

A Summary of Discrepancies

- by BK Lim (first written on 10 Aug 2010, revised on 28 April 2011)

The first few obvious discrepancies to stick out like a sore thumb were the “2 major leaks on the riser” substitution for the real leaks on the seabed. These discrepancies were first raised in the forensic analysis of the Deepwater Horizon wreckage ([DWH blowout CSI: Why-it-could-not-have-happened-as-reported-by-BP](#)) in July 2010.

In figure 157-1, these discrepancies are illustrated diagrammatically. BP's official story on the leaks on the riser are given in figures 157-2 and 157-3. Till this day, none of the main stream media had ever questioned the flaws in BP's story of the two leaks on the riser. One year later, we again bring up the discrepancies to illustrate the physical impossibilities.

To refresh readers, BP claimed that the BOP was largely intact and still standing after the DWH sank on 22 April 2010. The 5,000ft riser was bent but still connected to the BOP at well A. BP claimed that all the oil spilled into the gulf came from two leaks on the riser. The first (1) were several punctures sustained on the riser when it bent as the DWH sank. The second (2) and bigger leak was the severed end of the “riser” 480 ft north of well A. Rov videos and images of the second leak were shown first in early May 2010. The first leak (1) on top of the BOP was only shown weeks later.

Discrepancy #1

It is obvious that the severed casing at 2 had not been bent, twisted and broken off during the sinking of the DWH. If it was, the casing could not have maintained its almost circular shape. It appears more likely to have been either cut or torn-off as in “blown apart”. This itself rules out the severed casing being the mid section of the riser since there would not be any reason for the riser to be blown apart anywhere in its mid section.

Discrepancy #2

The diameter of the casing at 2 is evidently much larger than the diameter of the bent riser at 1. They do not appear to look the same at all. The casing at 2 appears more likely to be part of the casing coming directly out of the seabed than being connected to the riser coming from the top of the BOP.

Discrepancy #3

Assuming BP's official version, how can the second leak (480 ft away from the BOP) have a large volume of oil/gas flow than the first leak (1) directly on top of the BOP? If the oil and gas were flowing out of the same riser pipe, should not the first leak be the larger of the two?

Discrepancy #4

Leak (1) is about 70 ft above the seabed. Could oil and gas flow downwards past the punctured bend at 1 to reach the second leak 480 ft away at seabed level? If some oil and gas did leak through (1), then leak 2 should be spewing less oil and gas than leak (1) – see discrepancy #3. But even BP admitted leak 2 to be the large of the two.

Discrepancy #5

Leak 2 appeared in all videos and images to spew more oil than gas and with more ferocity than leak (1). How can that be when all the pressure would have leaked out at (1)?

Discrepancy #6

Well A and the BOP was south of the second leak location. So if well A was the source, the oil and gas would have flowed northwards. But in all the rov videos, the casing was coming out of the seabed from the north with the oil and gas flowing southwards. So where is the connection?

There are many more discrepancies but the few that I have listed above should be enough to completely refute the official version of 2 leaks on the riser coming out of the BOP at well A.