From: Ronald Sweatman
Sent: Mon Jun 28 09:46:37 2010
To: Thomas Roth
Subject: RE: Conversation with Jeff Moss of ExxonMobil
Importance: Normal

THANKS

From: Thomas Roth
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 8:57 AM
To: Ronald Sweatman; Roland Chemali; James Bement - VP Sperry PSL
Cc: Anthony Badalamenti
Subject: RE: Conversation with Jeff Moss of ExxonMobil

Ron:

BP has yet to recognize top sand identified in SDS Log at 17,720' in any of their reporting.

Spacer pumped ahead for sea water displacement of SBM from riser is the source of difficulties with negative test and likely flawed interpretation of successful test.

I agree. Foam cement is the best engineered solution to the conditions presented.

6,500 PSI stated is likely 6,900 PSI, pressure of burst disks installed in 16" casing. If you shut in 13,000 psi dry gas kick with hanger failed, 16" ruptures and you have flow on outside of all containment...Tommy

---

From: Ronald Sweatman
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 8:33 AM
To: Roland Chemali; James Bement - VP Sperry PSL
Cc: Thomas Roth; Anthony Badalamenti
Subject: RE: Conversation with Jeff Moss of ExxonMobil

Roland,

Jeff is on the BOP and Rig Equipment JITF ("Equipment").

Last month, the Well Operations Procedures JITF ("Procedures") briefly discussed an upper HC zone (HP gas) not having the required 500' of cement above it. For some unknown reason, this didn't get into the May 17 JITF (Equipment & Procedures) report to DOI. The May 27 DOI report to the White House also didn't mention it. Ditto in the Congressional and MMS/CG hearings. It appears that the SLB log data hasn't been released by BP. Jeff likely knew about it from XOM's people that were called in to BP's office to help them deal with the incident.

The idea that foam cement was an issue was dismissed by Procedures JITF due it being the best solution to control gas flow. Foam cement has a long, successful track record and was a natural choice for the Macondo hole conditions (potential losses & influxes). API RP 65 says it is a best practice for same. The Procedures JITF recognized that both foam and non-foam cement had little chance for success based on the lack of hole cleaning, mud degassing, centralizers, etc.

This is the first time I have heard about the 6500 vs 13000 lb rating. Do you know what specific part of the "top equipment" has this low rating?

Thanks and regards,
Ron

Ronald (Ron) Sweatman
Chief Technical Professional
Global Business & Technical Solutions and CCS
Halliburton
10200 Bellaire Blvd. 3NE14E
Houston, Texas 77072-5206

Office Phone: 281.575.4389

From: Roland Chemali
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 7:36 AM
To: James Bement - VP Sperry PSL; Ronald Sweatman
Subject: Conversation with Jeff Moss of ExxonMobil

James, Ron,

This is being sent to you only for distribution as you see fit.

I had a non-confidential conversation with Jeff Moss at the opening reception at the SPE Forum on Geosteering last night. Jeff stated that there were many "red herrings" in the investigation of the BP well blow out. These red herrings included his early discussion with a few of us last April of a problem with the spacer. He dismissed that as pure unsubstantiated speculation. He did however question two very important issues:

1. Why was there only 300 ft of cement above a known hydrocarbon producing zone? That cement was foam cement to boot. (I presume that the cement height was specified by BP). Please note that Jeff's specification of the "hydrocarbon producing interval" is probably based on Schlumberger MDT data, to which we have no access.

2. The well top equipment could only control 6500 lbs when in reality the requirement should have been for 13000 lbs. Therefore he believes that if the BOP had worked there was a chance of the entire BOP lifting up and potentially an even bigger mess.

Best regards
Roland Chemali
Chief Petrophysicist
Halliburton Sperry Drilling
3000 North Sam Houston Parkway
Cell: +1-281-684-9349
Office:+1-281-871-4257