

Global



Environmental Operations, Inc.

February 14, 2006

Mr. Steven Donziger
27 E. 92nd St.,
New York, NY, 10128

Dear Steve:

Subject: Cease and Desist

I believe that you might want to stop using that Remediation Cost Estimate from 2003. As you know, it was prepared in a very short time, with only a week of review time in the jungle, and heavily influenced by you in the writing..

As you will recall, and at your insistence, I deliberately chose the most expensive remedial options available and applicable to the work in Ecuador because you wanted a "large" number. At that time there were cheaper remediation techniques available, but they were unproven for those specific soils.

Since that report was issued, I have attended several technical conferences, both inside and outside the US and met individuals who have convinced me that alternative remedial techniques applicable to Ecuador are just as effective as those I proposed, and are far less costly. Some of the people I met at these conferences have worked on contamination in Ecuador, others have performed satisfactory remediation on crude materials similar to those found in Ecuador. This is hard evidence that I cannot ignore. They are using both phytoremediation and bioremediation, and it works well!

To date I have seen no data which would indicate that there is any significant surface or groundwater contamination caused by petroleum sources in Ecuador. Moreover, there was not, and is not any effort being made by the Plaintiff's in *Aguinda vs Texaco* to characterize the groundwater or the surface waters. As I recall, there was substantial opposition by Cristobal toward doing any work in this area because of the costs of the investigation. As the surface and groundwater cleanup represent a very large portion of the cost estimate, (over half), this further invalidates the 2003 cost estimate.

As such, it would cause me to state that the 2003 cost estimate is too high by a substantial margin, perhaps by a factor of ten, or more.

We settled our differences through the courts. I have washed my hands of the whole sorry affair. Let's leave it at that . I don't need to hear from you nor do I want to hear from you in any way now or in the future. I do not want to be re-engaged in any work in support of you or your lawsuit.

Now, I understand that you have prepared a request to the Securities and Exchange Commission demanding that they investigate Chevron under Sorbanes-Oxley for underreporting of their liabilities, and you are basing that upon the cost estimate I prepared in 2003. Again, that cost

4642 Warrior Trail, SW. Lilburn, GA, 30047
Phone: 770 923-4408; Fax: 770- 381-8004
e-mail: dlr@mindspring.com

**PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT
764**
11 Civ. 0691 (LAK)



estimate is no longer valid and if subpoenaed to testify, I will state that the costs are much lower based upon the knowledge available to me at the time I was released from the project.

I do not want to get into the courts in the US, and do not want to be involved in your case against Texaco/Chevron!

I have not prepared any other cost estimate, nor do I intend to do so. It is no longer any of my concern, except to see that the name of my company and my reputation are not abused by continued association with the Aguinda vs. Texaco lawsuit. If subpoenaed, I will tell the truth about what I know about the existing costs, how the cost estimate was prepared, and what the differences in unit costs might be to cleanup contamination in Ecuador .

I am trying to stay out of your way and out of your case, but by using and abusing the outdated cost estimate to flail Chevron, you keep dragging me back in to it! The Ecuador project has been a sorry chapter in my life and I do not want to get re-involved with you or it on any basis.

Several recent press releases using the 2003 cost estimate plus the most recent demand by Amazon Watch abuses me and my company.

Get a new cost estimate generated in Ecuador . You will have to do that under the terms of the Global Inspection as required by the Court in Ecuador. That 2003 cost estimate is a ticking time bomb which will come back to bite you, and very badly if anyone attempts due diligence on it.

Sincerely,

David L. Russell, PE

President, Global Environmental Operations, Inc.