Welcome to TimesPeople Get Started



6:25 AM

Recommend

- Get Home Delivery-Bay Area
- Welcome, <u>75200</u>
- Log Out
- Help
- Home Page
- Today's Paper
- Video
- Most Popular
- <u>Times Topics</u>

Search All NYTimes.com

Go

The New York Times

Thursday, June 3, 2010

Environment

- World
- <u>U.S.</u>
- N.Y. / Region
- Business
- Technology
- Science
- <u>Health</u>
- Sports
- Opinion
- Arts
- Style
- Travel
- Jobs
- Real Estate
- Autos
- Environment
- Space & Cosmos



The Orange Savings Account™

- Join 8 million other Super Savers
- Make a small deposit to get started





Green

A Blog About Energy and the Environment

June 2, 2010, 12:47 pm

More Dispersant? Asking Hard Questions

By LESLIE KAUFMAN



In announcing on Saturday that BP would end efforts to plug the gulf oil leak through a "top kill" and focus instead on capturing oil until a relief well is in place, Rear Adm. Mary Landry of the Coast Guard said that the use of dispersants would inevitably continue.

The reasons are presumably two-fold: something is needed to break down the oil as it comes gushing out of the newly cut riser pipe before a "top hat" can be placed over it, and even if the top hat works (a big leap, to be sure) oil will still leak from the pipe.



Reuters A plane sprays dispersant over the oil leaked from the Deepwater Horizon

wellhead in the Gulf of Mexico.

The use of dispersants, however, remains controversial on numerous fronts. The Environmental Protection Agency has already asked BP to find a less toxic alternative to Corexit, the dispersant that it is currently using in the gulf. But have the E.P.A. and BP proved that a dispersant is necessary at all?

Rick Steiner, a marine biologist and a veteran of the 1989 Exxon Valdez oil spill, suggests not. He explains why:

"I have been trying for some time now to get any data on the size of the oil droplets exiting the blowout before and during dispersant use," he writes. "After considerable badgering by me, E.P.A. finally provided droplet size data during/after dispersant use" — a range of 2.5 to 60 microns, he said.

Yet there are no data on how big the oil droplets at the spill site were before BP began applying Corexit, Mr. Steiner said. So how, he asks, is one to determine the impact of the dispersant?

"The physics of these high-pressure blowouts predicts that the droplet size will be quite small anyway, even without the use of toxic dispersants," he said. "Thus it is questionable as to why they are adding dispersant without even knowing the effect."

"It may be a violation of federal law to approve this activity without having this understanding," he added.

- E-mail This
- Print
- Share Close
 - o Linkedin
 - o Digg
 - o Facebook
 - o Mixx
 - o My Space
 - Yahoo! Buzz
 - o Permalink

0

Twitter

• Sign in to Recommend

Business, Science, bp, Coast Guard, Corexit, Deepwater Horizon accident, dispersant, Exxon Valdez, Gulf of Mexico, oil industry, oil spill, pollution

Related Posts

From Green

- If You Build It ...
- A Looming Shortage of Oil Boom?
- Burning the Oil Off? Weather Is the Hitch
- Roaming Oil Blob: You're the Host
- A Proliferation of Plumes?

From Around the Web

• Issues in Scholarly Communication - Georgia State University Lib

Oil Dispersants and BP

AlterNet

Fisherman Who Fell Ill During Oil Spill Clean-up Alleges BP Tried to Cover-up Evidence

• Think Progress

Fisherman who fell ill during oil spill clean-up alleges BP tried to cover-up evidence.

What's This?

Powered by **Blogrunner**

Previous post Grid Confronts a Threat from Mother Nature 15

Next post Katrina and Climate: Case Dismissed?

Post a Comment »

Readers' Comments

- All Comments
 - Highlights
 - Readers' Recommendations
 - Replies
 - Oldest
 - Newest

1.

Expat

Mexico

June 2nd, 2010

12:01 pm

This is a classic case of layering mistake upon mistake when being driven by the political compulsion to DO SOMETHING, DO ANYTHING that will make it look like we're in control. Sometimes doing nothing---except stopping the gusher, of course---makes more sense. Especially when we don't know the consequences. And lack of reasonable foresight---isn't that what started this whole mess?

Recommended by 2 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

<u>2</u>.

Technic Ally Toronto June 2nd, 2010

12:01 pm

Whoops?

Use Corexit for your bad spills.

Recommended by 1 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

3.

yoandel

Boston, MA

June 2nd, 2010

12:01 pm

We also do not have, on day 43, an accurate measurement of the flow of oil by using in situ techniques for volcanic vents... Do we have pressure readings that show if the oil pressure is diminishing since the spill began? Do we even have a measurement indicating how much of the oil is natural gas?

Wouldn't it be indispensable to know the flow of oil to see if it will be possible to attach a new pipe after the latest drill cut? Or will the flow just push the new pipe off to the side?

And, what is the state of the rock surrounding the blow out preventer? We have heard some talk about problems there...

The technical circumstances of the situation are as murky as when the spill began... this is really unacceptable and so it is how the White House has allowed BP to ignore the EPA's own decisions on a less dangerous

dispersant.

Recommended by 2 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

<u>4</u>. T

Columbia, SC June 2nd, 2010

12:04 pm

"The dispersant is a toxic pollutant that has been applied in the volume of millions of gallons and I think has greatly exacerbated the situation. I think the whole idea of using a dispersant is wrong, and I think it's part of the whole pattern of BP trying to cover up and hide the body. They don't want us to see how much oil, so they've taken this oil that was concentrated at the surface and dissolved it. But when you dissolve it, it's still there, and it actually gets more toxic, because instead of being in big blobs, it's now dissolved and can get across the gills, get into the mouths of animals. The water below the floating oil was water. Now it's this toxic soup. So I think that in this whole pattern of BP trying to not let people know what's going on, the idea of disperse the oil is a way of just hiding the body. But it actually makes the oil more toxic, and it adds this incredible amount of toxic pollutant in the dispersant itself."

Carl Safina, president of Blue Ocean Institute and author of many books about marine ecology

Recommended by 5 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

<u>5</u>.

CL

seattle

June 2nd, 2010

12:04 pm

Thank you for bring attention to this issue -- I worry that it is not getting enough attention in the press. As several scientists have pointed out, the dispersants may be causing more environmental damage than the actual oil, both due to direct and indirect action, as it contributes to the formation of emulsions.

It makes me very uneasy that BP has been so determined to continue use of the dispersants, and that the EPA's order that they reduce the amounts was defied. Why should it be so easy for them to say 'no' to the EPA's commands???

Recommended by 5 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

6.

rockman

northern hemisphere

June 2nd, 2010

1:07 pm

i am of the same opinion of others that this argument is over a corpse, the gulf may be dead and the culprit might turn out to these dispersants that nobody knows completely what the true effects are. the oil might be a decade long inconvenience but what if that noxious corexit kills the bottom of the food chain. what then hillbilly? better hope obama the socialist shows up and freezes all of bp's american assets before the republicans leave you with nothing but dirty shorts and a handful of empty dreams.

Recommended by 2 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

<u>7</u>.

Shannon Ferguson

Washington, DC

June 2nd, 2010

1:18 pm

Why did the US government tell the PEMEX oil company to stop using Corexit on our side of the Gulf during

the last big Gulf oil well blowout (Ixtoc1, off Campeche)? http://www.incidentnews.gov/incident/6250 PEMEX later refused to pay our clean-up costs.

I visited Campeche last year, over thirty years later. Its beaches and coastline are still almost lifeless, except for "grumos" (tar balls). And good luck finding a "marisqueria" seafood restaurant.

Recommended by 1 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

<u>8</u>.

Ed

Lowell Oregon

June 2nd, 2010

1:35 pm

Corexit is way more toxic than oil folks. Look it up.

If it gets into the rainwater through osmosis - watch out - end result could be way worse than an oil slime on you. To work with corexit you put on hazardous material protection gear.

Ever dealt with raw dishwasher soap? Corexit is very similar. Would you want a liquid form falling on your children?

That is why the EPA told them to stop using it.

It is toxic for 28 days or so. This madness should be stopped at once before someone gets hurt.

Recommended by 1 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

<u>9</u>.

John Lane

Phila Pa

June 2nd, 2010

2:07 pm

Wouldn't it be much easier to collect the oil in order to scoop it up or burn it if it is not dispersed but just allowed to rise to the surface?

Recommended by 0 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

<u>10</u>.

Judy

New York

June 2nd, 2010

2:07 pm

Isn't correxit basically deodorized kerosene? And its quite toxic. It will make the oil in the water harder to notice. Children will end up swimming in it and the kerosene makes it more likely that the toxins will be absorbed through the skin.

Recommended by 0 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

11.

Judy

New York

June 2nd, 2010

2:07 pm

Correxit makes the petroleum harder to spot and more carcinogenic.

Recommended by 0 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

12.

Ed Lowell Oregon June 2nd, 2010 4:51 pm From Corexit's website

Composition

- Examples of everyday products with specific ingredients in common with COREXIT 9500 include:
- One ingredient is used as a wetting agent in dry gelatin, beverage mixtures, and fruit juice drinks.
- A second ingredient is used in a brand-name dry skin cream and also in a body shampoo.
- A third ingredient is found in a popular brand of baby bath liquid.
- A fourth ingredient is found extensively in cosmetics and is also used as a surface-active agent and emulsifier for agents used in food contact.
- A fifth ingredient is used by a major supplier of brand name household cleaning products for "soap scum" removal.
- A sixth ingredient is used in hand creams and lotions, odorless paints and stain blockers.

Notice how no ingredients are named. Instead we get vague references to things like "odorless paints", "stain blockers", "soap scum removal".

Realize the absurdity of this description folks. A chemical is not it's parts but the sum of its parts. I could give you a very benign description of dynamite or nitroglycerin. The individual ingredients are nothing to be concerned with for either of those. Or a terrorist could say the bomb was simple "ingredients used in harmless fertilizer".

Here is my favorite quote "common household dish soap as has a substantially higher rainbow trout toxicity than COREXIT 9527. Put another way, COREXIT 9527 is more than 7 times safer than dish soap"

Put yet another even clearer way "Corexit kills fish"

Recommended by 1 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

13.

S.C.

New Orleans, LA

June 2nd, 2010

10:59 pm

Would it be pragmatic to use larger diameter segments to build something like (a) chimney(s) for the spilled oil to rise in? A short-height large-diameter base would be anchored and sealed to the sea floor around the spill site. One hundred 50-foot lengths connected and stacked one atop another could bring the oil to the surface in a controlled manner.

As each segment is dropped to the depth at which it would be joined to the stack, pressure would be equalized inside and out. Because the stack would be open and large in diameter, buoyant methane hydrate crystals would not collect at the top to clog the stack. Once the stack reaches the surface, it could be connected to a reservoir, from which pumping vessels could remove the spilled oil (like a birdbath).

What I suggest is likely too simple, but I have to suggest it. Thanks for reading this far, and if you know why this might or might not work, please comment.

Recommended by 0 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

14

F. Murray Rumpelstiltskin

Judy, Kentucky

June 3rd, 2010 4:49 am About #12 "rainbow trout toxicity"

Rainbow trout:Threats and conservation http://en.wikipedia.org...

Rainbow trout, and subspecies thereof, are currently EPA approved indicator species for acute fresh water toxicity testing.

Recommended By 0 Readers Report as Inappropriate 15.

BrianJDonovan

Tampa, FL

June 3rd, 2010

4:50 am

Pursuant to NCP Section 300.310, "As appropriate, actions shall be taken to recover the oil or mitigate its effects. Of the numerous chemical or physical methods that may be used, the chosen methods shall be the most consistent with protecting public health and welfare and the environment. Sinking agents shall not be used." Sinking agents means those additives applied to oil discharges to sink floating pollutants below the water surface. The question is whether BP's dispersants are "sinking agents" when they are applied a mile underwater at the source of the well leak.

For a more complete discussion of BP oil spill issues, visit:

http://renergie.wordpress.com...

Recommended by 0 Readers

Report as Inappropriate

Post a Comment Suggest a Correction to This Blog Post »

You are currently logged in as 75200.

Display Name (What's this) Rosalind Peterson
Location USA
Send me a link to my published comment at info@californiaskywatch.com (Change e-mail)
Characters Remaining: 5000
Comment (Required)
Submit

Comments are moderated and generally will be posted if they are on-topic and not abusive. For more information, please see our Comments FAQ.

Ads by Google what's this?

Helping w/ the Oil Spill?

Carhartt Clothing Can Help! Durable, Premium Quality Workwear.

www.Carhartt.com

Search This Blog



Previous post <u>Grid Confronts a Threat from Mother Nature</u> <u>Advertise on NYTimes.com</u>

Next post Katrina and Climate: Case Dismissed?





About Green

How are climate change, scarcer resources, population growth and other challenges reshaping society? From science to business to politics to living, our reporters track the high-stakes pursuit of a greener globe in a dialogue with experts and readers.

• Read more about the blog » | Follow Green on Twitter

Topics



Science

Forests, oceans, air, species, land use and the climate debate.

• More in Green Science »



Business

Renewable and conventional energy, markets and green technology.

• More in Green Business »



Politics

Legislation, lobbying, policy debates, regulation and international diplomacy.

• More in Green Politics »



Living

Lifestyle changes and environmentally pitched products and services.

• More in Green Living »

TIPS & SUGGESTIONS

Talk to Green

Got a tip on breaking green news, or a suggestion for areas of coverage? Email us at greenblog@nytimes.com.

Q & A

Green Interviews

Chatting with scientists, policy experts and activists about environmental issues.

• More Green Q & A Interviews »

Archive

Select Month

Recent Posts

- City Tightens Rules on Artificial Turf
- Roaming Oil Blob: You're the Host
- Katrina and Climate: Case Dismissed?
- More Dispersant? Asking Hard Questions
- Grid Confronts a Threat from Mother Nature

Blogroll

Blogs

- AutoBlog Green
- Blue Marble Blog
- Bright Green Blog, Christian Science Monitor
- Coal Tattoo
- Conscious Consuming
- Cool Green Science, The Nature Conservancy
- Dominion Energy's E-Conserve Blog
- Environmental Economics
- Forrest for the Trees
- gGadget.org
- GoodCleanTech
- Green Business
- Green Energy Reporter
- Green Trust Sustainability
- Groovy Green
- Joel Makower

- Livable Future Blog
- Los Angeles Times: Greenspace
- MapAWatt Blog
- Sustainablog
- The Goat
- The Inspired Economist
- The Oil Drum
- The Vine
- Wall Street Journal: Environmental Capital
- World Changing

Consumers

- Climate Ark
- Green-e
- Greener Choices
- Grist
- Jamble Magazine
- MetroGreen+Business
- National Geographic Green Guide
- Solar Buzz
- The Daily Green
- Treehugger

Institutions

- DOE: Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy
- Energy Star
- European and Chicago Climate Exchanges
- European Commission Directorate General for Environment
- European Federation for Transport and Environment
- International Energy Agency
- National Renewable Energy Laboratory
- United Nations Environment Program
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
- US Department of Energy
- World Meteorlogical Association

Jobs

- Bright Green Talent
- Clean Edge Jobs
- CleanTechies
- CleanTechRecruits.com
- EcoEmploy
- Green Career Central
- Green Dream Jobs
- GreenCareers from Monster
- GreenJobs from Treehugger
- Grist Jobs

• Renewable Energy Jobs

News Sources

- Alternative Energy Investments
- Alternative Energy News
- BBC News: Global Climate Change
- Clean Edge, Inc.
- Climate Biz
- Climate Change News Digest
- CNet: Green Tech
- Consumer Reports: Greener Choices
- Environmental News Network
- Green Business News
- Green: From the Washington Post
- GreenBiz.com
- Greentech Media
- Greenwire
- Grist
- High Country News
- Point Carbon
- Renewable Energy World
- The Environment Report
- Yale Environment 360

Organizations

- American Society of Landscape Architects
- American Wind Energy Association
- Association for the Study of Peak Oil
- Carbon Disclosure Project
- Climate Matters @Columbia
- Environmental Defense
- Friends of the Earth
- Independent Energy Producers Association
- Interstate Renewable Energy Council
- Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future
- National Biodiesel Board
- Rocky Mountain Institute
- Solar Energy Industries Association
- Sustainable Buildings Industry Council
- The Pew Center on Global Climate Change
- The Post Carbon Institute
- United States Energy Association

TicketWatch - Theater Offers by E-Mail



Sign up for ticket offers from Broadway shows and other advertisers. See Sample info@californiaskywatch.com Sign Up

Change E-mail Address | Privacy Policy

Subscribe

• Green RSS

Ads by Google what's this?

Spring Sale on Home Solar

Get 40% Off a Solar Panel System! SolarCity Discount + Gov't Rebates.

www.SolarCity.com/GetMoreSolarInfo

Home

- World
- <u>U.S.</u>
- N.Y. / Region
- Business
- <u>Technology</u>
- Science
- Health
- Sports
- Opinion
- Arts
- <u>Style</u>
- <u>Travel</u>
- Jobs
- Real Estate
- Autos
- Back to Top

Copyright 2010 The New York Times Company

- Privacy
- Terms of Service
- Search
- Corrections
- RSS
- First Look
- Help
- Contact Us
- Work for Us
- Advertise
- Site Map