Transcript of March 4, 2007

Interview with Richard Kamp

(Video Files: CRS196-3, CRS 196-4, CRS 196-5)

CRS196-03
August 13, 2010
Transcript by TransPerfect

INTERVIEWER: Whom do you work for?

DICK KAMP: I'm the director of E-Tech International which is a relatively new non-profit and we work in developing countries or in communities in poor countries that need technical support to more or less level the playing field when they are facing either new or old development projects. It could be oil or gas, could be mining, could be some horrible factory that has been in existence for 50 years or a new proposed manufacturing plant. It could be many many things in many places.

INTERVIEWER: And how did you get involved in this particular case?

DICK KAMP: We came down in January of 2006 when one of our members Bill Powers was doing some work for Steven on the Texaco project and Ann [PH] Maest and I spent about 5 or 6 days here at that time just kind of scoping out what was going on and discussing with Steven and with San Selva Madre the whole issue of what technical data they had, what they might need, what would make the case stronger and then we decided to join up with the case.

INTERVIEWER: So can you describe what E-Tech's role is in the case?

DICK KAMP: Well, our role to date has been to largely to provide support to an Ecuadorian technical and legal team and try and quality control, kind of raise the ante on how work is done here. Our work at this stage obviously is going to have to do with the final arguments for the peritaje global and trying to figure out the most maximum, well the most intensely usable information that can be generated in a very short period of time that doesn't exist yet. In that sense, what we've been doing for the past day and what we will be doing for the next couple of days is to find that and try to set about a work plan with both the Ecuadorian team and with Steven.

INTERVIEWER: Can you describe to me the nature of the work and the things that you are going to be investigating? I mean do you go out into the field and take samples?

DICK KAMP: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Could you describe that to me?

DICK KAMP: I think what we are anticipating in doing is figuring out with Luis Villacrista, the current perito, the current professional consultant that's going to be working with the team, how we can best work with him and with an Ecuadorian team to minimize our time in the field but we'd be in the field particularly in those sites where we are trying to characterize what really isn't known. Which is to what degree has this mess saturated ground water? What's the extent of the contamination? What are the pathways? Where is it going? Also who's affected? But given the short period of time I think the most important aspect that we can contribute to first is getting the information that will define the remediation strategy and then you are going to have a million choices. If the ground water is contaminated so and so many hundreds of meters from a pit, how

far are you going to go to clean it up? At what point do you actually clean up the environment or at what point do you substitute? "Mitigate" by substituting potable water whether it's coming through the surface or coming out of a well. So there's really three things we are trying to do right now. One's, take everything that's been done and work with the team that's in the office and get it as coherent and as strong as we can. Work like hell with the Ecuadorian technical team. And with Tania, the woman who has been hired to put together images so people can understand it. So the judge who's got say the technical background that I have which isn't all that fantastic can understand this, it's comprehensible. This is what the pollution is. This is what it's [INDISCERNIBLE]. This is what we've found so far. And then figure out what hasn't been covered. That's kind of what you call scoping the base line data. Then the second phase of working in the field, hopefully by Monday night we'll have worked out a plan. We'll have figured out how much we need to be out there with the Ecuadorian team. We are going to focus real hard on making sure this laboratory is really good. We always presume that all laboratories suck. It's easy enough to get materials if you send them to a laboratory and demonstrate that same material was sent to 10 other labs or 20 other labs in the United States, it shows the same results in Ecuador. If not we'll take samples to the US. All of this links back and forth to remediation. What it is that can be done in remediation, what it is that you can do, and we're just talking remediation in the dumbest terms, which is clean up surrounding the pit.

[05:00]

That's what we'll try and figure out. If they're lucky and all this works out we'll try and do all this in 60 to 90 days. We'll also try and help with other really important issues. Find people who can come in and help if not us figure out what the natural resource damage has been and how it's once you start damaging the damage gets worse and worse and worse and you loose the resources that were there. So we'll try and find people to do that. We'll certainly work with everybody who's doing remediation and provide all the help we can. We'll give as much positive criticism. We are anxious to see this happen, we're anxious to provide whatever expertise we have or to find expertise that we don't have which is what we've been trying to do. So that's our role, you know, now that everything is hitting the fan.

INTERVIEWER: When you were saying earlier that you deal with mining and polluting factories and all kinds of things like that, how does this particular situation compare to some of the other cases that you've worked on, other things that you've seen in terms of just global pollution?

DICK KAMP: First of all what's at stake is monstrously huge. If you get an oil company to admit that they have to pay for damages for what they've done, it's amazing that nobody has ever been hit up before. And it's amazing to me coming into legal, coming into litigation over, with a giant oil company that they haven't said we'll settle without admitting guilt. Here's a billion to start and we'll keep pumping more into this and we're going to hype this in National Geographic and the New York Times. Since they are not doing it the significance is that there's a huge area. This may be the worst; a

number of people said it's the worst they've seen. We've worked at a distance in Nigeria. I don't think anybody really knows how bad Nigeria is, but whatever, this is a disaster area in terms of scope. How it compares with mining is an interesting question because mining tends to have a single sight that can be absolutely destroyed in a hideous manner. In some ways in a much larger scale but on a point specific - site specific scale that's bigger than these pits are, obviously. And then it can have subsequent damage where it destroys a river or poisons a bunch of people but you don't have mines that are spread out over 4,000 square miles or whatever the area that's actually being dealt with and there's many other areas. This is also an important, incredibly important message for the Amazon but there you are getting more into the speculation that you can put down as propaganda. From a technical point of view oil-gas projects are potentially far worse. This is the worst thing we are dealing with. But we are working on other similar areas. Bill Powers has been working with the Achuar, the indigenous people, who've been struggling with the successors to Occidental in the northern part of Peru. That's very similar, very similar type of a problem. I think what's happened is, the focus on this has been intense. Hopefully the characterization and the damages on this can be addressed. I don't know how much worse this is than some of the others places that are like it where oil was done in the rainforest. The Amazon itself is at…particularly Peru's actions over the past month or two where they've given up like eleven concessions, retracted three where there's indigenous people living all along the Amazon and the whole Amazon is up for bid. The risk if huge since whether or not everybody in the country is poor those people that are managing these resources are putting a lot up for bid. It's incredibly important for all the reasons that you've heard many times before. In terms of the scale of it I think these oil projects in terms of the impacts on water, on damages on ecology are huge. I've worked on copper smelter issues where people suffered for 60-70 miles and couldn't breathe. Your apples and oranges of what's screwed up in the world are pretty great. You can probably pick many fruits.

INTERVIEWER: You guys basically have 60 to 90 days is my understanding of the amount of time that you have to essentially go in to….

DICK KAMP: Pablo's definition was 60 days to get the work done. It could overlap beyond that but his schedule seems absolutely on target to me. If they've got 120 work days from whenever the gun sounds and they are certainly hoping that the starting gun is going to sound real quick then yes that's how much time we'll have to do the field work

[10:00]

and we might have 90 days to complete what we're doing and put it in a coherent form, and…

CRS196-4
August 13, 2010
Transcript by TransPerfect

INTERVIEWER: So in that 120 work day period could you just tell me specifically what is it that E-Tech is going to be doing, or what you hope to be doing?

DICK KAMP: Well I think we'll be working on trying to synthesize as quickly as possible, you know, presuming everybody wants to go ahead and we're on the pay roll such as it is. First thing would be that we would be trying to synthesize all the information that's in the office already and work with the existing peritos with the existing consultants and do several things. But the goal of the several things is to figure out which sites are the highest priority sites based on the criteria of being Texaco-only sites, based on the degree of pollution, the visual guesses on the extent of pollution and these people have been in the field for a long time. You guys probably have something to offer just from the time you've been in the field as to what you think are usable sites. We are trying to figure out what on a common sense basis and what based on the old reports before remediation, the reports that Texaco had published after remediation and all the fieldwork so far. Which one should we be picking out and why? Ideally we would like to get that done in two to three, maybe a couple of weeks. I don't know how quickly it will go but hopefully working cooperatively and working at a distance and figuring out ways to do this electronically or, if necessary, by courier. We can do this jointly with everybody who is already there. Pablo and Steven can make their decisions but I mean this is what it's going to boil down to. Second thing we're going to do concurrently, parallel to this, is we're going to figure out what lab to use by the methods I was saying before. We are going to send materials to the labs. We are going to lab here, see what the analytical results are and we'll figure out which is the best laboratory to use. Then after that hopefully we'll play kind of a long distance auditing role trusting that two things will help us ensure that the data is good. The regular perito team that's there I think will be doing the filling-in-the-holes monitoring. By going out there and finding those spots that still need to be checked out. We're going to focus on getting out and doing the intensive monitoring and having people out in the field. If not for all of it for enough of it that we're sure that everybody is on the same page: How to work, how to monitor, get some ground water samples, begin to get an idea of the extent of pollution. We are going to put all this into a coherent report. That report will be an appendix to the whole big report. It will be summarized. God knows in four pages? Who knows? Peritaje global. And we'll try and get it in a coherent form. But we are going to try and ensure the information particularly on trying to figure out the extent of the sites is as good as it can. And we'll work in the same period of time with the remediation specialists to see who we can suggest to help review it or add their expertise to it. Try and fill it out so that the obvious questions that anybody would ask or would come at a cross-examination – how are you going to remediate? What's going to happen here? How much ground water are you going to do? How are you going to provide potable water? – that we've gone pretty far on answering those questions therefore along with figuring out natural resource damage from the past, which I don't think, I don't know, maybe we'll pass the check to somebody else to do it. We are not going to do it ourselves. That's kind of it. That's a lot to get done in a very, very short period of time. We think we can do it if we just kind of keep a handle on it. That's the hardest thing to do anywhere in Latin America.

INTERVIEWER: One last question. Based on what you've seen so far, [INDISCERNIBLE] studies in Latin America, is it possible to clean this up?

DICK KAMP: It's a damn good question. I mean I think the question is…you start out with, here's a pit. We are going to clean the pit. And you got to define exactly how you are going to do that. I think in general if you come up with a strategic plan that's been outlined by….

CRS196-5
August 13, 2010
Transcript by TransPerfect

DICK KAMP: The remediation stuff?

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, it's possible.

DICK KAMP: I think what you are asking whether it's possible to clean up the mess? The real answer is 'no, it's not possible to clean up the whole mess.' The question is what extent of the mess are you going to clean up? And can you, you know you start with the pits, you can clean the soil, you can get it back. Your ground water is contaminated. How much? How far? We know that Texaco is wrong, Chevron is wrong. It's definitely some ground water contaminated. There's discharges that go right into water ways. How far are you going to carry this? And then, that's, how much we can characterize that I don't know? I think we are going to find experts who've worked in other similar areas to tell us how far they've gone before and how much has been a write off after a certain point. They destroyed this area. It's done. And what the price tag is on however much you can clean or can't clean I don't know. You can clean ground water. You can pump, you can strip and clean and you can release polluted water. You don't have to put it all on injection wells. You can add clean water to the environment. But basically what it comes out to is you got a bunch of technical options that are expensive. Exactly what the price tag is I don't know. How far it will get cleaned will be the ultimately settlement if there is a settlement. If this works out. And if Chevron takes the responsibility that they obviously should be. It's a definition of how much the judge determines is going to be cleaned versus how much people will get water to bathe in, to drink, to avoid disease, as a result of the contamination that there is.

INTERVIEWER: [INDISCERNABLE]

DICK KAMP: Okay.

INTERVIEWER: Thanks, man.