

Fw Brooks McCall analysis team next phase - are you available to discuss
Fw: Brooks McCall analysis team next phase - are you available to discuss?
----- Forwarded by Mark K Sogge/DO/USGS/DOI on 09/10/2010 02:57 PM -----
From: Mark K Sogge/DO/USGS/DOI
To: Robert.Pavia@noaa.gov
Date: 06/06/2010 08:38 AM
Subject: Re: Brooks McCall analysis team next phase - are you available to discuss?

Hi Bob,

I am in Houston for the week, but 3:30 Pacific still works great. Is there a preferred number at which I should call you?

Mark

Mark Sogge
2255 Gemini Drive, Flagstaff, AZ 86001
Cell: 928-606-1286; FAX: 928-556-7266
mark_sogge@usgs.gov

From: Robert.Pavia@noaa.gov
To: Mark K Sogge <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>
Date: 06/06/2010 09:33 AM
Subject: Re: Brooks McCall analysis team next phase - are you available to discuss?

Mark, good idea. Since you are out west too, let's look for a time Monday PM. What about 330 PDT?

----- Original Message -----
From: Mark K Sogge <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>
Date: Sunday, June 6, 2010 7:20 am
Subject: Brooks McCall analysis team next phase - are you available to discuss?
To: Robert Pavia <Robert.Pavia@noaa.gov>

> Hi Bob,
>
> As the Brooks McCall team starts wrapping up this analysis, there are
> a
> couple of questions I would like to discuss with you:
>
> - what you envision for the format of this report when released?
>
> - what you see as the next immediate activity for this group (if
> anything)?
>
> - whether I am the most appropriate USGS rep for this group, as it
> transitions to the broader JAG concept
>
>
> I think it would be easiest to have this discussion by phone. Are you

Fw Brooks McCall analysis team next phase - are you available to discuss

>
> available to chat for a bit in the next couple of days?

> Mark

> Mark Sogge
> 2255 Gemini Drive, Flagstaff, AZ 86001
> Cell: 928-606-1286; FAX: 928-556-7266
> mark_sogge@usgs.gov

>
>
>
> From:
> Mark K Sogge/DO/USGS/DOI
> To:
> Robert.Pavia@noaa.gov
> Date:
> 06/05/2010 02:27 PM
> Subject:
> Re: Brooks McCall analysis team - Paper for Review

>
> It looks like I misinterpreted the sentence on page 4: "The dissolved
> oxygen data derived from the R/V Brooks McCall cruises are relatively
> lower than WOA and WOD data particularly below 1000 m depth." I took
> that
> to mean that the levels are relatively lower than what would be
> expected
> under "normal" conditions, but perhaps "relatively lower" is not
> necessarily "significantly lower" (in a statistical sense).

> Mark

> Mark Sogge
> 2255 Gemini Drive, Flagstaff, AZ 86001
> Cell: 928-606-1286; FAX: 928-556-7266
> mark_sogge@usgs.gov

>
>
>
> From:
> Robert.Pavia@noaa.gov
> To:
> Mark K Sogge <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>
> Date:
> 06/05/2010 02:22 PM
> Subject:
> Re: Brooks McCall analysis team - Paper for Review

>
> Mark, thank you. Your summary is on except for the O2, it is not
> significantly lower "no evidence of large-scale changes in O2" is the
> quote I focus on. Bob

> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Mark K Sogge <mark_sogge@usgs.gov>

Fw Brooks McCall analysis team next phase - are you available to discuss
> Date: Saturday, June 5, 2010 12:09 pm
> Subject: Re: Brooks McCall analysis team - Paper for Review
> To: Robert.Pavia@noaa.gov

>
>> Hi Bob,
>>
>> You have all pulled together some really useful information in an
>> amazingly short time. Nice work!!
>>
>> I have no technical comments on the draft (given this is outside my
>> area
>> of expertise). As a general comment, I think the report reads as a
>> balanced evaluation of the situation. The major take-home points
>> that
>> I
>> got from it are:
>>
>> - there is clear evidence of the presence of substantial subsurface
>> oil
>> near the well, decreasing outward to about 10 km from the well
>> - temperature and salinity readings in the vicinity of the
>> subsurface
>> oil
>> are relatively normal
>> - oxygen level in the vicinity of the subsurface oil is
>> significantly
>>
>> lower than normal, but above levels that would be considered hypoxic
>> - these data do not imply anything about the ecological
>> consequences
>> of
>> the oil
>>
>> Am I interpreting the basics correctly?
>>
>> Mark
>>
>> Mark Sogge
>> 2255 Gemini Drive, Flagstaff, AZ 86001
>> Cell: 928-606-1286; FAX: 928-556-7266
>> mark_sogge@usgs.gov
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> From:
>> Robert.Pavia@noaa.gov
>> To:
>> Scott Cross <Scott.Cross@noaa.gov>, todd.brandi@epa.gov,
>> anne.walls@uk.bp.com, micah.reasnor@bp.com,
>> wainberg.Daniel@epamail.epa.gov, ldecker@asascience.com,
>> Jeff.Napp@noaa.gov, mark_sogge@usgs.gov, Rik.Wanninkhof@noaa.gov,
>> Sam.Walker@noaa.gov, Russ.Beard@noaa.gov, Benjamin.Shorr@noaa.gov,
>> Venosa.Albert@epa.gov, Jerry.Galt@noaa.gov, Rost.Parsons@noaa.gov,
>> Fred.Zeile@noaa.gov, Jim.Farr@noaa.gov
>> Cc:
>> Steve.Murawski@noaa.gov, William.Conner@noaa.gov
>> Date:
>> 06/05/2010 01:40 PM
>> Subject:

Fw Brooks McCall analysis team next phase - are you available to discuss
> > Brooks McCall analysis team - Paper for Review
> >
> >
> > I have revised the Friday draft report and it is ready for your
> > review. I
> > highlighted several bullets that changed significantly from the last
> >
> > version. There are changes throughout, so please check it closely.
> >
> > There is a new section on physical oceanography to describe the
> > physical
> > setting. Most significantly, we reexamined the TPH data and found a
> >
> > stronger, but not perfect correlation with the fluorometer data.
> > There
> > was
> > also an issue on some of the profile plots of bottle data, so those
> >
> > are
> > being redone.
> >
> > I greatly appreciate your assistance with this work. I look forward
> > to
> >
> > your comments, corrections, and improvements. Please use track
> > changes
> > in
> > your response.
> >
> > Bob
> >
> > p.s. EPA folks, please let us know if we missed anyone on your team.
> > [attachment "Analysis of Brooks McCall Sampling Data_v4.doc" deleted
> >
> > by
> > Mark K Sogge/DO/USGS/DOI]
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >