6/24/2010 4:59 PM  
**To:** Forgit, Robert CAPT; Laferriere, Roger CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT; Poulin, Steven CAPT; Lauer, Daniel LCDR; Jillson, Donald CAPT  
**Cc:** McCabe, Alan LCDR; Zukunft, Paul RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Wiedenhoeft, Paul CAPT; Rooke, Connie  
**Subject:** FW: HOT NIC RFI: Top 5 Political Issues for ADM Allen - DUE: 0700 Friday

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Lauer, Daniel LCDR [Daniel.D.Lauer@uscg.dhs.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 24, 2010 6:32 PM  
**To:** Nauta, David; Forgit, Robert CAPT; Laferriere, Roger CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT; Poulin, Steven CAPT; Lauer, Daniel LCDR; Jillson, Donald CAPT  
**Cc:** McCabe, Alan LCDR; Zukunft, Paul RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Wiedenhoeft, Paul CAPT; Rooke, Connie  
**Subject:** RE: HOT NIC RFI: Top 5 Political Issues for ADM Allen - DUE: 0700 Friday

The top 5 issues for the state and the Governor are:

1. Cessation of the drilling moratorium. Governor held a large rally at Gulf Island Marine Fabricators in Houma today. Yesterday at the press conference both the Governor and Parish Presidents (Nungesser & Tafaro) requested ADM Allen use his position as NIC to advocate for the state to cease the moratorium.
2. Allow the state to continue dredging for the berm project off Chandeleur Island until the new dredge pipe is constructed at the new borrow site. Underlying issues here are that the either the ACOE or F&W looked at an old (pre Katrina chart) and that a comment was made on the white house conference call this morning about 7000 ft of pipe in Houma that the state could/should have already used. Evidently this pipe was actually in Morgan City and the state already has used it.
3. Receive permit for the "rocks" for the Grand Isle protection plan with the barges and pilings. The state would like the CG to be an advocate to have the ACOE issue the permit.
4. Access to the database from BP for % of Louisiana residents hired for the spill (this is listed in the at a glance white house brief each morning) and claims information.
5. Reconciliation of the boom numbers found on the at a glance report. Today's report showed LA at more than 180% complete for UCCP boom deployment and there is disparity because 2 parishes (St. Benard & Plaquemines) have not agreed to the required number of feet of boom and the operational requirement (per UC) for protection boom is far above the UCCP/ACP. The Governor addressed this with RADM Watson during his visit today.

Others that compete:

All other gulf states received an additional \$25 million grant except LA. The Governor consistently requests the BP LNO at the state to reach up her chain of command for an answer.

Increase the number of VOOs working as the more robust C2 allows more vessels to work. The Governor does not want the boats sitting at the dock.

v/r  
LCDR Dan Lauer

---

**From:** Nauta, David [mailto:David.Nauta@dhs.gov]  
**Sent:** Thu 6/24/2010 4:59 PM  
**To:** Forgit, Robert CAPT; Laferriere, Roger CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT; Poulin, Steven CAPT; Lauer, Daniel LCDR; Jillson, Donald CAPT  
**Cc:** McCabe, Alan LCDR; Zukunft, Paul RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Wiedenhoeft, Paul CAPT; Rooke, Connie  
**Subject:** FW: HOT NIC RFI: Top 5 Political Issues for ADM Allen - DUE: 0700 Friday

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

From: Lori\_Faeth@ios.doi.gov on behalf of Faeth, Lori [Lori\_Faeth@ios.doi.gov]  
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 6:49 AM  
To: Peterson, Sarah E; Koenigsberg, Melissa; Shaun McGrath; Mark Morland (Mark.G.Moland@uscg.dhs.gov); Tate, Gail; Loebel, Gordon CAPT; McKinley, Andrew CAPT; Nolan, John CDR  
Cc: Strickland, Thomas; Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML  
Subject: FW: CBS Story Re: National Guard

Finally some truth getting out!

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2010/06/24/eveningnews/main6615414.shtml>

### Gulf Coast Governors Leaving National Guard Idle Thousands of Troops Called Up to Fight Oil Spill Haven't Been Deployed

By Armen Keteyian

(CBS) All along the Gulf coast, local officials have been demanding more help from the federal government to fight the spill, yet the Gulf states have deployed just a fraction of the National Guard troops the Pentagon has made available, CBS News Chief Investigative Correspondent Armen Keteyian reports.

That's a particular problem for the state of Louisiana, where the Republican governor has been the most vocal about using all resources.

Special Section: Disaster in the Gulf

Gov. Bobby Jindal's message has been loud and clear, using language such as "We will only be winning this war when we're actually deploying every resource," "They (the federal government) can provide more resources" and "It's clear the resources needed to protect our coast are still not here."

But nearly two months after the governor requested - and the Department of Defense approved the use of 6,000 Louisiana National Guard troops - only a fraction - 1,053 - have actually been deployed by Jindal to fight the spill.

"If you ask any Louisianan, if you said 'If you had those troops, do you think they could be put to good use? Is there anything they can do in your parish?' I think they'd all tell you 'Absolutely,'" Louisiana state Sen. Karen Carter Peterson, D-New Orleans, said.

As of today, the federal government has authorized a total of 17,500 National Guard troops across four Gulf states, all to be paid for by BP.

But CBS News has learned that in addition to Louisiana's 1,053 troops of 6,000, Alabama has deployed 432 troops of 3,000 available. Even fewer have been deployed in Florida - 97 troops out of 2,500 - and Mississippi - 58 troops out of 6,000.

Those figures prompted President Obama to weigh in.

"I urge the governors in the affected states to activate these troops as soon as possible," Mr. Obama said.

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Lori\_Faeth@ios.doi.gov on behalf of Faeth, Lori [Lori\_Faeth@ios.doi.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 25, 2010 6:49 AM  
**To:** Peterson, Sarah E; Koenigsberg, Melissa; Shaun McGrath; Mark Morland (Mark.G.Moland@uscg.dhs.gov); Tate, Gail; Loebel, Gordon CAPT; McKinley, Andrew CAPT; Nolan, John CDR  
**Cc:** Strickland, Thomas; Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML  
**Subject:** FW: CBS Story Re: National Guard

Finally some truth getting out!

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2010/06/24/eveningnews/main6615414.shtml>

### Gulf Coast Governors Leaving National Guard Idle Thousands of Troops Called Up to Fight Oil Spill Haven't Been Deployed

By Armen Keteyian

(CBS) All along the Gulf coast, local officials have been demanding more help from the federal government to fight the spill, yet the Gulf states have deployed just a fraction of the National Guard troops the Pentagon has made available, CBS News Chief Investigative Correspondent Armen Keteyian reports.

That's a particular problem for the state of Louisiana, where the Republican governor has been the most vocal about using all resources.

Special Section: Disaster in the Gulf

Gov. Bobby Jindal's message has been loud and clear, using language such as "We will only be winning this war when we're actually deploying every resource," "They (the federal government) can provide more resources" and "It's clear the resources needed to protect our coast are still not here."

But nearly two months after the governor requested - and the Department of Defense approved the use of 6,000 Louisiana National Guard troops - only a fraction - 1,053 - have actually been deployed by Jindal to fight the spill.

"If you ask any Louisianan, if you said 'If you had those troops, do you think they could be put to good use? Is there anything they can do in your parish?' I think they'd all tell you 'Absolutely,'" Louisiana state Sen. Karen Carter Peterson, D-New Orleans, said.

As of today, the federal government has authorized a total of 17,500 National Guard troops across four Gulf states, all to be paid for by BP.

But CBS News has learned that in addition to Louisiana's 1,053 troops of 6,000, Alabama has deployed 432 troops of 3,000 available. Even fewer have been deployed in Florida - 97 troops out of 2,500 - and Mississippi - 58 troops out of 6,000.

Those figures prompted President Obama to weigh in.

"I urge the governors in the affected states to activate these troops as soon as possible," Mr. Obama said.

s believed officials in Alabama, Florida and Mississippi and are reluctant to use more troops because their presence could hurt tourism. In hardest-hit Louisiana, however, Jindal is pointing fingers.

"Actually we asked the White House to approve the initial 6,000," Jindal said. "What they came back and said is the Coast Guard and BP had to authorize individual tasks."

But Coast Guard Adm. Thad Allen, the national incident commander in charge of the government's response to the spill, said Jindal is just flat wrong.

"There is nothing standing in the governor's way from utilizing more National Guard troops," Allen said.

In fact, the Coast Guard says every request to use the National Guard has been approved, usually within a day. Now Jindal's office acknowledged to CBS News the governor has not specifically asked for more Guard troops to be deployed.

Whether it's simple confusion or the infusion of politics into the spill, the fact remains thousands of helping hands remain waiting to be used.

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** jackie.mutschler@bp.com on behalf of Mutschler, Jackie C [jackie.mutschler@bp.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 26, 2010 8:02 PM  
**To:** Parker, Heather; Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML  
**Cc:** Bass, Tim A; Weltzer, Louis E; Fryar, Robert T; Morrison, Richard; Seilhan, Keith A; Easley, Max; Chapman, Bryant L  
**Subject:** Skimmers  
**Attachments:** Skimmers procurement jun26 v6.ZIP; Skimmer Plan Update final 6-19-10.ppt

Admiral Watson,  
Enclosed is information that addresses the concerns you recently sent in an e-mail. Please forward to the relevant Captains.

We are not awaiting 213s to procure skimmers, nor are we using EDRC to determine need or make ICP allocations. We are scouring the world to secure appropriate and available skimmers.

The enclosed procurement spreadsheet will be updated overnight, so there will be minor number changes, primarily in beach/bay/marsh.

Do not get overly excited on the Houma/Mobile ICP designation. Many of the Houma line items reflect they were the ones who issued the purchase order. In addition to sending most incoming Nearshore skimmers on vessels to Mobile, we are already working to redistribute some of the other recent skimmer deliveries, e.g. Slickbar. We will also send some of the Offshore skimmers to Mobile as well.

To increase Nearshore skimmers in the near term, the reality is we will have to install skimming equipment on vessels. Nearshore skimmers already on a vessel are in short supply. FYI - the total number (and delivery timing) of Navy Kviachaks is still quite uncertain. The other near term Nearshore option is self-help: maintenance and repair, as well as prioritized deployment.

Jackie

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

**From:** Weltzer, Louis E  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 26, 2010 4:00 PM  
**To:** Chapman, Bryant L; Mutschler, Jackie C; Utsler, Mike J; Keller, Luke; Sliger, Kris; Johnson, Maureen L; Livett, Ian G  
**Cc:** Fryar, Robert T; Bass, Tim A

Attached is the current update of skimmers on order...the list was issued out to Ops/Plng sections yesterday. This supply profile exceeds the plan approved by UAC (attached) on 6/19. The basis of the approved UAC plan is 752 skimmers. The roll-up of skimmer needs from Mobile and Houma in the plan was 602. Today, the number of sourced and recently delivered skimmers totals 517. (attached as well). As of 3-4 days ago, a reconciliation of existing skimmers in the field was being undertaken in both Houma and Mobile to both confirm the numbers of existing skimmers in the 6-11 plan and outline the necessary split of where newly sourced skimmers should be delivered. The spreadsheet currently shows where we think the skimmers are needed. We sorely need input from Mobile to guide our supply efforts. (and as I am writing this note, I got a phone call that Mobile is planning to have their plan ready Mon morning) Although we don't have a total view from Houma yet either, we

**Nash, Roy RDML**

---

**From:** jackie.mutschler@bp.com on behalf of Mutschler, Jackie C [jackie.mutschler@bp.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 26, 2010 8:02 PM  
**To:** Parker, Heather; Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML  
**Cc:** Bass, Tim A; Weltzer, Louis E; Fryar, Robert T; Morrison, Richard; Seilhan, Keith A; Easley, Max; Chapman, Bryant L  
**Subject:** Skimmers  
**Attachments:** Skimmers procurement jun26 v6.ZIP; Skimmer Plan Update final 6-19-10.ppt

Admiral Watson,  
Enclosed is information that addresses the concerns you recently sent in an e-mail. Please forward to the relevant Captains.

We are not awaiting 213s to procure skimmers, nor are we using EDRC to determine need or make ICP allocations. We are scouring the world to secure appropriate and available skimmers.

The enclosed procurement spreadsheet will be updated overnight, so there will be minor number changes, primarily in beach/bay/marsh.

Do not get overly excited on the Houma/Mobile ICP designation. Many of the Houma line items reflect they were the ones who issued the purchase order. In addition to sending most incoming Nearshore skimmers on vessels to Mobile, we are already working to redistribute some of the other recent skimmer deliveries, e.g. Slickbar. We will also send some of the Offshore skimmers to Mobile as well.

To increase Nearshore skimmers in the near term, the reality is we will have to install skimming equipment on vessels. Nearshore skimmers already on a vessel are in short supply. FYI - the total number (and delivery timing) of Navy Kviachaks is still quite uncertain. The other near term Nearshore option is self-help: maintenance and repair, as well as prioritized deployment.

Jackie

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

**From:** Weltzer, Louis E  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 26, 2010 4:00 PM  
**To:** Chapman, Bryant L; Mutschler, Jackie C; Utsler, Mike J; Keller, Luke; Sliger, Kris; Johnson, Maureen L; Livett, Ian G  
**Cc:** Fryar, Robert T; Bass, Tim A

Attached is the current update of skimmers on order...the list was issued out to Ops/Plng sections yesterday. This supply profile exceeds the plan approved by UAC (attached) on 6/19. The basis of the approved UAC plan is 752 skimmers. The roll-up of skimmer needs from Mobile and Houma in the plan was 602. Today, the number of sourced and recently delivered skimmers totals 517. (attached as well). As of 3-4 days ago, a reconciliation of existing skimmers in the field was being undertaken in both Houma and Mobile to both confirm the numbers of existing skimmers in the 6-11 plan and outline the necessary split of where newly sourced skimmers should be delivered. The spreadsheet currently shows where we think the skimmers are needed. We sorely need input from Mobile to guide our supply efforts. (and as I am writing this note, I got a phone call that Mobile is planning to have their plan ready Mon morning) Although we don't have a total view from Houma yet either, we

ave a better feel for their needs given their participation in a daily  
skimmer call.

Hope this helps,

-Lou



## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Loebel, Gordon CAPT  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 29, 2010 12:05 PM  
**To:** Watson, James RADM  
**Cc:** Nash, Roy RDML; McKinley, Andrew CAPT; Kelley, Brian CAPT  
**Subject:** NEW STCW STANDARDS FOR FITNESS FOR DUTY - HOURS OF REST

Admiral,

Wanted to call your attention to this recent item from IMO. Not that I'm keeping a log, but UAC senior staff is nowhere near this standard. Hoping you will take the hint and go home early tonight.

v/r

Gordon

Gordon Loebel  
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard  
Executive Assistant to RADM Jim Watson  
Federal On Scene Coordinator  
Deepwater Horizon Response  
Cell: 202-507-3283  
Desk: 504-525-2283

<http://www.imo.org/Newsroom/mainframe.asp?topic id=1859&doc id=13290>

Conference agrees new provisions on hours of rest for watchkeepers

Conference of Parties to the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978, Manila, the Philippines, 21-25 June 2010

A Diplomatic Conference to adopt amendments to the STCW Convention, (successfully completed in Manila on 25 June 2010 - see briefing 32/2010) has also agreed, by consensus, a series of new provisions on the issue of "fitness for duty - hours of rest", to provide watchkeeping officers aboard ships with sufficient rest periods. Under the Manila Amendments to the STCW Convention, all persons who are assigned duty as officer in charge of a watch or as a rating forming part of a watch and those whose duties involve designated safety, prevention of pollution and security duties shall be provided with a rest period of not less than:

1. a minimum of 10 hours of rest in any 24-hour period; and
2. 77 hours in any 7-day period.

The hours of rest may be divided into no more than two periods, one of which shall be at least 6 hours in length, and the intervals between consecutive periods of rest shall not exceed 14 hours.

At the same time, in order to ensure a continued safe operation of ships in exceptional conditions, the Conference unanimously agreed to allow certain exceptions from the above requirements for the rest periods.

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Loebel, Gordon CAPT  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 29, 2010 12:05 PM  
**To:** Watson, James RADM  
**Cc:** Nash, Roy RDML; McKinley, Andrew CAPT; Kelley, Brian CAPT  
**Subject:** NEW STCW STANDARDS FOR FITNESS FOR DUTY - HOURS OF REST

Admiral,

Wanted to call your attention to this recent item from IMO. Not that I'm keeping a log, but UAC senior staff is nowhere near this standard. Hoping you will take the hint and go home early tonight.

v/r

Gordon

Gordon Loebel  
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard  
Executive Assistant to RADM Jim Watson  
Federal On Scene Coordinator  
Deepwater Horizon Response  
Cell: 202-507-3283  
Desk: 504-525-2283

<http://www.imo.org/Newsroom/mainframe.asp?topic id=1859&doc id=13290>

Conference agrees new provisions on hours of rest for watchkeepers

Conference of Parties to the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978, Manila, the Philippines, 21-25 June 2010

A Diplomatic Conference to adopt amendments to the STCW Convention, (successfully completed in Manila on 25 June 2010 - see briefing 32/2010) has also agreed, by consensus, a series of new provisions on the issue of "fitness for duty - hours of rest", to provide watchkeeping officers aboard ships with sufficient rest periods. Under the Manila Amendments to the STCW Convention, all persons who are assigned duty as officer in charge of a watch or as a rating forming part of a watch and those whose duties involve designated safety, prevention of pollution and security duties shall be provided with a rest period of not less than:

1. a minimum of 10 hours of rest in any 24-hour period; and
2. 77 hours in any 7-day period.

The hours of rest may be divided into no more than two periods, one of which shall be at least 6 hours in length, and the intervals between consecutive periods of rest shall not exceed 14 hours.

At the same time, in order to ensure a continued safe operation of ships in exceptional conditions, the Conference unanimously agreed to allow certain exceptions from the above requirements for the rest periods.

Under the exception clause, parties may allow exceptions from the required hours of rest provided that the rest period is not less than 70 hours in any 7 day period and on certain conditions, namely:

1. such exceptional arrangements shall not be extended for more than two consecutive weeks;
2. the intervals between two periods of exceptions shall not be less than twice the duration of the exception;
3. the hours of rest may be divided into no more than three periods, one of which shall be at least 6 hours and none of the other two periods shall be less than one hour in length;
4. the intervals between consecutive periods of rest shall not exceed 14 hours; and
5. exceptions shall not extend beyond two 24-hour periods in any 7-day period.

Exceptions shall, as far as possible, take into account the guidance regarding prevention of fatigue in section B-VIII/1.

These provisions were the result of intensive negotiations between regulators and the shipping industry and represent a well balanced solution of the issue in the well known IMO spirit of compromise.

In a statement, Secretary-General Mitropoulos said:

"I am very pleased that the Conference agreed, by consensus, an important new text on fitness for duty, which will create better conditions for seafarers to be adequately rested before they undertake their onboard duties. Fatigue has been found to be a contributory factor to accidents at sea and to ensure seafarers' rest will play an important role in preventing casualties.

I am particularly pleased that the new STCW requirements on this delicate issue are consistent with the corresponding provisions of ILO's Maritime Labour Convention, 2006, which I hope will come into force soon."

---

Briefing 33/2010  
25 June 2010

## Watson, James RADM

---

**From:** Lederer, Calvin  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 29, 2010 5:41 PM  
**To:** Allen, Thad W  
**Cc:** Loebl, Gordon CAPT; Watson, James RADM; Neffenger, Peter RDML; Nash, Roy RDML; Salerno, Brian RADM; Cook, Kevin RDML; Lloyd, Anthony CAPT  
**Subject:** Deepwater Horizon Emergency Final Rule  
**Attachments:** EmergencyRule.pdf

Sir: CG/EPA emergency temp interim rule has posted on the Fed Reg website and will publish tomorrow (Wed). Rule suspends certain planning factors for responses to spills, in expectation that it will free up response equipment nationwide for transfer to the Gulf of Mexico. Record time to complete a rule. EPA very cooperative for this action. Was discussed in today's congressional call and will be discussed tomorrow in governors call. Navy on line, although there are challenges in continuing discussions with states of WA and CA. Implementation will remain heavy lift for RRTs and COTPs in other places.

VR Cal

Cal Lederer  
Acting Judge Advocate General  
U.S. Coast Guard  
202-372-3728  
571-212-5882 (cell)  
[calvin.m.lederer@uscg.mil](mailto:calvin.m.lederer@uscg.mil)

Captain Fred Kenney, USCG  
Chief, Office of Maritime and International Law U.S. Coast Guard (CG-0941) 2100 Second St SW  
Stop 7121 Washington, DC 20593-7121

Phone: (202) 372-3785  
Cell: (202)-297-6984

Sipr: [kenneyf@uscg.smil.mil](mailto:kenneyf@uscg.smil.mil)

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Nash, Roy RDML  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 29, 2010 8:32 AM  
**To:** Crissy, Paul CAPT  
**Cc:** samuel.cox@nmic.navy.mil; jstewart@nmic.navy.mil; shorne@nmic.navy.mil; Call, Joe; Coogan, Cynthia RADM; Day, Steven RDML; Welch, John CAPT; Cook, Kevin RDML  
**Subject:** CAPT PAUL CRISSY...THANK YOU FOR YOUR OUTSTANDING SERVICE, SHIPMATE

Paul,

As you start your last work week here on 4 July, I wish to thank you sincerely for your outstanding work at NMIC, and throughout your Coast Guard Career. I have no idea how we will ever replace your policy writing expertise, your leadership in the IC community, and your ever-present leadership role in looking after our people. It will be quite a shock when I return from New Orleans next time and not see you here.

That said, I will absolutely look you up and find you (somewhere) in the 'greater DC campus'. Please keep me advised of key dates, and if I happen to miss your retirement gathering for some reason, like cleaning-up oil in the Gulf of Mexico, Deb and I plan to take you and Roberta out for dinner upon my return.

It has been an extraordinarily excellent time working with you here, Paul. Keep up your positive attitude, and looking out for others as you do. You are a terrific Shipmate...in all matters there unto pertaining. You have served your country extremely well, Paul, and the Nation is indebted to you for your many sacrifices.

Most Sincerely,

Roy Nash

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Pond, Robert  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 01, 2010 4:33 PM  
**To:** Watson, James RADM; Hanzalik, James CAPT; Loebl, Gordon CAPT  
**Cc:** Nash, Roy RDML; Gautier, Peter CAPT; Zukunft, Paul RADM; Grawe, William; Mann, Timothy; Lloyd, Anthony CAPT; Warren, Geoffrey CDR; McElroy, Amy LT; Lundgren, Scott  
**Subject:** Conf Call w/ NOAA AND EPA - RECOVERY METHODS AND DISPERSANTS  
**Importance:** High

Sirs

Here is my latest take on the set-up for tomorrow's conference call. This is what I recommend be discussed .... please advise if I am out of line or missing key facts....

1. Preference in all oil spill response is to physically remove the oil from the water via natural weathering, mechanical recovery and in situ burning as far from shore as possible.
2. The oil does most environmental harm when it migrates into near-shore or on-shore environments.
3. Chemical dispersion of oil, while delaying or preventing the migration of oil from near shore and onshore environments, does not remove the oil from the environment where it may cause unknown or undocumented harm.
4. Therefore, simple oil budget formula to consider in this discussion: oil released to the environment - natural weathering - mechanical and in situ burning removal = oil dispersed + oil on shoreline.
5. The current Dispersant Directives, with the process improvements agreed to by EPA and CG this week, are sufficient to allowing deployment of an appropriate mix of mechanical recovery, in-situ burning and dispersant resources during most operational periods to optimize protection of the most sensitive shoreline environments, as well as human health and safety. This is true, despite the fact that aerial application of dispersants is used on almost a daily basis to augment on-going mechanical recovery, ISB and sub-surface dispersant use. That is the directive supports optimum removal of oil using mechanical means, and controlled and monitored application of dispersants to minimize shoreline impacts.
6. Protocols for employing the current directive during sustained period of adverse weather (e.g., multiple day shut in and abandonment of well due to tropical storm or hurricane) need to be further vetted to determine whether there are alternatives to cessation of all response activities including both sub-surface and surface dispersion, until sea conditions allow effective monitoring of those dispersant operations. Under the current directive, mechanical recovery, in situ burning, and dispersant application would all be suspended and EPA to date has been firm on holding to this. We need to ask how much oil will be released; how much will the natural weathering process be accelerated, how much oil will come ashore and are there any alternatives to no response during adverse weather shut-in.
7. In addition, need to convene a group to catalogue data being collected for both subsea and surface applications, to determine what the data is telling us and whether there are any gaps or inconsistencies in the data.

Does this adequately reflect your understanding?

Very respectfully

Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Pond, Robert  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 01, 2010 4:33 PM  
**To:** Watson, James RADM; Hanzalik, James CAPT; Loebel, Gordon CAPT  
**Cc:** Nash, Roy RDML; Gautier, Peter CAPT; Zukunft, Paul RADM; Grawe, William; Mann, Timothy; Lloyd, Anthony CAPT; Warren, Geoffrey CDR; McElroy, Amy LT; Lundgren, Scott  
**Subject:** Conf Call w/ NOAA AND EPA - RECOVERY METHODS AND DISPERSANTS  
**Importance:** High

Sirs

Here is my latest take on the set-up for tomorrow's conference call. This is what I recommend be discussed .... please advise if I am out of line or missing key facts....

1. Preference in all oil spill response is to physically remove the oil from the water via natural weathering, mechanical recovery and in situ burning as far from shore as possible.
2. The oil does most environmental harm when it migrates into near-shore or on-shore environments.
3. Chemical dispersion of oil, while delaying or preventing the migration of oil from near shore and onshore environments, does not remove the oil from the environment where it may cause unknown or undocumented harm.
4. Therefore, simple oil budget formula to consider in this discussion: oil released to the environment - natural weathering - mechanical and in situ burning removal = oil dispersed + oil on shoreline.
5. The current Dispersant Directives, with the process improvements agreed to by EPA and CG this week, are sufficient to allowing deployment of an appropriate mix of mechanical recovery, in-situ burning and dispersant resources during most operational periods to optimize protection of the most sensitive shoreline environments, as well as human health and safety. This is true, despite the fact that aerial application of dispersants is used on almost a daily basis to augment on-going mechanical recovery, ISB and sub-surface dispersant use. That is the directive supports optimum removal of oil using mechanical means, and controlled and monitored application of dispersants to minimize shoreline impacts.
6. Protocols for employing the current directive during sustained period of adverse weather (e.g., multiple day shut in and abandonment of well due to tropical storm or hurricane) need to be further vetted to determine whether there are alternatives to cessation of all response activities including both sub-surface and surface dispersion, until sea conditions allow effective monitoring of those dispersant operations. Under the current directive, mechanical recovery, in situ burning, and dispersant application would all be suspended and EPA to date has been firm on holding to this. We need to ask how much oil will be released; how much will the natural weathering process be accelerated, how much oil will come ashore and are there any alternatives to no response during adverse weather shut-in.
7. In addition, need to convene a group to catalogue data being collected for both subsea and surface applications, to determine what the data is telling us and whether there are any gaps or inconsistencies in the data.

Does this adequately reflect your understanding?

Very respectfully

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Mason.Steve@epamail.epa.gov  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 03, 2010 3:47 PM  
**To:** Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Laferriere, Roger CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT  
**Cc:** Hansen.Mark@epamail.epa.gov; Carroll.Craig@epamail.epa.gov; Coleman.Sam@epamail.epa.gov; Lyssy.Gregory@epamail.epa.gov  
**Subject:** Region 6 EPA Update -- July 3, 2010  
**Attachments:** ATT494316.jpg

Admiral Watson, Nash:

Sam asked us to develop a simple report each day for you on our sampling / monitoring activities for the previous day... Sam and Craig reviewed the template report below... We will begin sending to you each day...

Thanks...

Deepwater Horizon Incident, Gulf of Mexico Region 6 EPA Update

**Subject:** Region 6 EPA Update  
Deepwater Horizon Incident, Gulf of Mexico

**Date:** July 3, 2010  
**To:** Admiral Watson, Admiral Nash, Area Command; Captain Laferriere, Captain Austin, Incident Command  
**From:** Steve Mason, Area Command  
**Reporting Period:** July 2, 2010 1300 - July 3, 2010 1300

- \* Total EPA Personnel in the Field: 72
- \* Samples Collected (during reporting period): 36 (water, sediment, air, oil)
- \* Samples Collected (cumulative): 1,915 (water, sediment, air, oil)
- \* Continuous air monitoring at Poydras, Chalmette, Hopedale, Grand Isle, Port Fourchon, Venice, Boothville, and Buras, LA.
  - \* Chalmette: EBAM at C04 recorded 5 instances of negative values on 6/30 and 7/02 which were due to humidity/rain.
  - \* Venice: E-BAM 1-hr average readings at Station V02 were above exceedance criteria at 1100 hrs (174 ug/m3), 1400 hrs (177 ug/m3) and 1600 hrs (183 ug/m3). The field observation crew noted that a large vessel was docked at both the USCG station and the Halliburton facility situated next to Station V02.



**Nash, Roy RDML**

---

**From:** Mason.Steve@epamail.epa.gov  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 03, 2010 3:47 PM  
**To:** Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML; Laferriere, Roger CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT  
**Cc:** Hansen.Mark@epamail.epa.gov; Carroll.Craig@epamail.epa.gov; Coleman.Sam@epamail.epa.gov; Lyssy.Gregory@epamail.epa.gov  
**Subject:** Region 6 EPA Update -- July 3, 2010  
**Attachments:** ATT494316.jpg

Admiral Watson, Nash:

Sam asked us to develop a simple report each day for you on our sampling / monitoring activities for the previous day... Sam and Craig reviewed the template report below... We will begin sending to you each day...

Thanks...

Deepwater Horizon Incident, Gulf of Mexico Region 6 EPA Update

**Subject:** Region 6 EPA Update  
Deepwater Horizon Incident, Gulf of Mexico

**Date:** July 3, 2010  
**To:** Admiral Watson, Admiral Nash, Area Command; Captain Laferriere, Captain Austin, Incident Command  
**From:** Steve Mason, Area Command  
**Reporting Period:** July 2, 2010 1300 - July 3, 2010 1300

- \* Total EPA Personnel in the Field: 72
- \* Samples Collected (during reporting period): 36 (water, sediment, air, oil)
- \* Samples Collected (cumulative): 1,915 (water, sediment, air, oil)

\* Continuous air monitoring at Poydras, Chalmette, Hopedale, Grand Isle, Port Fourchon, Venice, Boothville, and Buras, LA.

\* Chalmette: EBAM at C04 recorded 5 instances of negative values on 6/30 and 7/02 which were due to humidity/rain.

\* Venice: E-BAM 1-hr average readings at Station V02 were above exceedance criteria at 1100 hrs (174 ug/m3), 1400 hrs (177 ug/m3) and 1600 hrs (183 ug/m3). The field observation crew noted that a large vessel was docked at both the USCG station and the Halliburton facility situated next to Station V02.

\* Venice: E-BAM 1-hr average readings at Station V03 were also above exceedance criteria at 1600 hrs (286 ug/m3). The field observation crew did not note any abnormal activity or conditions during that period.

\* Grand Isle: There was exceedance for PM 10 for multiple hours (GI05 and GI08) attributed to strong wind, and storm.

\*  
\* No TAGA and ASPECT sampling and monitoring activities were conducted on July 3  
\*

Faithfully yours  
Steve

"Frequently, my thoughts get bored and walk down to my mouth. Often, this is a bad thing."

Steve Mason, EPA Region 6 (6SF-PE)  
1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, TX 75202  
214-665-2276 / 214-665-2278 fax

\* Venice: E-BAM 1-hr average readings at Station V03 were also above exceedance criteria at 1600 hrs (286 ug/m3). The field observation crew did not note any abnormal activity or conditions during that period.

\* Grand Isle: There was exceedance for PM 10 for multiple hours (GI05 and GI08) attributed to strong wind, and storm.

\*  
\* No TAGA and ASPECT sampling and monitoring activities were conducted on July 3  
\*

Faithfully yours  
Steve

"Frequently, my thoughts get bored and walk down to my mouth. Often, this is a bad thing."

Steve Mason, EPA Region 6 (6SF-PE)  
1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, TX 75202  
214-665-2276 / 214-665-2278 fax

**Watson, James RADM**

**From:** Stanislaus.Mathy@epamail.epa.gov  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 04, 2010 8:39 AM  
**To:** Watson, James RADM  
**Cc:** Nash, Roy RDML; Jackson.LisaP@epamail.epa.gov; Tulis.Dana@epamail.epa.gov; Coleman.Sam@epamail.epa.gov; Mason.Steve@epamail.epa.gov; Bob Perciasepe; Mr. Mark Hansen  
**Subject:** Re: Followup to Yesterday's meeting.

Jim: Let's talk. The decision not to concur was based on consultation between myself, Sam and Mark Hansen (in Houma) for the reasons that Sam set forth in his e-mail.

I am not following your observations of oil yesterday - it was reported both @ last evening and this morning's briefings that no dispersible oil targets were found.

✓ Per the process that I outlined - EPA in UAC and Houma will consult prior the IC Houma requests surface dispersant use initially every evening and then the next morning based the overflight.

1. Mental Model for subsea & surface dispersant
2. Hurricane Plan

---

**From:** "Watson, James RADM" [James.A.Watson@uscg.mil]  
**Sent:** 07/04/2010 08:12 AM EST  
**To:** Mathy Stanislaus  
**Cc:** "Nash, Roy RDML" <Roy.A.Nash@uscg.mil>; LisaP Jackson; Dana Tulis; Sam Coleman; Steve Mason  
**Subject:** RE: Followup to Yesterday's meeting.

This plan seemed to have failed on the first try. Despite the HOUMA FOSCR getting concurrence, then sending the request, Sam Coleman non-concured. Also the process also omits the verbal script we agreed to yesterday to ensure correct amounts of dispersant will be applied based on the morning overfl. I was offshore late yesterday and flew over lots of oil. Only A Whale could attempt to skim it, but the A Whale reported very low effectiveness. You are confusing the fact that these requests are unified command generated, not BP only. Once the oil has escaped and making way toward land, I am responsible for mitigating it iaw the National Contingency plan. The process is that I direct BP to take certain actions including use of dispersants, in consultation with interagency experts. The process described below implies that BP must ask for permission to use one method or an other to respond to the oil spill - a construct that just doesn't make sense. The unified command must be assertive and streamlined in dealing with both the oil and BP. Ideally I should be able to delegate decisions to the operational level and only provide oversight from my level.

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

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

**From:** Stanislaus.Mathy@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Stanislaus.Mathy@epamail.epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 03, 2010 08:47 PM Eastern Standard Time  
**To:** Watson, James RADM

**Watson, James RADM**

**From:** Stanislaus.Mathy@epamail.epa.gov  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 04, 2010 8:39 AM  
**To:** Watson, James RADM  
**Cc:** Nash, Roy RDML; Jackson.LisaP@epamail.epa.gov; Tulis.Dana@epamail.epa.gov; Coleman.Sam@epamail.epa.gov; Mason.Steve@epamail.epa.gov; Bob Perciasepe; Mr. Mark Hansen  
**Subject:** Re: Followup to Yesterday's meeting.

Jim: Let's talk. The decision not to concur was based on consultation between myself, Sam and Mark Hansen (in Houma) for the reasons that Sam set forth in his e-mail.

I am not following your observations of oil yesterday - it was reported both @ last evening and this morning's briefings that no dispersible oil targets were found.

✓ Per the process that I outlined - EPA in UAC and Houma will consult prior the IC Houma requests surface dispersant use initially every evening and then the next morning based the overflight.

1. Mental Model for subsea & surface dispersant
2. Hurricane Plan

---

**From:** "Watson, James RADM" [James.A.Watson@uscg.mil]  
**Sent:** 07/04/2010 08:12 AM EST  
**To:** Mathy Stanislaus  
**Cc:** "Nash, Roy RDML" <Roy.A.Nash@uscg.mil>; LisaP Jackson; Dana Tulis; Sam Coleman; Steve Mason  
**Subject:** RE: Followup to Yesterday's meeting.

This plan seemed to have failed on the first try. Despite the HOUMA FOSCR getting concurrence, then sending the request, Sam Coleman non-concured. Also the process also omits the verbal script we agreed to yesterday to ensure correct amounts of dispersant will be applied based on the morning overflight. I was offshore late yesterday and flew over lots of oil. Only A Whale could attempt to skim it, but the A Whale reported very low effectiveness. You are confusing the fact that these requests are unified command generated, not BP only. Once the oil has escaped and making way toward land, I am responsible for mitigating it iaw the National Contingency plan. The process is that I direct BP to take certain actions including use of dispersants, in consultation with interagency experts. The process described below implies that BP must ask for permission to use one method or an other to respond to the oil spill - a construct that just doesn't make sense. The unified command must be assertive and streamlined in dealing with both the oil and BP. Ideally I should be able to delegate decisions to the operational level and only provide oversight from my level.

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

-----Original Message-----  
**From:** Stanislaus.Mathy@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Stanislaus.Mathy@epamail.epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 03, 2010 08:47 PM Eastern Standard Time  
**To:** Watson, James RADM

BP Dispersant Report

cc: Nash, Roy RDML; Jackson.LisaP@epamail.epa.gov; Tulis.Dana@epamail.epa.gov;  
Coleman.Sam@epamail.epa.gov; Mason.Steve@epamail.epa.gov  
Subject: Followup to Yesterday's meeting.

Jim:

This is to followup yesterday's meeting to identify action items.

I. EPA has revised its process with respect to surface dispersant requests.

Specifically:

- 1) BP'S initial request every evening will provide sufficient details using the established protocol for prioritization of other tools (skimming/in situ burning), identifying suitable targets (with photos), and demonstrating specific basis for volumes requested.
- 2) Unified Command, including USCG, NOAA, EPA, and BP WILL prepare / review BP'S proposal for aerial dispersant application the evening before. BP'S original proposal package WILL INCLUDE A REQUEST only for initial spraying the next morning. EPA staff in UAC WILL consult with EPA staff in Houma regarding the request.
- 3) Concurrence / concerns will be conveyed back to EPA at Houma.
- 4) Proposal with concurrence of EPA and NOAA for only the initial volume would be sent to Admiral Watson for final signature.
- 5) Once morning flights are completed, deliberations at Houma would occur regarding whether the conditions for prior evenings request have changed, actual application of dispersant during morning flights, and whether need for volumes set forth by BP in prior evenings request have been adequately demonstrated by BP. Process items 2 - 4 would be followed. *NO! - this is when the SNO telcom would be used.*

USCG, EPA AND NOAA WILL develop an audit process to look at effectiveness of application, process success, success in application of dispersant chemicals on regular basis.

All BP references and claims regarding relationship of government dispersant approval decisions to any shoreline impacts will be removed from daily reports. All shoreline impacts are associated with BP's oil and BO's failure to stop flow from its leaking well or BP's failure to physically capture its oil before reaching shore. BP's attempts to distort that fact have no place in operational reports.

*BP to Plan*  
II) Develop SOP for phasing out deepsea dispersant based on free standing riser becoming operational (currently projected for July 7th).  
BP has ignored instructions to develop a plan for phase out of dispersants use for several weeks. BP needs to assign a high priority to this matter.

*Plan*  
III) BP TO develop SOP for application of surface dispersant post-hurricane (with acknowledgment that large volumes and quick concurrence may be necessary). This assumes SADI is not approved. This needs to be initiated by BP in consultation with FOSC, EPA and NOAA.

IV. ) Work in UAC - particularly with NOAA and CG - regarding setting forth more explicitly those concerns of SADI to BP. Based on this - FOSC will communicate to BP. Separately, EPA will close on its legal position on legal authorities and approvals for SADI.

BP Dispersant Report

cc: Nash, Roy RDML; Jackson.LisaP@epamail.epa.gov; Tulis.Dana@epamail.epa.gov;  
Coleman.Sam@epamail.epa.gov; Mason.Steve@epamail.epa.gov  
Subject: Followup to Yesterday's meeting.

Jim:

This is to followup yesterday's meeting to identify action items.

I. EPA has revised its process with respect to surface dispersant requests.

Specifically:

- 1) BP'S initial request every evening will provide sufficient details using the established protocol for prioritization of other tools (skimming/in situ burning), identifying suitable targets (with photos), and demonstrating specific basis for volumes requested.
- 2) Unified Command, including USCG, NOAA, EPA, and BP WILL prepare / review BP'S proposal for aerial dispersant application the evening before. BP'S original proposal package WILL INCLUDE A REQUEST only for initial spraying the next morning. EPA staff in UAC WILL consult with EPA staff in Houma regarding the request.
- 3) Concurrence / concerns will be conveyed back to EPA at Houma.
- 4) Proposal with concurrence of EPA and NOAA for only the initial volume would be sent to Admiral Watson for final signature.
- 5) Once morning flights are completed, deliberations at Houma would occur regarding whether the conditions for prior evenings request have changed, actual application of dispersant during morning flights, and whether need for volumes set forth by BP in prior evenings request have been adequately demonstrated by BP. Process items 2 - 4 would be followed. *NO! - this is when the SNO Falcon would be used.*

USCG, EPA AND NOAA WILL develop an audit process to look at effectiveness of application, process success, success in application of dispersant chemicals on regular basis.

All BP references and claims regarding relationship of government dispersant approval decisions to any shoreline impacts will be removed from daily reports. All shoreline impacts are associated with BP's oil and BO's failure to stop flow from its leaking well or BP's failure to physically capture its oil before reaching shore. BP's attempts to distort that fact have no place in operational reports.

*BP to Plan*  
II) Develop SOP for phasing out deepsea dispersant based on free standing riser becoming operational (currently projected for July 7th).  
BP has ignored instructions to develop a plan for phase out of dispersants use for several weeks. BP needs to assign a high priority to this matter.

*Plan*  
III) BP TO develop SOP for application of surface dispersant post- hurricane (with acknowledgment that large volumes and quick concurrence may be necessary). This assumes SADI is not approved. This needs to be initiated by BP in consultation with FOSC, EPA and NOAA.

IV. ) Work in UAC - particularly with NOAA and CG - regarding setting forth more explicitly those concerns of SADI to BP. Based on this - FOSC will communicate to BP. Separately, EPA will close on its legal position on legal authorities and approvals for SADI.

BP Dispersant Report

cc: Nash, Roy RDML; Jackson.LisaP@epamail.epa.gov; Tulis.Dana@epamail.epa.gov;  
Coleman.Sam@epamail.epa.gov; Mason.Steve@epamail.epa.gov  
Subject: Followup to Yesterday's meeting.

Jim:

This is to followup yesterday's meeting to identify action items.

I. EPA has revised its process with respect to surface dispersant requests.

Specifically:

- 1) BP'S initial request every evening will provide sufficient details using the established protocol for prioritization of other tools (skimming/in situ burning), identifying suitable targets (with photos), and demonstrating specific basis for volumes requested.
- 2) Unified Command, including USCG, NOAA, EPA, and BP WILL prepare / review BP'S proposal for aerial dispersant application the evening before. BP'S original proposal package WILL INCLUDE A REQUEST only for initial spraying the next morning. EPA staff in UAC WILL consult with EPA staff in Houma regarding the request.
- 3) Concurrence / concerns will be conveyed back to EPA at Houma.
- 4) Proposal with concurrence of EPA and NOAA for only the initial volume would be sent to Admiral Watson for final signature.
- 5) Once morning flights are completed, deliberations at Houma would occur regarding whether the conditions for prior evenings request have changed, actual application of dispersant during morning flights, and whether need for volumes set forth by BP in prior evenings request have been adequately demonstrated by BP. Process items 2 - 4 would be followed. *NO! - this is when the SNO falcon would be used.*

USCG, EPA AND NOAA WILL develop an audit process to look at effectiveness of application, process success, success in application of dispersant chemicals on regular basis.

All BP references and claims regarding relationship of government dispersant approval decisions to any shoreline impacts will be removed from daily reports. All shoreline impacts are associated with BP's oil and BO's failure to stop flow from its leaking well or BP's failure to physically capture its oil before reaching shore. BP's attempts to distort that fact have no place in operational reports.

*BP to Plan*  
II) Develop SOP for phasing out deepsea dispersant based on free standing riser becoming operational (currently projected for July 7th).  
BP has ignored instructions to develop a plan for phase out of dispersants use for several weeks. BP needs to assign a high priority to this matter.

*Plan*  
III) BP TO develop SOP for application of surface dispersant post- hurricane (with acknowledgment that large volumes and quick concurrence may be necessary). This assumes SADI is not approved. This needs to be initiated by BP in consultation with FOSC, EPA and NOAA.

IV. ) Work in UAC - particularly with NOAA and CG - regarding setting forth more explicitly those concerns of SADI to BP. Based on this -  
• FOSC will communicate to BP. Separately, EPA will close on its legal position on legal authorities and approvals for SADI.



v. BP to develop and communicate materials regarding containment/relief well timeline and milestones to the public.

1. Model Model for  
2. System Plan

Nash, Roy RDML

Greenpeace

From: Kelley, Brian CAPT  
Sent: Monday, July 05, 2010 3:41 PM  
To: john.hocevar@greenpeace.org  
Cc: Stewart, James CDR; Hartley, Lisa G LTJG; Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML  
Subject: RE: public access

Sir, I also suggest you consult Homeport ([homeport.uscg.mil](http://homeport.uscg.mil)). From the home page, you can access the Marine Safety Information Bulletins for the applicable port zone (e.g., New Orleans, Mobile, Morgan City) via the Port Directory tab. There you can stay abreast of all Coast Guard info published for professional mariners. R, BK

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

From: Kelley, Brian CAPT  
Sent: Monday, July 05, 2010 3:33 PM  
To: 'john.hocevar@greenpeace.org'  
Cc: Stewart, James CDR; Hartley, Lisa G LTJG; Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML  
Subject: FW: public access

Mr. Hocevar, here are points of contact to use in seeking access to waters within the Deepwater Horizon Response safety zones.

Coast Guard Sector New Orleans has delegated authority to Incident Command Post Houma, LA. The ICP Houma watch may be contacted at (985) 493-7835.

Coast Guard Sector Mobile points of contact are CDR Jim Stewart ([james.a.stewart@uscg.mil](mailto:james.a.stewart@uscg.mil)), and LTJG Lisa Hartley ([lisa.g.hartley@uscg.mil](mailto:lisa.g.hartley@uscg.mil)).

With regards, BK

CAPT Brian Kelley, USCG  
Chief of Staff  
Unified Area Command  
Deepwater Horizon Response

Cell: (703) 346-9947  
Watch Floor: (504) 335-0962

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

From: John Hocevar [<mailto:john.hocevar@greenpeace.org>]  
Sent: Thursday, July 01, 2010 05:48 PM Eastern Standard Time  
To: Watson, James RADM  
Subject: public access

Jim,

As I mentioned to you a while ago, I understand that there is tension between the need to ensure safety and prevent interference with response efforts, and the public's right to know what the true impacts of this disaster are. Greenpeace has had a team on the ground in the Gulf - primarily in LA, but at times in FL and MS - since shortly after the explosion occurred. Part of our mission has been to monitor the state of booms around particularly sensitive areas, and to report back to local authorities when we identify things that need immediate maintenance. We have also helped monitor for oiled wildlife, calling in reports to the hotline when appropriate. We have provided space on our boats for members of the press, scientists, and local environmental organizations.

Greenpeace

Nash, Roy RDML

From: Kelley, Brian CAPT  
Sent: Monday, July 05, 2010 3:41 PM  
To: john.hocevar@greenpeace.org  
Cc: Stewart, James CDR; Hartley, Lisa G LTJG; Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML  
Subject: RE: public access

Sir, I also suggest you consult Homeport (homeport.uscg.mil). From the home page, you can access the Marine Safety Information Bulletins for the applicable port zone (e.g., New Orleans, Mobile, Morgan City) via the Port Directory tab. There you can stay abreast of all Coast Guard info published for professional mariners. R, BK

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

From: Kelley, Brian CAPT  
Sent: Monday, July 05, 2010 3:33 PM  
To: 'john.hocevar@greenpeace.org'  
Cc: Stewart, James CDR; Hartley, Lisa G LTJG; Watson, James RADM; Nash, Roy RDML  
Subject: FW: public access

Mr. Hocevar, here are points of contact to use in seeking access to waters within the Deepwater Horizon Response safety zones.

Coast Guard Sector New Orleans has delegated authority to Incident Command Post Houma, LA. The ICP Houma watch may be contacted at (985) 493-7835.

Coast Guard Sector Mobile points of contact are CDR Jim Stewart ([james.a.stewart@uscg.mil](mailto:james.a.stewart@uscg.mil)), and LTJG Lisa Hartley ([lisa.g.hartley@uscg.mil](mailto:lisa.g.hartley@uscg.mil)).

With regards, BK

CAPT Brian Kelley, USCG  
Chief of Staff  
Unified Area Command  
Deepwater Horizon Response

Cell: (703) 346-9947  
Watch Floor: (504) 335-0962

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

From: John Hocevar [mailto:[john.hocevar@greenpeace.org](mailto:john.hocevar@greenpeace.org)]  
Sent: Thursday, July 01, 2010 05:48 PM Eastern Standard Time  
To: Watson, James RADM  
Subject: public access

Jim,

As I mentioned to you a while ago, I understand that there is tension between the need to ensure safety and prevent interference with response efforts, and the public's right to know what the true impacts of this disaster are. Greenpeace has had a team on the ground in the Gulf - primarily in LA, but at times in FL and MS - since shortly after the explosion occurred. Part of our mission has been to monitor the state of booms around particularly sensitive areas, and to report back to local authorities when we identify things that need immediate maintenance. We have also helped monitor for oiled wildlife, calling in reports to the hotline when appropriate. We have provided space on our boats for members of the press, scientists, and local environmental organizations.

For the most part, the restrictions on public access have not hindered us too much, although there have certainly been exceptions. Surprisingly, access seems to be tightening lately, with more enforcement of regulations and a new safety zone around all protective boom. I can say from firsthand experience that it was often very difficult to adequately monitor for oiled birds and other wildlife from the edge of the boom surrounding islands in Barataria Bay. If we are forced to stay an additional 20 meters out, we will not be able to offer much value.

Is there some process by which we can gain USCG approval to operate within safe limits? Is there an opportunity to obtain vessel of opportunity status for our boats?

Looking a bit further ahead, we are planning to bring two of our ships, the Arctic Sunrise and the Esperanza, to the Gulf in the near future. The mission will be focused on documentation and science, and we are working with some of the top marine scientists in the country. We expect to have submersibles on board, and a considerable array of sampling equipment. The scientific work will be designed and carried out by independent scientists, who will conduct the research and analyze and publish the data. We have been hearing stories from some of the scientists who have already been involved in research expeditions since the spill began about the restrictions they had to operate under, and they are concerned that we will not be able to get to their proposed study sites. This is one of my biggest headaches right now, knowing that even after we assemble a world class team from a number of prestigious institutions, develop a strong scientific program, and acquire the gear necessary to make it possible, we have no guarantee that we won't be hampered by exclusion zones. Is there anything you recommend that I do at this stage to ensure that we are able to get the scientists where they need to go?

Thanks again,

John Hocevar  
Oceans Campaign Director  
Greenpeace USA  
(202) 319-2408  
(512) 577-3868 (cel)

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

From: Woodring, Marcus CAPT  
Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 2010 5:03 PM  
To: Woodring, Marcus CAPT  
Subject: DEEPWATER HORIZON Incident - Texas Partners Briefing - Update #28

Partners,

I have moved all the e-mail addresses to the Bcc line to avoid any inadvertent "reply to all" issues and ensure some privacy. For those of you that I have added in recent days, this is the method I have been using since late May to keep our local stakeholders, Congressional delegations, local EMs, County Judges, the Governor's Office, TGLO, FWS, and my staff informed. All having the same information is vital to speaking with one voice.

My two priorities from Governor Perry this morning were 1) try to determine which ship might have carried the oil here, and 2) work with NOAA to see if any possibility exists that the currents could have carried oil to Texas. I will address both below, and personally briefed him at 1630 today.

The tar mats from McFaddin Beach (from Monday evening) tested positive for DWH oil. It was somewhat weathered and the strong possibility exists that it was a "break away" streamer from the source. This was confirmed on the State of Texas Conference Call today when the Texas scientific report discussed more streamers/oil to the west of the wellhead. Dr. Charlie Henry, one of the NOAA Scientific Support Coordinators, says that under certain conditions, i.e. strong easterly winds like we had with ALEX, oil from the wellhead could reach Texas in the form of tar balls. The longshore current increased to 2kts as a result of ALEX. These tar balls would be random and scattered, and only in certain conditions, but it is possible.

We are still pending the results from the samples taken from Bolivar Peninsula and Galveston on Tuesday. A small patch of tar balls was reported on Galveston Island today.

As stated yesterday, we have been assigned a Texas rep from BP. The contact info for Mr. Mike Cortez is: Cell 832-746-3846 and [Michael.cortez@bp.com](mailto:Michael.cortez@bp.com) He has joined us at the small command post in Galveston, alongside TGLO and the USCG. We will maintain this presence for the near term to track reports, and coordinate response to all tar ball sightings.

No definitive news on the investigation of ships which may have carried some DWH oil to Texas. I must add that it is possible that another ship, just passing thru the spill area, might have inadvertently carried the oil here, and thus not be on our list to check. With over 70 deep draft arrivals a day into the Houston Ship Channel, checking everyone would be virtually impossible. We will continue to focus on our short list of candidates and keep you apprised of the results. One of five has been ruled out by inspection, no oil was present in its ballast tanks.

Captain Marcus Woodring  
Sector Commander/Captain of the Port  
U.S. Coast Guard Sector Houston-Galveston  
Phone: 713.671.5199  
[Marcus.E.Woodring@uscg.mil](mailto:Marcus.E.Woodring@uscg.mil)

Nash, Roy RDML

---

From: Woodring, Marcus CAPT  
Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 2010 5:03 PM  
To: Woodring, Marcus CAPT  
Subject: DEEPWATER HORIZON Incident - Texas Partners Briefing - Update #28

Partners,

I have moved all the e-mail addresses to the Bcc line to avoid any inadvertent "reply to all" issues and ensure some privacy. For those of you that I have added in recent days, this is the method I have been using since late May to keep our local stakeholders, Congressional delegations, local EMs, County Judges, the Governor's Office, TGLO, FWS, and my staff informed. All having the same information is vital to speaking with one voice.

My two priorities from Governor Perry this morning were 1) try to determine which ship might have carried the oil here, and 2) work with NOAA to see if any possibility exists that the currents could have carried oil to Texas. I will address both below, and personally briefed him at 1630 today.

The tar mats from McFaddin Beach (from Monday evening) tested positive for DWH oil. It was somewhat weathered and the strong possibility exists that it was a "break away" streamer from the source. This was confirmed on the State of Texas Conference Call today when the Texas scientific report discussed more streamers/oil to the west of the wellhead. Dr. Charlie Henry, one of the NOAA Scientific Support Coordinators, says that under certain conditions, i.e. strong easterly winds like we had with ALEX, oil from the wellhead could reach Texas in the form of tar balls. The longshore current increased to 2kts as a result of ALEX. These tar balls would be random and scattered, and only in certain conditions, but it is possible.

We are still pending the results from the samples taken from Bolivar Peninsula and Galveston on Tuesday. A small patch of tar balls was reported on Galveston Island today.

As stated yesterday, we have been assigned a Texas rep from BP. The contact info for Mr. Mike Cortez is: Cell 832-746-3846 and [Michael.cortez@bp.com](mailto:Michael.cortez@bp.com) He has joined us at the small command post in Galveston, alongside TGLO and the USCG. We will maintain this presence for the near term to track reports, and coordinate response to all tar ball sightings.

No definitive news on the investigation of ships which may have carried some DWH oil to Texas. I must add that it is possible that another ship, just passing thru the spill area, might have inadvertently carried the oil here, and thus not be on our list to check. With over 70 deep draft arrivals a day into the Houston Ship Channel, checking everyone would be virtually impossible. We will continue to focus on our short list of candidates and keep you apprised of the results. One of five has been ruled out by inspection, no oil was present in its ballast tanks.

Captain Marcus Woodring  
Sector Commander/Captain of the Port  
U.S. Coast Guard Sector Houston-Galveston  
Phone: 713.671.5199  
[Marcus.E.Woodring@uscg.mil](mailto:Marcus.E.Woodring@uscg.mil)

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Woodring, Marcus CAPT  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 07, 2010 5:03 PM  
**To:** Woodring, Marcus CAPT  
**Subject:** DEEPWATER HORIZON Incident - Texas Partners Briefing - Update #28

Partners,

I have moved all the e-mail addresses to the Bcc line to avoid any inadvertent "reply to all" issues and ensure some privacy. For those of you that I have added in recent days, this is the method I have been using since late May to keep our local stakeholders, Congressional delegations, local EMS, County Judges, the Governor's Office, TGLO, FWS, and my staff informed. All having the same information is vital to speaking with one voice.

My two priorities from Governor Perry this morning were 1) try to determine which ship might have carried the oil here, and 2) work with NOAA to see if any possibility exists that the currents could have carried oil to Texas. I will address both below, and personally briefed him at 1630 today.

The tar mats from McFaddin Beach (from Monday evening) tested positive for DWH oil. It was somewhat weathered and the strong possibility exists that it was a "break away" streamer from the source. This was confirmed on the State of Texas Conference Call today when the Texas scientific report discussed more streamers/oil to the west of the wellhead. Dr. Charlie Henry, one of the NOAA Scientific Support Coordinators, says that under certain conditions, i.e. strong easterly winds like we had with ALEX, oil from the wellhead could reach Texas in the form of tar balls. The longshore current increased to 2kts as a result of ALEX. These tar balls would be random and scattered, and only in certain conditions, but it is possible.

We are still pending the results from the samples taken from Bolivar Peninsula and Galveston on Tuesday. A small patch of tar balls was reported on Galveston Island today.

As stated yesterday, we have been assigned a Texas rep from BP. The contact info for Mr. Mike Cortez is: Cell 832-746-3846 and [Michael.cortez@bp.com](mailto:Michael.cortez@bp.com) He has joined us at the small command post in Galveston, alongside TGLO and the USCG. We will maintain this presence for the near term to track reports, and coordinate response to all tar ball sightings.

No definitive news on the investigation of ships which may have carried some DWH oil to Texas. I must add that it is possible that another ship, just passing thru the spill area, might have inadvertently carried the oil here, and thus not be on our list to check. With over 70 deep draft arrivals a day into the Houston Ship Channel, checking everyone would be virtually impossible. We will continue to focus on our short list of candidates and keep you apprised of the results. One of five has been ruled out by inspection, no oil was present in its ballast tanks.

Captain Marcus Woodring  
Sector Commander/Captain of the Port  
U.S. Coast Guard Sector Houston-Galveston  
Phone: 713.671.5199  
[Marcus.E.Woodring@uscg.mil](mailto:Marcus.E.Woodring@uscg.mil)

**Nash, Roy RDML**

---

**From:** Woodring, Marcus CAPT  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 07, 2010 5:49 PM  
**To:** McKinley, Andrew CAPT  
**Cc:** Nash, Roy RDML; Neffenger, Peter RDML; Watson, James RADM; Landry, Mary RADM; Elliott, James CDR; Plunkett, John CAPT; Whitehead, James CAPT; Maguire, Patrick CAPT; Troedsson, Peter CAPT; Austin, Meredith CAPT; McPherson, James CAPT; 'Richard.Arnhart@glo.state.tx.us'; Hanzalik, James CAPT  
**Subject:** Sector HG actions - 07July Recap

Scott - Doing well in Texas.

Spoke to Governor Perry several times today. Clearly explained that tar patties on McFaddin Beach were probably carried here via the current. Also explained that we will probably not determine which ship it was that transported the "fresh" oil here.

Overcame some confusion this morning on a positive test that somehow was being retracted or revised. We had been using the lab results from Houma as our trigger for positive matches. We understand now that we are to await results from MSL. We will change our processes henceforth, but not invalidate anything we have broadcast to date.

A report of small tar balls on Bolivar (ferry stopped running so we couldn't get there) and a small patch of tar balls on Galveston Island being responded to.

One request for ICP Houma - Now that we have quasi-stood up, we ask that we be notified of teams being deployed to Texas (investigation of ships, shoreline assessment contractors). Running into them on the beach leads to confusion.

Thanks.

Captain Marcus Woodring  
Sector Commander/Captain of the Port  
U.S. Coast Guard Sector Houston-Galveston  
Phone: 713.671.5199  
[Marcus.E.Woodring@uscg.mil](mailto:Marcus.E.Woodring@uscg.mil)



## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Briggs, Wyman  
**Sent:** Friday, July 09, 2010 7:41 PM  
**To:** Nash, Roy RDML  
**Cc:** Maguire, Patrick CAPT; McKinley, Andrew CAPT; Wilbert, Mark CAPT; Charlie Henry-NOAA  
**Subject:** FW: BP Response Letter

RDML Nash,

As discussed, I met this afternoon with Mathy Stamislaus, Sam Coleman, and Greg Lyssy of EPA; and Terry Wood and Jackie Mutschler of BP; and Charlie Henry of NOAA to discuss questions and concerns related to Bob Dudley 9 July response to Admiral Allen's letter of 8 July.

Concerns that we recommend forwarding from the FOSC include the following:

1. Charlie Wood of NOAA was concerned with the wording in the second paragraph regarding "a projected weather window of some 8 days as projected by NOAA". BP should be reminded that NOAA cannot provide weather projections with a high level of confidence beyond 72 hours. NOAA's weather outlook calls for favorable conditions over an extended period beyond 72 hours.
2. Mr. Dudley's letter does not address aerial dispersant - which must be addressed along with sub-sea and surface in minimizing overall dispersant use. Suggested comments: "It is anticipated that there will be an increased volume of oil discharged once the top cap is removed and before the Helix Producer starts up containment operations. Outline any anticipated requests for increased aerial dispersant use if weather conditions do not enable maximum skimming and in-situ burning efficiency.
3. Mathy of EPA requests that BP provide full clarity regarding the sequence of containment process. He is discussing with his Administrator whether to submit his comments through the FOSC or independently. He has reviewed and signed off on the above. I've been awaiting his comments for an hour+. My comments are outlined above. These will be no surprise to BP.

V/R,

Wyman

Wyman Briggs  
USCG  
DWH Response - UAC-Strategic Planning  
ph:504-335-0924  
Cell:207-321-9133  
email:Wyman.W.Briggs@uscg.mil

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

**From:** Nash, Roy RDML  
**Sent:** Friday, July 09, 2010 3:50 PM  
**To:** Briggs, Wyman; Maguire, Patrick CAPT; McKinley, Andrew CAPT; Wilbert, Mark CAPT; Charlie Henry-NOAA; Stanislaus.Mathy@epamail.epa.gov

## Nash, Roy RDML

---

**From:** Briggs, Wyman  
**Sent:** Friday, July 09, 2010 7:41 PM  
**To:** Nash, Roy RDML  
**Cc:** Maguire, Patrick CAPT; McKinley, Andrew CAPT; Wilbert, Mark CAPT; Charlie Henry-NOAA  
**Subject:** FW: BP Response Letter

RDML Nash,

As discussed, I met this afternoon with Mathy Stamislaus, Sam Coleman, and Greg Lyssy of EPA; and Terry Wood and Jackie Mutschler of BP; and Charlie Henry of NOAA to discuss questions and concerns related to Bob Dudley 9 July response to Admiral Allen's letter of 8 July.

Concerns that we recommend forwarding from the FOSC include the following:

1. Charlie Wood of NOAA was concerned with the wording in the second paragraph regarding "a projected weather window of some 8 days as projected by NOAA". BP should be reminded that NOAA cannot provide weather projections with a high level of confidence beyond 72 hours. NOAA's weather outlook calls for favorable conditions over an extended period beyond 72 hours.
2. Mr. Dudley's letter does not address aerial dispersant - which must be addressed along with sub-sea and surface in minimizing overall dispersant use. Suggested comments: "It is anticipated that there will be an increased volume of oil discharged once the top cap is removed and before the Helix Producer starts up containment operations. Outline any anticipated requests for increased aerial dispersant use if weather conditions do not enable maximum skimming and in-situ burning efficiency.
3. Mathy of EPA requests that BP provide full clarity regarding the sequence of containment process. He is discussing with his Administrator whether to submit his comments through the FOSC or independently. He has reviewed and signed off on the above. I've been awaiting his comments for an hour+. My comments are outlined above. These will be no surprise to BP.

V/R,

Wyman

Wyman Briggs  
USCG  
DWH Response - UAC-Strategic Planning  
ph:504-335-0924  
Cell:207-321-9133  
email:Wyman.W.Briggs@uscg.mil

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

From: Nash, Roy RDML  
Sent: Friday, July 09, 2010 3:50 PM  
To: Briggs, Wyman; Maguire, Patrick CAPT; McKinley, Andrew CAPT; Wilbert, Mark CAPT; Charlie Henry-NOAA; Stanislaus.Mathy@epamail.epa.gov

From: Zukunft, Paul RADM; Korn, John RDML; Watson, James RADM  
Subject: FW: BP Response Letter

Wyman, PJ, Scott, Charlie, Mathy,

Electronic copy of BP letter and attachment. Dispersant use addressed on page 3 of 3 of letter.

Let's shoot to turnaround later this afternoon...advise if this is not possible.

v/r  
Roy Nash

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

From: Gautier, Peter CAPT

Sent: Friday, July 09, 2010 1:28 PM

To: Cook, Kevin RADM; mcnuttt@usgs.gov; tohunter@sandia.gov

Cc: Khey, Brian LCDR; Odom, Michael LCDR; Fitzgerald, John LT; Zichal, Heather R.; Neffenger, Peter RDML; Hubble, Solange; Allen, Thad W; Kiefer, Kevin CAPT; Arguin, Wayne CDR; Lowe, Steve CDR; Grawe, William; Nash, Roy RDML; Watson, James RADM; Maguire, Patrick CAPT

Subject: FW: BP Response Letter

Dr. McNutt, Admiral Cook and Mr. Hunter,

Attached is the BP response to the NIC letter requiring detailed plans and decision points moving ahead. Per the NIC letter, we look forward to written revisions to this plan from BP as a result of your discussions today, and request that you advocate with BP directly on changes that need to be made.

Admiral Cook, can we link up with you after your meeting for a download on today's discussion?

LCDRs Khey and Odom, please make sure that the Science and Technology Team gets hard copies of this document.

v/r

Pete