

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF TEXT PRESENTED BY THE ATTORNEY MR. FAJARDO AND THAT OF THE COURT-APPOINTED EXPERT MR. CABRERA

Submittal date of the corresponding report	Text submitted to the Court of Nueva Loja by attorney Fajardo in his pronouncement to the Expert Evaluation report of March 24, 2008, submitted by the Expert Richard Cabrera Vega	Responses of the expert Richard Cabrera Vega, to the questions and comments formulated by the Plaintiffs attorney Mr. Fajardo	Costs associated with each response
September 16, 2008		November 2008	
Answer to Question 14 (Fajardo p. 106-107 of 118; Cabrera p. 17 of 51)	<p>The 1000 ppm level of TPH is not only far from being a [level for] complete environmental restoration, but it is also a level or standard [that is] much higher than [in] many other places around the world. Appendix D from the Expert Evaluation [report] of Mr. Cabrera himself, shows that the Ecuadorian norm of 1000 ppm TPH is higher than many other standards (Appendix D, Table 5). As indicated by Mr. Cabrera of the 13 values that were presented for the states in the United States, 10 were less than or equal to 500 ppm, and 6 were less than or equal to 100 ppm (Appendix D, Table 5). The Expert Evaluation [report] also emphasizes that the "Project for Elimination of pits in the Amazonian District", or PEPDA, has set a value less than 1000 ppm of TPH as an indicator of complete remediation (Summary, p. 14). According to PEPDA, the standard of 1000 ppm of TPH from Decree 1215 of Ecuadorian standards for sensitive ecosystems is equivalent to only 70% of total environmental quality (Summary, p. 14).</p> <p>As a result, even PEPDA acknowledges that the level of 1000 ppm of TPH was not appropriate and that it is far from complete environmental restoration.</p> <p>Therefore, the level for the cleanup of soils in the concession area should be well below the [limit of] 1000 ppm TPH. We recognize that, in some cases and certain types of soils, the analytical method used by the Plaintiffs' experts to measure the TPH in soil can give values higher than zero in uncontaminated natural lands; nevertheless, those values are lower than 100 ppm TPH. With this in mind, we believe that 100 ppm TPH is a far better cleanup level and it will achieve an environmental restoration much closer to the previous conditions before the damage caused by Texaco ...</p>	<p>The "Project for Elimination of pits in the Amazonian District", or PEPDA, has set a value less than 100 ppm of TPH as an indicator of environmental assessment.</p> <p>Therefore I will use the level of 100 PPM TPH for the pit cleanup value. I believe that 100 ppm TPH is a better cleanup level and it will achieve an environmental restoration much closer to the previous conditions before the damage caused by Texaco, as ordered by the Court. What follows is a revaluation of the costs for the pit cleanup using the cleanup level of 100 ppm TPH.</p>	\$2,743,000,000

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF TEXT PRESENTED BY THE ATTORNEY MR. FAJARDO AND THAT OF THE COURT-APPOINTED EXPERT MR. CABRERA

Submittal date of the corresponding report	Text submitted to the Court of Nueva Loja by attorney Fajardo in his pronouncement to the Expert Evaluation report of March 24, 2008, submitted by the Expert Richard Cabrera Vega	Responses of the expert Richard Cabrera Vega, to the questions and comments formulated by the Plaintiffs attorney Mr. Fajardo	Costs associated with each response
	September 16, 2008	November 2008	
<p>Answer to Question 14 (continued) (Fajardo p. 107 of 118; Cabrera p. 17 of 51)</p>	<p>The data included in the tables of Appendix H of the Expert Evaluation [report] indicate that 164 of 169 pits (or 97%) from oil well sites at which judicial inspections were conducted and Expert Evaluation was done had TPH concentrations above 100 ppm. Therefore, 803 of 828 pits from oil wells and 100% of the 88 pits from the stations must be remediated or must be re-remediated to a level that at least does not represent a risk to life. Tables 1 and 2 of numeral 6.7.6 revised, present a new calculation of the area and the volume of the soil that must be remediated with a cleanup level of 100 ppm. This calculation assumes that the average depth of excavated soil is 5 m. instead of 4 m, the latter measurement being the one that the Expert [Mr. Cabrera] used for the cleanup of 1000 ppm TPH. A thorough cleanup of soil must necessarily go deeper than a cleanup of [of soil] to 1000 ppm TPH.</p>	<p>Of 169 pits, 97% (or 164) located in oil wells where judicial inspections were conducted and that I examined, TPH concentrations above 100 ppm were detected. Therefore, 803 of 828 pits from oil wells and the totality of the 88 pits from the stations must be remediated. Tables 1 revised and 2 revised present my new calculation of the area and the volume of the soil that must be remediated with a cleanup level of 100 ppm. This calculation assumes that the average depth of excavated soil is 5 m. instead of 4 m, the latter measurement being the one that I used for the cleanup of 1000 ppm TPH. A thorough cleanup of soil must necessarily go deeper than a cleanup [of soil] to 1000 ppm TPH.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">\$2,743,000,000</p>

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF TEXT PRESENTED BY THE ATTORNEY MR. FAJARDO AND THAT OF THE COURT-APPOINTED EXPERT MR. CABRERA

Submittal date of the corresponding report	Text submitted to the Court of Nueva Loja by attorney Fajardo in his pronouncement to the Expert Evaluation report of March 24, 2008, submitted by the Expert Richard Cabrera Vega	Responses of the expert Richard Cabrera Vega, to the questions and comments formulated by the Plaintiffs attorney Mr. Fajardo	Costs associated with each response																																							
September 16, 2008	November 2008	<p>As described <i>in Appendix N</i> of Mr. Cabrera's report, 80% of the pits from the oil well sites contained soils with concentrations of TPH above 1000 ppm (p 2). However, data from the tables in Appendix H indicate that over 80% of the pits have TPH concentrations above 1000 ppm. One hundred fifty of 169 pits (or 89%) located at oil well sites that were inspected judicially, and that later were the subject of the Expert Evaluation, revealed TPH concentrations above 1000 ppm. Therefore, if the cleanup level is 1000 ppm TPH, 737 of the 828 pits from the oil wells must be remediated, instead of the 662 pits stated in Appendix N (p 2). The original table 1 shows the original calculation, and corrected table 1 shows the calculation that uses the correct assumption that 89% of the pits constructed by Texpet must be cleaned up to a level of 1000 ppm TPH.</p>	<p><i>In Appendix N</i> (p 2) I assumed that 80% of the pits from the oil well sites contained soils with concentrations of TPH above 1000 ppm. However, data from the tables in Appendix H indicate that over 80% of the pits have TPH concentrations above 1000 ppm. One hundred fifty of 169 pits (or 89%) at oil well sites that received judicial inspections and I evaluated had TPH concentrations above 1000 ppm. Therefore I used 89% for my calculations. Therefore, if the cleanup level is 1000 ppm TPH, 737 of the 828 pits from the oil wells must be remediated, instead of 662 pits. Corrected table 1 shows my calculation that uses the correct assumption that 89% of the pits constructed by Texaco must be cleaned up to a level of 1000 ppm TPH.</p>	<p>Answer to Question 15 (Fajardo p. 80-84 of 118; Cabrera p. 18-19 of 51)</p>	<p>Corrected Table 1: Areas of soils of the Concession required to be remediated (> 1000 ppm TPH). This is the corrected table that uses the appropriate assumption that 89% of the pits must be cleaned up to a level of 1000 ppm TPH.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="478 906 976 1214"> <caption>Tabla 1 corregida: Superficies de los suelos de la Concesión que requieren ser remediados (>1000 ppm de TPH). Esta es la tabla corregida que utiliza el supuesto adecuado de que el 89% de las piscinas deben limpiarse a un nivel de 1000 ppm de TPH.</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Superficie del suelo</th> <th>Pozos</th> <th>6.7.6.1.1.2 Est acion es</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Superficie total de las piscinas</td> <td>691.000 m²</td> <td>77.500 m²</td> <td>769.000 m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Superficie de piscinas que requieren ser remediadas</td> <td>615.000 m² (89% de los suelos de las piscinas)</td> <td>77.500 m² (100% de los suelos de las piscinas)</td> <td>693.000 m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Superficies de los suelos fuera de las piscinas que requieren ser remediados (50% del suelo de las piscinas)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>347.000 m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Superficie total de los suelos que requieren ser remediados</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1.040.000 m²</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Superficie del suelo	Pozos	6.7.6.1.1.2 Est acion es	Total	Superficie total de las piscinas	691.000 m ²	77.500 m ²	769.000 m ²	Superficie de piscinas que requieren ser remediadas	615.000 m ² (89% de los suelos de las piscinas)	77.500 m ² (100% de los suelos de las piscinas)	693.000 m ²	Superficies de los suelos fuera de las piscinas que requieren ser remediados (50% del suelo de las piscinas)			347.000 m ²	Superficie total de los suelos que requieren ser remediados			1.040.000 m ²	<p>Corrected Table 1: Areas of soils of the Concession required to be remediated (> 1000 ppm TPH). This is the corrected table that uses the appropriate assumption that 89% of the pits must be cleaned up to a level of 1000 ppm TPH.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1094 935 1755 1154"> <caption>Tabla 1 corregida: Superficies de los suelos de la Concesión que requieren ser remediados (>1000 ppm de TPH). Esta es la tabla corregida que utiliza el supuesto adecuado de que el 89% de las piscinas deben limpiarse a un nivel de 1000 ppm de TPH.</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Superficie del suelo</th> <th>Pozos</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Superficie total de las piscinas</td> <td>691.000 m²</td> <td>769.000 m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Superficie de piscinas que requieren ser remediadas</td> <td>615.000-m² (89% de los suelos de las piscinas)</td> <td>693.000 m² (100% de los suelos de las piscinas)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Superficies de los suelos fuera de las piscinas que requieren ser remediados (50% del suelo de las piscinas)</td> <td></td> <td>347.000 m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Superficie total de los suelos que requieren ser remediados</td> <td></td> <td>1.040.000 m²</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Superficie del suelo	Pozos	Total	Superficie total de las piscinas	691.000 m ²	769.000 m ²	Superficie de piscinas que requieren ser remediadas	615.000-m ² (89% de los suelos de las piscinas)	693.000 m ² (100% de los suelos de las piscinas)	Superficies de los suelos fuera de las piscinas que requieren ser remediados (50% del suelo de las piscinas)		347.000 m ²	Superficie total de los suelos que requieren ser remediados		1.040.000 m ²	<p align="center">\$2,034,000,000</p>
Superficie del suelo	Pozos	6.7.6.1.1.2 Est acion es	Total																																							
Superficie total de las piscinas	691.000 m ²	77.500 m ²	769.000 m ²																																							
Superficie de piscinas que requieren ser remediadas	615.000 m ² (89% de los suelos de las piscinas)	77.500 m ² (100% de los suelos de las piscinas)	693.000 m ²																																							
Superficies de los suelos fuera de las piscinas que requieren ser remediados (50% del suelo de las piscinas)			347.000 m ²																																							
Superficie total de los suelos que requieren ser remediados			1.040.000 m ²																																							
Superficie del suelo	Pozos	Total																																								
Superficie total de las piscinas	691.000 m ²	769.000 m ²																																								
Superficie de piscinas que requieren ser remediadas	615.000-m ² (89% de los suelos de las piscinas)	693.000 m ² (100% de los suelos de las piscinas)																																								
Superficies de los suelos fuera de las piscinas que requieren ser remediados (50% del suelo de las piscinas)		347.000 m ²																																								
Superficie total de los suelos que requieren ser remediados		1.040.000 m ²																																								

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF TEXT PRESENTED BY THE ATTORNEY MR. FAJARDO AND THAT OF THE COURT-APPOINTED EXPERT MR. CABRERA

Submittal date of the corresponding report	Text submitted to the Court of Nueva Loja by attorney Fajardo in his pronouncement to the Expert Evaluation report of March 24, 2008, submitted by the Expert Richard Cabrera Vega	Responses of the expert Richard Cabrera Vega, to the questions and comments formulated by the Plaintiffs attorney Mr. Fajardo	Costs associated with each response												
September 16, 2008	November 2008														
<p>Answer to Question 15 (continued) (Fajardo p. 80-84 of 118; Cabrera p. 18-19 of 51)</p>	<p>Corrected Table 2: Total volume of the soil that needs to be remediated using the corrected assumption that 89% of the pits need a cleanup level of 1000 ppm TPH.</p> <p>Tabla 2 corregida: Volumen total del suelo que requiere ser remediado utilizando el supuesto corregido de que el 89% de las piscinas necesitan un nivel de limpieza de 1000 ppm de TPH.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Superficie total de los suelos que requieren ser remediados</th> <th>Profundidad promedio de remediación</th> <th>6.7.6.1.1.1.3 Volumen total del suelo a ser remediado</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.040.000 m²</td> <td>4 m</td> <td>4.160.000 m³</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Superficie total de los suelos que requieren ser remediados	Profundidad promedio de remediación	6.7.6.1.1.1.3 Volumen total del suelo a ser remediado	1.040.000 m ²	4 m	4.160.000 m ³	<p>Corrected Table 2: Total volume of the soil that needs to be remediated using the corrected assumption that 89% of the pits need a cleanup level of 1000 ppm TPH.</p> <p>Tabla 2 corregida: Volumen total del suelo que requiere ser remediado utilizando el supuesto corregido de que el 89% de las piscinas necesitan un nivel de limpieza de 1000 ppm de TPH.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Superficie total de los suelos que requieren ser remediados</th> <th>Profundidad promedio de remediación</th> <th>Volumen total del suelo a ser remediado</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.040.000 m²</td> <td>4 m</td> <td>4.160.000 m³</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Superficie total de los suelos que requieren ser remediados	Profundidad promedio de remediación	Volumen total del suelo a ser remediado	1.040.000 m ²	4 m	4.160.000 m ³	
	Superficie total de los suelos que requieren ser remediados	Profundidad promedio de remediación	6.7.6.1.1.1.3 Volumen total del suelo a ser remediado												
	1.040.000 m ²	4 m	4.160.000 m ³												
	Superficie total de los suelos que requieren ser remediados	Profundidad promedio de remediación	Volumen total del suelo a ser remediado												
1.040.000 m ²	4 m	4.160.000 m ³													
<p>The original and corrected [versions] of Table 4 showing a total estimated remediation cost for contaminated soils using the same average remediation cost: \$448 per m3. Corrected Table 4: Total estimated cost for soil remediation using the correct assumption that 89% of the pits need a cleanup level of 1000 ppm TPH.</p> <p>Tabla 4 corregida: Costo total estimado para la remediación del suelo utilizando el supuesto corregido de que el 89% de las piscinas necesitan un nivel de limpieza de 1000 ppm de TPH.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Volumen total del suelo que requiere ser remediado</th> <th>Costo promedio para remediar los suelos contaminados</th> <th>Costo total para remediar los suelos contaminados</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4.160.000 m³</td> <td>489 dólares estadounidenses/m³</td> <td>\$2.034.000.000 dólares estadounidenses</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Volumen total del suelo que requiere ser remediado	Costo promedio para remediar los suelos contaminados	Costo total para remediar los suelos contaminados	4.160.000 m ³	489 dólares estadounidenses/m ³	\$2.034.000.000 dólares estadounidenses	<p>The corrected [version] of Table 4 shows my total estimated remediation cost for contaminated soils using the same average remediation cost: \$489 per m3. Corrected Table 4: Total estimated cost for soil remediation using the correct assumption that 89% of the pits need a cleanup level of 1000 ppm TPH.</p> <p>Tabla 4 corregida: Costo total estimado para la remediación del suelo utilizando el supuesto corregido de que el 89% de las piscinas necesitan un nivel de limpieza de 1000 ppm de TPH.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Volumen total del suelo que requiere ser remediado</th> <th>Costo promedio para remediar los suelos contaminados</th> <th>Costo total para remediar los suelos contaminados</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4.160.000 m³</td> <td>489-dól. estadounidenses/m³</td> <td>\$2.034.000.000-dól. estadounidenses</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Volumen total del suelo que requiere ser remediado	Costo promedio para remediar los suelos contaminados	Costo total para remediar los suelos contaminados	4.160.000 m ³	489-dól. estadounidenses/m ³	\$2.034.000.000-dól. estadounidenses	<p>\$2,034,000,000</p>	
Volumen total del suelo que requiere ser remediado	Costo promedio para remediar los suelos contaminados	Costo total para remediar los suelos contaminados													
4.160.000 m ³	489 dólares estadounidenses/m ³	\$2.034.000.000 dólares estadounidenses													
Volumen total del suelo que requiere ser remediado	Costo promedio para remediar los suelos contaminados	Costo total para remediar los suelos contaminados													
4.160.000 m ³	489-dól. estadounidenses/m ³	\$2.034.000.000-dól. estadounidenses													
<p>These 3 Tables contain identical information, including areas, depths, volumes, and remediation cost</p>															
<p>Therefore, the cost analysis to remediate to 1000 ppm TPH that is included in Appendix N calculates a cost which is less than the actual one to obtain this level of cleanup (although it must be considered that 1000 ppm TPH is not an adequate cleanup level, as mentioned previously). The actual cost to remediate soils to 1000 ppm TPH is approximately \$ 2,034,000,000.</p>	<p>Therefore, my cost analysis to remediate to 1000 ppm TPH that is included in Appendix N calculates a cost which is less than the actual one to obtain this level of cleanup (although it must be considered that 1000 ppm TPH is not an adequate cleanup level, as mentioned previously). Using my revised calculations, the actual cost to remediate soils to 1000 ppm TPH is approximately \$ 2,034,000,000.</p>														

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF TEXT PRESENTED BY THE ATTORNEY MR. FAJARDO AND THAT OF THE COURT-APPOINTED EXPERT MR. CABRERA

Submittal date of the corresponding report	Text submitted to the Court of Nueva Loja by attorney Fajardo in his pronouncement to the Expert Evaluation report of March 24, 2008, submitted by the Expert Richard Cabrera Vega	Responses of the expert Richard Cabrera Vega, to the questions and comments formulated by the Plaintiffs attorney Mr. Fajardo	Costs associated with each response
September 16, 2008	November 2008		
Answer to Question 42 (Fajardo p. 77-80 of 118; Cabrera pp. 35-37 of 51)	<p>Using the results of Appendix L as a reference, Appendix Q of the Expert Evaluation [report], provides an approximate calculation of the excess number of deaths by cancer attributable to the Texaco petroleum production operations in the Concession area and the resulting amount in dollars that Chevron must pay to compensate for these excessive deaths. The estimate of 638 excess deaths from cancer was based on an estimate of the area population of 30,000 people. This value is excessively low in relation to the actual number of people living in the Concession area. Consequently, the compensation of \$2.907 billion American dollars using the 2008 value of the dollar that was calculated is too low, and it does not fully cover all of the consequences resulting from Texaco operations.</p>	<p>Appendix Q of my <i>expert opinion</i>, [contains] an approximate calculation of the excess number of deaths by cancer that appear to be attributable to the Texaco petroleum production operations in the Concession area and the resulting amount in dollars that the defendant must pay to compensate for these excessive deaths. I based my estimate of 638 deaths from cancer on an estimate of the area population of 30,000 people. In retrospect, this value could be too low in relation to the actual number of people living in the Concession area. Consequently, it is reasonable to assert that the compensation that I calculated of \$2.907 billion American dollars using the 2008 value of the dollar is too low, and it does not fully cover all of the consequences resulting from Texaco operations.</p>	
	<p>Between 1985 and 1998 studies were conducted testing the excess deaths from cancer (Hurtig and San Sebastián, 2002) or those [that were] focused on cancer cases that occurred only in individuals or families living in the area for Texaco's oil operations (Appendix L of the Expert Evaluation). Therefore, rates of excess cancer cases that developed from these studies apply to these specific time periods. Although the people who have moved to the Concession area or who were born there since 1990 have been exposed to the same contaminant factors for which Texaco is responsible, their rates of exposure and excess cancer cases may differ from those populations that were investigated and reported in the literature and in Appendix L.</p> <p>As a result, for this analysis we used an estimate of the population exposed to oil contamination that dates back to 1990, instead of the current population. However, this approach is also too low in relation to excess deaths from cancer for which Texaco is responsible, as more people have moved to the area since 1990.</p>	<p>Between 1985 and 1998 studies were conducted testing the excess deaths from cancer (Hurtig and San Sebastián, 2002) or those [that were] focused on cancer cases that occurred only in individuals or families living in the area for Texaco's oil operations (Appendix L of the Expert Evaluation). Therefore, rates of excess cancer cases that were developed from these studies apply to these specific time periods. Although the people who have moved to the Concession area or who were born there since 1990 have been exposed to the same contaminant factors for which Texaco is responsible, their rates of exposure and excess cancer cases may differ from those populations that were investigated and reported in the literature and in Appendix L.</p> <p>As a result, for this analysis I used an estimate of the population exposed to oil contamination that dates back to 1990, instead of the current population. However, this approach is also too low in relation to excess deaths from cancer for which Texaco is responsible, as more people have moved to the area since 1990. However, I have no reliable indexes of excess cancer cases for these people, and therefore have not included them in this analysis.</p>	\$9,527,000,000

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF TEXT PRESENTED BY THE ATTORNEY MR. FAJARDO AND THAT OF THE COURT-APPOINTED EXPERT MR. CABRERA

Submittal date of the corresponding report	Text submitted to the Court of Nueva Loja by attorney Fajardo in his pronouncement to the Expert Evaluation report of March 24, 2008, submitted by the Expert Richard Cabrera Vega	Responses of the expert Richard Cabrera Vega, to the questions and comments formulated by the Plaintiffs attorney Mr. Fajardo	Costs associated with each response
September 16, 2008		November 2008	
Answer to Question 42 (continued) (Fajardo pp. 77-80 of 118; Cabrera pp. 35-37 of 51)	<p>Census data for 1990 indicate that the total population in the provinces of Sucumbíos and Orellana at that time was 125,900 people (INEC, 2001b). However, this includes people living in the two provinces but not within the Concession area. The detailed data of the census by parish within the two provinces are available for 2001, and in that year 78% of the total population lived in the two provinces within the concession area (INEC, 2001a). Using the same percentage, we estimated that in 1990 approximately 98,200 people were living within the Concession area in what today are the provinces of Sucumbios and Orellana (78% of 125,900).</p>	<p>Census data for 1990 indicate that the total population in the provinces of Sucumbíos and Orellana at that time was 125,900 people (INEC, 2001b). However, this includes people living in the two provinces but not within the Concession area in the province of Napo. The detailed data of the census by parish within the two provinces are available for 2001, and in that year 78% of the total population lived in the two provinces within the concession area in the province of Napo (INEC, 2001a). Using the same percentage, I estimated that in 1990 approximately 98,200 people were living within the Concession area in the province of Napo (78% of 125,900).</p>	\$9,527,000,000
	<p>The following sections re-calculate the number of excess cancer deaths by using this more accurate calculation of the affected population. Note Mr. President that the calculations use exactly the same methods used by the Expert [Mr. Cabrera], but use the most appropriate population estimate.</p>	<p>In the following sections I again calculate the number of excess cancer deaths by using this more accurate calculation of the affected population. The calculations use exactly the same methods that I used previously, but with a more appropriate population estimate.</p>	
	<p>Step 1: To calculate the total number of cancer cases in the population of interest We used the cancer rate of 306 for every 6066 people as reported in Appendices L and Q. With an affected population of 98,200 people, this is equivalent to at least 4954 cases of cancer in the affected group in all of the areas.</p>	<p>Step 1: To calculate the total number of cancer cases in the population of interest I used the cancer rate of 306 for every 6066 people as reported in Appendices L and Q. With an affected population of 98,200 people, this is equivalent to at least 4954 apparent cases of cancer in the affected group for all kinds of causes.</p>	

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF TEXT PRESENTED BY THE ATTORNEY MR. FAJARDO AND THAT OF THE COURT-APPOINTED EXPERT MR. CABRERA

Submittal date of the corresponding report	Text submitted to the Court of Nueva Loja by attorney Fajardo in his pronouncement to the Expert Evaluation report of March 24, 2008, submitted by the Expert Richard Cabrera Vega	Responses of the expert Richard Cabrera Vega, to the questions and comments formulated by the Plaintiffs attorney Mr. Fajardo	Costs associated with each response
September 16, 2008		November 2008	
Answer to Question 42 (continued) (Fajardo pp. 77-80 of 118; Cabrera pp. 35-37 of 51)	<p>Step 2: To determine the effect of contamination on cancer rates</p> <p><i>Appendix Q indicates that the risk of developing cancer that is attributed to living in an area near a source of oil pollution is 1.73 times greater. This value is the average of two rates. The first index, 2.24 times, is the increased risk of developing cancer in the people who live in an area within 2 km of a well, a pit or a flare in comparison with the risk to the people who live 2 km or more away from such sources as reported in Appendix L. The second index, 1.22 times, is the increased risk of developing cancer in the people who live in the cantons with [oil] production over the nonproducing cantons, as reported by Hurtig and San Sebastián (2002). We trusted in the same method that the Expert [Mr. Cabrera] used, with the average value of 1.73 times used in this calculation.</i></p>	<p>Step 2: To determine the effect of contamination on cancer rates</p> <p><i>Appendix Q indicates that the risk of developing cancer that is attributed to living in an area near a source of oil pollution is 1.73 times greater. I calculated this value as an average of two rates. The first index, 2.24 times, is the increased risk of developing cancer in the people who live in an area within 2 km of a well, a pit or a flare in comparison with the risk to the people who live 2 km or more away from such sources as reported in Appendix L. The second index, 1.22 times, is the increased risk of developing cancer in the people who live in the cantons with [oil] production over the nonproducing cantons, as reported by Hurtig and San Sebastián (2002).</i></p>	\$9,527,000,000
	<p>Step 3: To calculate the excess cancer cases and excess deaths</p> <p><i>The number of cancer cases that would be expected in this population is 2864 (2864 = 4954 ÷ 1.73). The difference in the number of calculated cases with exposure, 4954, and if there were no exposure, 2863, is the measurement of the number of excess cancer cases that are attributable to petroleum contamination. This results in 2091 excess cancer cases (2091 = 4954 - 2863).</i></p>	<p>Step 3: To calculate the excess cancer cases and excess deaths</p> <p><i>The number of cancer cases that would be expected in this population is 2864 (2864 = 4954 ÷ 1.73). The difference in the number of calculated cases with exposure, 4954, and if there were no exposure, 2863, is the measurement of the number of excess cancer cases that are attributable to petroleum contamination. This results in 2091 excess cancer cases (2091 = 4954 - 2863).</i></p>	
	<p><i>When this value is multiplied by the cancer mortality rate of 67% reported in Appendices L and Q, the estimated number of excess cancer deaths attributed to exposure to the contamination is 1401 (1401 = 2091 x 0.67).</i></p>	<p><i>When I multiplied this value by the cancer mortality rate of 67% reported in Appendices L and Q, the estimated number of excess cancer deaths attributed to exposure to the contamination is 1401 (1401 = 2091 x 0.67).</i></p>	

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF TEXT PRESENTED BY THE ATTORNEY MR. FAJARDO AND THAT OF THE COURT-APPOINTED EXPERT MR. CABRERA

Submittal date of the corresponding report	Text submitted to the Court of Nueva Loja by attorney Fajardo in his pronouncement to the Expert Evaluation report of March 24, 2008, submitted by the Expert Richard Cabrera Vega	Responses of the expert Richard Cabrera Vega, to the questions and comments formulated by the Plaintiffs attorney Mr. Fajardo	Costs associated with each response												
September 16, 2008	November 2008														
<p>Answer to Question 42 (continued) (Fajardo pp. 77-80 of 118; Cabrera pp. 35-37 of 51)</p>	<p><i>With the revised estimate of the number of excess cancer deaths of 1401, and the value of the statistical life estimate of \$6,800,000 million U. S. dollars (2008 dollar value) presented in Appendix Q, the required compensation would be \$9,527,000,000 U.S. dollars (\$9.527 billion in 2008 dollars rounded to the nearest million dollars). Table 6 provides a summary of the total monetary value of the excess deaths using the original and revised estimates of the population, and the two indices of original excess cancer and the average.</i></p>	<p><i>With my revised estimate of the amount of excess cancer deaths of 1401, and the value of the statistical life estimate of \$6,800,000 million U. S. dollars (2008 dollar value) presented in Appendix Q, the required compensation would be of \$9,527,000,000 U.S. dollars (\$9.527 billion in 2008 dollars rounded to the nearest million dollars). The following table provides a summary of the total monetary value of the excess deaths when I use the original and revised estimates of the population, and the two indices of original excess cancer and the average.</i></p>													
	<p>Table 6. Calculations of the total monetary value of the excess deaths from cancer</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="415 695 1058 915"> <caption>Tabla 6. Cálculos del valor monetario total de las muertes excesivas por cáncer</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Índice de casos excesivos de cáncer</th> <th>Población afectada de 30.000 (Anexo Q)</th> <th>Población afectada de 98.200 (Revisada utilizando el Censo de Población de 1990)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1,73 (media)</td> <td>\$2.907.000.000 dólares estadounidenses</td> <td>\$9.527.000.000 dólares estadounidenses</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Índice de casos excesivos de cáncer	Población afectada de 30.000 (Anexo Q)	Población afectada de 98.200 (Revisada utilizando el Censo de Población de 1990)	1,73 (media)	\$2.907.000.000 dólares estadounidenses	\$9.527.000.000 dólares estadounidenses	<p>Table. Calculations of the total monetary value of the excess deaths from cancer</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1117 708 1705 863"> <caption>Tabla. Cálculos del valor monetario total de las muertes excesivas por cáncer</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Índice de casos excesivos de cáncer</th> <th>Población-afectada de 30.000 (Anexo Q)</th> <th>Población-afectada de-98.200 (Revisada utilizando el Censo de Población de 1990)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1,73 (media)</td> <td>\$2.907.000.000 dól. estadounidenses</td> <td>\$9.527.000.000 dól. estadounidenses</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Índice de casos excesivos de cáncer	Población-afectada de 30.000 (Anexo Q)	Población-afectada de-98.200 (Revisada utilizando el Censo de Población de 1990)	1,73 (media)	\$2.907.000.000 dól. estadounidenses	\$9.527.000.000 dól. estadounidenses	\$9,527,000,000
	Índice de casos excesivos de cáncer	Población afectada de 30.000 (Anexo Q)	Población afectada de 98.200 (Revisada utilizando el Censo de Población de 1990)												
1,73 (media)	\$2.907.000.000 dólares estadounidenses	\$9.527.000.000 dólares estadounidenses													
Índice de casos excesivos de cáncer	Población-afectada de 30.000 (Anexo Q)	Población-afectada de-98.200 (Revisada utilizando el Censo de Población de 1990)													
1,73 (media)	\$2.907.000.000 dól. estadounidenses	\$9.527.000.000 dól. estadounidenses													
<p>This Table contains identical information of the monetary value of the excess deaths from cancer.</p>															
<p>As you will notice Mr President, there is a huge gap - which favors the the defendant - between the data that most approximate reality and those used in Mr. Cabrera's [expert] report. In conclusion, the monetary calculation made by the Mr. Cabrera, on the population, or excess cancer deaths is not realistic and unfairly benefits the defendant oil company. Consequently Mr. Cabrera will have to make a new calculation that comes closer to the actual number of cancer victims.</p>	<p>In conclusion, my calculation of the affected population that was used to calculate the total monetary value of the excess deaths from cancer was not realistic. When I used the affected population according to the 1990 Census, the total calculated monetary value of excess deaths is \$9.527 billion U.S. dollars [using] the 2008 dollar value. This calculation is probably also too low, since it excludes the tens of thousands of additional people who were born in the Concession area or who have moved there since 1990 and for those who an index of excessive of cancer cases was not defined. Therefore, my calculation of \$2.907 billion seriously underestimates the total monetary value of the excess deaths from cancer.</p>														

Notes:

Bold italics indicate identical text in Mr. Fajardo's and Mr. Cabrera's reports. All the tables mentioned above have the same format.