

From: "Jacqui Michel" <jmichel@researchplanning.com>
To: "Kim McCleneghan" <kimmc@softcom.net>
Cc: "Peter Parham" <pparham@researchplanning.com>, "Cameron Kerr" <ckerr@researchplanning.com>, <Justin.casey@atkinsglobal.com>
Bcc:
Date: 10/30/2011 07:30:05 am
Subject: Re: update from MS...
Attachments:

Kim: first of all, thank you for the email. I very much like hearing from you in the field.
And my gawd! What a great photograph! I am definitely going to use that a lot in future SCAT training lectures!

Yup, this spill has been "different" in many ways, and especially now. I have no control over the "Shoreline Cleanup Completion Plan" formerly known as the STage 5 plan. It is being written and negotiated by the UC. I understand that the FOSC is going to sign it on Tuesday, regardless if any states sign.

And it does have all those impossible endpoints. But, I have been told, that there is now a "process" whereby segments, through the PSIT/SIR-1, SCAT Monitoring, and SIR-2 inspections, will get moved out of the response. SCAT reports what they see, then the "packages" come to NOLA for review, approval, etc., then supposedly there is some progress.

Much of this process is driven by those impossible cleanup endpoints you mentioned. But the states won't let go of them.

So, it will be very interesting to see how/if the process works.

Hang in there.

Jacqui

On Oct 29, 2011, at 7:18 PM, Kim McCleneghan wrote:

Hi Jacqui. Thanks for the email regarding the Thanksgiving break; the rotation schedule for Peter and me fits perfectly with that.

SCAT work here has kind of been sputtering along. In those segments I've walked this rotation (Petit Bois Is., Horn Is., and some mainland beaches) there is little oil residue. Some segments however remain "STR continue", but even so, there is little oil to recover. The expectations of the State and NPS seems to be No Visible Oil. I think this will be difficult to achieve and at what cost? What ever happened to the concept that there is a point in the cleanup where the level of effort (as well cost and potential additional environmental impact) exceeds the level of environmental improvement. I think we have surpassed that point. (I'm talking myself out of a job here... :) Seems kinda of a goofy process to me....the scat team is picking up SRBs so the segment can be moved from PIST to SIR. On other mainland segments I'm told that ops has already been assigned to revisit those segments so I am unsure why we are even spending scat time on it. The answer I was given was "politics". I don't mind picking up the oil but the process seems curious. A criteria of no more than 1% coverage is something that is easily met now, but to have not one SRB greater than 2.5 cm for non-amenity beaches and NOO for

Ex 13003

Worldwide
Court Reporters, Inc.

US_PP_NOAA182020

amenity beaches is something that is almost never achieved in the segments I've walked. And we are picking up all SRBs, regardless of size, in order to move the segment along in the process. Today we were counting the srbs recovered (300+ in several segments); additionally, the team lead had been told to weigh the amount recovered in each segment and report that to ops so it could be included in their reports on oil recovery. SCAT is becoming a mini-cleanup team. I am not complaining, just making an observation. I'm sure you have been involved in the discussions in LA that determined how this thing is going to proceed. It just seems to me that the State (and counties?) have unreasonable expectations about how much of the residue can and should be recovered. With each tide change and brisk wind, surface sand is relocated exposing some more SRBs. Generally, the number and size of these is so small that I doubt that most people would even notice or recognize them as residual oil. Also, I sincerely doubt there is any environmental impact from this small quantity as well. Additionally, some counties have significant projects underway to excavate sand that has drifted to the back beach and relocate it to the fore beach and intertidal effectively burying the present beach face and any remaining SRBs. This activity makes it pretty clear to me that the county doesn't care about the on-going oil recovery effort on their beaches. So, it seems to me then that the beach replenishment conflicts with the State's position to have cleanup continue. It appears that the State and local governments do not have a unified position on the cleanup endpoint.

I am attaching a picture of trenching we did a week ago at an outfall for surface water drainage in W MS. There were four of these outfalls where MS presumed there were large deposits of buried oil. We trenched excessively on each side of the outfall. In the location of the picture, there was about 300 m of trenches when completed. One SRB was found on the surface before the trenching started; that was it. I thought this effort was pretty remarkable given there was little justification for it other than I guess some local "gut feeling"....at least that's what I got out of it. However, these outfall jettys did trap floating oil when it came ashore initially. Again, I'm not complaining....just keeping you apprised of what is going on out here.

The last 2 days there were no boat ops and none tomorrow I expect as there was a strong, cold N wind throughout the day today. So, I expect there will some areas of newly exposed SRBs when scat gets back out to the islands for a look.

Sorry about the long email....hope there is some useful information here.

Take care. Kim

<IMG_1574.JPG>

Jacqueline Michel, Ph.D.

President

Research Planning, Inc.

1121 Park Street

Columbia, SC 29201

803-256-7322 (o)

803-513-5650 (c)

www.researchplanning.com

P.O. Box 328

Columbia, SC 29202

