

BP and the Government Are Underplaying the Difficulty of Stopping the Oil Leak

By [Washington's Blog](#)

Theme: [Environment](#)

Global Research, August 20, 2010

washingtonsblog.com 20 August 2010

While BP and the government say that permanently capping the oil well is no problem, they act like they have no idea what they're doing.

Indeed, Admiral Thad Allen is now saying "We're concerned about the vital signs of this well":

BP and the Government Are Underplaying the Difficulty of Stopping the Oil Leak While BP and the government say that permanently capping the oil well is no problem, they act like they have no idea what they're doing. Indeed, Admiral Thad Allen is now saying "We're concerned about the vital signs of this well": He's also saying that completion of relief well will be delayed until mid-September, at the earliest, and that the government is looking for problematic "material" in the well: What's really going on? Well, initially, if the well had structural integrity, there wouldn't be concern about the "vital signs" of the well, there wouldn't have been delay after delay in completing the relief wells, there wouldn't be never-ending rounds of new tests, there wouldn't have been an attempt to seal it (or perhaps more accurately, patch it) from the top using cement, there wouldn't be an attempt to remove "material" from the well. Indeed, what does "removing material" even mean?

Does that mean removing crumpled casing or drill pipe, or does it mean clearing out caved-in portions of the well and trying to rebuild those portions from scratch? Moreover, one of the world's top experts in oil drilling disasters - Dr. Robert Bea - told me yesterday that the geology underneath the seafloor at the leak site is fractured, and includes very loose salt formations. This geology may make it very hard to kill the well, even using relief wells, and he says that we may never be able to kill it. He also said that there are uncorroborated reports of additional leaks other than the main well, but that BP isn't sharing enough information to be able to assess whether or not that there are additional leaks. (Dr. Bea told me that BP is using a "cloak of silence", and is refusing to even show the government videos of what the seafloor looked like before the April explosion). So instead of simply trying to cap an existing well, it may be more accurate to think of this as trying to build a new well - or at least trying to duck tape the old one - so that it has enough integrity to be permanently stopped.

He's also saying that completion of relief well will be delayed until mid-September, at the earliest, and that the government is looking for problematic "material" in the well:

What's really going on?

Well, initially, if the well had structural integrity, there wouldn't be concern about the "vital

signs” of the well, there wouldn’t have been delay after delay in completing the relief wells, there wouldn’t be never-ending rounds of new tests, there wouldn’t have been an attempt to seal it (or perhaps more accurately, patch it) from the top using cement, there wouldn’t be an attempt to remove “material” from the well.

Indeed, what does “removing material” even mean? Does that mean removing crumpled casing or drill pipe, or does it mean clearing out caved-in portions of the well and trying to rebuild those portions from scratch?

Moreover, one of the world’s top experts in oil drilling disasters – Dr. Robert Bea – told me yesterday that the geology underneath the seafloor at the leak site is fractured, and includes very loose salt formations. This geology may make it very hard to kill the well, even using relief wells, and he says that we may never be able to kill it. He also said that there are uncorroborated reports of additional leaks other than the main well, but that BP isn’t sharing enough information to be able to assess whether or not that there are additional leaks. (Dr. Bea told me that BP is using a “cloak of silence”, and is refusing to even show the government videos of what the seafloor looked like before the April explosion).

So instead of simply trying to cap an existing well, it may be more accurate to think of this as trying to build a new well – or at least trying to duck tape the old one – so that it has enough integrity to be permanently stopped.

The original source of this article is washingtomblog.com
Copyright © Washington's Blog, washingtomblog.com, 2010

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Washington's Blog](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca