

June 3, 2008

Exxon Mobil Corporation
5959 Las Colinas Blvd.
Irving, TX 75039-2298

Dear Sir or Madam:

Sometime in the next few weeks, the Project On Government Oversight (POGO) will update its Federal Contractor Misconduct Database (<http://www.contractormisconduct.org/>), a compilation of information from public resources regarding government contractors, including Exxon Mobil Corp. On March 6, 2006 and November 15, 2006, we sent Exxon Mobil information regarding findings in POGO's database. As of today, we have not received a response from you. I have enclosed the findings relevant to your company, and I am seeking verification of this data.

Any response would be greatly appreciated, as the accuracy of this information is in the best interest of all parties. Out of fairness to Exxon Mobil, please be assured that any response received by POGO will be posted on the website along with the data.

The biggest change we will be making to the database is the inclusion of more federal contractors (the top 100). We are also adding new instances that we have found in recent months and updating instances already in the database with new information. Please note that the database also includes pending instances, but these are kept separate from resolved instances and are not included in the totals.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at (202) 347-1122. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Neil Gordon
Investigator

Enclosure

Instances

1. Clean Air Act Violation

Date: 10/11/2005 (Date of Agreement)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: Multiple Agencies

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$14,400,000

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: A "Consent Decree in United States et al. v. Exxon Mobil Corporation and ExxonMobil Oil Corporation, Civil Action No. 05-C-5809, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. In a complaint that was filed simultaneously with the Consent Decree, the United States, the State of Illinois, the State of Louisiana, and the State of Montana sought injunctive relief and penalties against Exxon Mobil Corporation and ExxonMobil Oil Corporation ("ExxonMobil") pursuant to Sections 113(b) and 304(a) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7413(b) and 7604(a), for alleged Clean Air Act violations and violations of the corollary provisions in state laws at ExxonMobil petroleum refineries in Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Baytown, Texas; Beaumont, Texas; Billings, Montana; Joliet, Illinois, and Torrance, California." Under the settlement, ExxonMobil will implement innovative pollution control technologies to reduce emissions of nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, and particulate matter from refinery process units and also will adopt facility-wide enhanced benzene waste monitoring and fugitive emission control programs. In addition, ExxonMobil paid a \$7.7 million civil penalty and pledged to undertake \$6.7 million in federal and state environmental projects.

2. Exxon Corp. v. Alabama (Natural Gas Royalties)

Date: 05/12/2005 (Date of Decision)

Misconduct Type: Cost/Labor Mischarge

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$51,907,634

Disposition: Judgment Against Defendant

Synopsis: "In December 2000, a jury in the 15th Judicial Circuit Court of Montgomery County, Alabama, returned a verdict against the Corporation in a dispute over royalties in the amount of \$88 million in compensatory damages and \$3.4 billion in punitive damages in the case of Exxon Corporation v. State of Alabama, et al. The verdict was upheld by the trial court in May 2001. In December 2002, the Alabama Supreme Court vacated the \$3.5 billion jury verdict. The case was retried and in November 2003, a state district court jury in Montgomery, Alabama, returned a verdict against Exxon Mobil Corporation. The verdict included \$63.5 million in compensatory damages and \$11.8 billion in punitive damages. In March 2004, the district court judge reduced the amount of punitive damages to \$3.5 billion." In November 2007, the Alabama Supreme Court struck down the punitive damages award. The court ruled that the state did not prove that Exxon Mobil committed fraud and was therefore not entitled to punitive damages. The court also reduced compensatory damages to \$51.9 million plus interest, which could amount to an additional \$70 million.

3. Exxon Dealers Class Action

Date: 12/19/2005 (Date of Settlement)

Misconduct Type: Cost/Labor Mischarge

Enforcement Agency: Non-Governmental

Contracting Party: Non-Governmental

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$1,075,000,000

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: In 1991, a group of current and former Exxon direct served dealers filed a lawsuit against Exxon, alleging Exxon had been overcharging dealers for the wholesale price of motor fuel since March 1983. The lawsuit was filed on behalf of all dealers who were parties to one or more Sales Agreements with Exxon and who purchased motor fuel directly from Exxon between March 1983 and August 1994. The claim relates to Exxon's Discount for Cash program, under which Exxon began charging dealers a separate 3% fee for processing credit transactions. However, Exxon said it would reduce the wholesale price of motor fuel by an amount that, on average, would offset the fee. The dealers alleged Exxon collected the fee but failed to reduce the price. On December 19, 2005, Exxon and the plaintiffs entered into a settlement agreement pursuant to which Exxon agreed to pay \$1.075 billion.

4. Grefer v. Exxon Mobil (Contaminated Property)

Date: 04/01/2005 (Date of Press Release)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: Non-Governmental

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$168,000,000

Disposition: Judgment Against Defendant

Synopsis: In 2001, a Louisiana state court jury awarded compensatory damages of \$56 million and punitive damages of \$1 billion to a landowner for damage caused by a third party that leased the property from the landowner. The third party provided pipe cleaning and storage services for Exxon Mobil. The Louisiana Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals reduced the punitive damage award to \$112 million in 2005. In February 2007, the U.S. Supreme Court vacated the Louisiana appeals court's \$112 million punitive damages award and directed it to re-examine the award in light of the Court's recent decision that put new limits on punitive damages. On remand, the appeals court reaffirmed the award. In April 2008, the Supreme Court denied Exxon's appeal.

5. Hazardous Waste

Date: 12/13/2001 (Date of Settlement)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: EPA

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$11,200,000

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: "United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 2,...announced one of the largest hazardous waste settlements in history, with the filing of a Consent Decree, settling a hazardous waste case

filed in 1996 against Mobil Oil Corporation. The case alleged mismanagement of benzene-contaminated wastes at Port Mobil, a major petroleum product storage and distribution terminal on the Arthur Kill in Staten Island. United States v. Mobil Oil Corporation, 96-1432 (JG). The case was scheduled for trial this week before United States District Judge John Gleeson. The Consent Decree is with Exxon Mobil Corporation, as a result of the 1999 merger of Mobil and Exxon."

6. Massachusetts Clean Up Violation

Date: 10/19/2005 (Date of Fine)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$43,984

Disposition: Fine

Synopsis: The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) has assessed a penalty of \$43,984 against the ExxonMobil Oil Corporation for the company's failure to undertake cleanup actions in compliance with environmental regulations at the former Exxon Service Station location at 6 Goffe Street, Hadley.

7. Oil Royalties

Date: 01/08/2001 (Date of Settlement)

Misconduct Type: Cost/Labor Mischarge

Enforcement Agency: Interior

Contracting Party: Interior

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$7,000,000

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: "Exxon Mobil Corporation...agreed to pay \$7 million to resolve claims under the False Claims Act [31 U.S.C. § 3729] and administrative claims that the corporation underpaid royalties due for oil produced on federal leases between 1988 and 1998."

8. Santa Clara Oil Spill

Date: 09/24/2002 (Date of Settlement)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: Multiple Agencies

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$4,700,000

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: "The U.S. Department of Justice, together with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the California Department of Fish and Game,...announced a settlement under which ExxonMobil Oil Corporation [paid] the United States and the state of California \$4.7 million in compensation for a spill of crude oil from a pipeline operated by the former Mobil Oil Company."

9. Texas Air Quality Regulation Violations

Date: 02/21/2004 (Date of Agreement)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$150,000

Disposition: Administrative Agreement

Synopsis: "Texas Commission on Environmental Quality ("TCEQ") issued Notices of Enforcement to [Exxon Mobil Corporation (EMOC)] with respect to its Beaumont, Texas refinery on May 21, 2002 and on August 22, 2002. The TCEQ alleged violations of Texas Air Quality regulations relating to leak detection and repair issues. EMOC entered into a final administrative order with the TCEQ, resolving all outstanding issues in this matter, on February 21, 2004. Under the order, EMOC has paid a \$75,000 penalty to the TCEQ and has paid \$75,000 to Jefferson County, Texas for a supplemental environmental project."

10. Leak Detection and Repair Violations and Failure to Submit Required Reports

Date: 02/03/2004 (Date of Agreement)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$4,800

Disposition: Administrative Agreement

Synopsis: The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) "issued a Notice of Enforcement on June 25, 2003, alleging leak detection and repair violations and failure to submit deviation reports required by a permit. The allegations relate to Colonial Tank Farm, which is operated by [Exxon Mobil's (EMOC)] Beaumont refinery under an agreement with Colonial Pipeline. EMOC entered into an administrative order with the TCEQ on February 3, 2004 whereby EMOC has agreed to pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$4,800 to resolve this matter."

11. Leak Detection and Repair Violations and Inadequate Notification of Emission Events

Date: 08/29/2003 (Date of Notice)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$80,444

Disposition: Administrative Agreement

Synopsis: The "Texas Commission on Environmental Quality ("TCEQ")... agreed to settle a Notice of Enforcement issued on August 29, 2003, alleging leak detection and repair violations and inadequate notifications of several emissions events as required by air quality regulations at ExxonMobil Oil Corporation's ("EMOC") Beaumont, Texas refinery. Under the terms of the settlement, EMOC has agreed to pay a civil penalty totaling \$80,444, half of which will be paid through a supplemental environmental project involving county vehicle retrofits."

12. Unregistered Tanks in Pennsylvania

Date: 10/29/1999 (Date of Settlement)

Misconduct Type: Environment
Enforcement Agency: State/Local
Contracting Party: None
Court Type: Administrative
Amount: \$90,000

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: On October 29, 1999, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (the "PDEP") [alleged] that Mobil Oil Corporation had violated the Pennsylvania Tank Act by knowingly delivering products into unregistered tanks, was settled. The PDEP had sought penalties of up to \$295,000; the matter was settled with the payment of a \$90,000 penalty.

13. Unauthorized Re-Exports to Sudan

Date: 08/09/2005 (Date of Settlement)

Misconduct Type: Import/Export
Enforcement Agency: Commerce
Contracting Party: None
Court Type: Civil
Amount: \$49,500

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: "The U.S. Department of Commerce announced that ExxonMobil Corporation of Fairfax, Va., agreed to pay civil penalties totaling \$49,500 to settle charges that affiliates of the former Mobil Oil Corporation, located in Texas, the United Kingdom, and Egypt participated in or were otherwise liable for the unauthorized re-export of computers and related hardware to Sudan. These exports were made in violation of the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) and a trade embargo in place since 1997...The Commerce Department's Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS) charged that on three occasions between June 1999 and February 2000, Mobil Services Company Ltd. and Mobil Oil Egypt caused the re-export of computer servers and laptop computers to a Mobil Oil subsidiary in Sudan without the required export licenses."

14. DPP v. Esso Australia Party Ltd. (Occupational Health and Safety Violations)

Date: 07/30/2001 (Date of Verdict)

Misconduct Type: Labor
Enforcement Agency: International
Contracting Party: None
Court Type: Criminal
Amount: \$1,000,000

Disposition: Found Guilty

Synopsis: In 1998 an explosion at the Longford, Australia gas processing plant owned by Esso, a subsidiary of Exxon Mobil, killed two and wounded eight. In July 2001, the Australian Supreme Court imposed \$1 million in fines on Esso after the company was found guilty of 11 criminal charges brought under the Occupational Health and Safety Act 1985.

15. MTBE Cleanup Costs (Santa Monica, CA)

Date: 02/16/2005 (Date of Settlement)

Misconduct Type: Environment
Enforcement Agency: EPA
Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Civil

Amount: Unknown

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: "Under the terms of a settlement filed...in federal court, several oil companies will pay \$1.5 million to the Environmental Protection Agency for costs it incurred while directing the investigation and cleanup of methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), a gasoline additive, from a groundwater basin formerly used for drinking water by the City of Santa Monica, California... The agreement between the EPA and the oil companies follows eight years of investigation and cleanup under the Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and California's Porter Cologne Act. The MTBE contamination in the vicinity of Santa Monica's drinking water wells came from at least 25 possible sources, most of which were gas stations in the Charnock Sub-Basin."

16. Air Pollution Violations (Illinois)

Date: 08/18/2005 (Date of Settlement Agreement)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$281,846

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: On August 18, 2005, the Will County State's Attorney's office in Illinois announced that local environmental projects would receive \$110,000 "as part of a settlement agreement reached with ExxonMobil regarding alleged air pollution violations at the oil company's refinery located southwest of Joliet, in Channahon Township...In addition, ExxonMobil will pay \$150,000 to the Illinois Environmental Protection Trust Fund and \$21,846 to the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) for costs incurred during the investigation and clean-up."

17. Air Quality Violations (California)

Date: 09/02/2004 (Date of Settlement)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$8,250,000

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: "In one of the region's largest air pollution penalties, ExxonMobil Oil Corp. paid \$8.25 million...to the South Coast Air Quality Management District to settle numerous air quality violations at the company's Torrance refinery and Terminal Island facility...Most of the ExxonMobil violations were for improper inspection and maintenance of large, above-ground tanks used to store gasoline and other petroleum-based liquids; and for leaks of smog-forming volatile organic compounds from those tanks and other equipment."

18. The Exxon Valdez Case Reopener

Date: 06/01/2006 (Date of Plan Submission)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: Multiple Agencies

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$92,000,000

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: "The United States and the State of Alaska submitted to ExxonMobil Corporation a detailed plan for a proposed restoration project intended to restore habitat in the area affected by the 1989 Exxon Valdez oil spill. Today's restoration plan was submitted in accord with the requirements of a set of provisions known as the "Reopener for Unknown Injury" in the consent decree which settled the governments' civil claims against Exxon Corporation (now ExxonMobil), the Exxon Shipping Company and the Exxon Pipeline Company arising from the spill....At the time of the settlement, Exxon agreed to pay the governments \$900 million in installments for costs and for natural resource damages known or reasonably anticipated at the time of the settlement. The settlement also included a unique provision allowing the federal and state trustees to seek up to \$100 million in additional monies for damages satisfying [certain] criteria...The ultimate cost of the project depends upon such factors as how many oiled sites require remediation and the remediation approach selected. It is currently estimated to cost approximately \$92 million."

19. Violations of Clean Water Act (Texas)

Date: 01/09/2006 (Date of Consent Agreement)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: EPA

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$122,000

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: On January 9, 2006, Exxon Mobil and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) agreed to settle a complaint that "alleged violations of the Clean Water Act at Hawkins Field (in Wood County, Texas) related to 13 spills of produced water into potential waters of the United States occurring June 2000 to August 2004." Exxon Mobil agreed to pay a \$31,000 civil penalty and to perform a supplemental environmental project valued at \$91,000.

20. Violation of Minerals Management Service Regulation

Date: 06/08/2006 (Date of Penalty)

Misconduct Type: Other

Enforcement Agency: Interior

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$25,000

Disposition: Fine

Synopsis: Exxon Mobil was assessed a \$25,000 penalty by the Offshore Minerals Management on June 8, 2006 because "the Pressure Safety Low (PSL) for Well G-24 , had the incorrect spring and piston installed; the spring tension was backed off to a point where it would not function. This violation occurred for 11 days."

21. Violations of Air Quality Regulations (Louisiana)

Date: 05/24/2005 (Date of Penalty Notice)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$4,000

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: On May 24, 2005, the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality issued a Notice of Potential Penalty found several violations of the Environmental Quality Act, and, more specifically, air quality regulations. These violations included several 2004 incidents which discharged harmful chemicals into the air. Without admitting liability, Exxon agreed to pay \$4000 to settle the claims.

22. Safety Violations Leading to the Unauthorized Release of Hazardous Chemicals (Louisiana)

Date: 11/22/2002 (Date of Penalty Notice)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$350,000

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: On November 22, 2002, the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality issued a Notice of Potential Penalty for safety violations which led to the unauthorized release of several hazardous chemicals. Without admitting liability, Exxon agreed to pay \$350,000, \$250,000 of which will go to performing beneficial environmental projects.

23. Violations of Underground Tank Systems Standards

Date: 11/29/2001 (Date of Consent Decree)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$245,000

Disposition: Administrative Agreement

Synopsis: "The Department of Environmental Protection entered into an administrative consent order with ExxonMobil Corporation ("ExxonMobil") on November 29, 2001 for alleged underground storage tank violations at the ExxonMobil facility abutting Interstate-95 in Madison...One or more of the tank systems allegedly leaked an estimated 5,775 gallons of unleaded gasoline or petroleum products to the ground. ExxonMobil allegedly failed to timely report the release and immediately investigate and correct its source. Prior to the issuance of this consent order ExxonMobil thoroughly emptied, removed and replaced the four underground tank systems at the site...The consent order requires ExxonMobil to fund an informational campaign designed to heighten public awareness of underground storage tank leak detection requirements in the amount of \$150,000 as a supplemental environmental project and pay a civil penalty of \$95,000"

24. New Hampshire Gasoline Spills Cleanup

Date: 04/30/2007 (Date of Settlement)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$2,041,438

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: In April 2007, as part of a settlement with the state of New Hampshire, Exxon Mobil agreed to pay the State Environmental Fund \$2,041,438 to reimburse the cost of cleaning up gasoline spills at 41 of its gasoline stations. The types of contamination involved included methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), a gasoline additive the state banned in 2007. The state of New Hampshire is also currently pursuing a separate MTBE lawsuit against Exxon Mobil and 21 other oil companies. See related ChevronTexaco Corp. pending misconduct instance, "New Hampshire MTBE Pollution Lawsuit."

25. Environmental Violations at Torrance, Calif. Refinery

Date: 05/08/2007 (Date of SEC 10-Q)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$400,000

Disposition: Fine

Synopsis: Exxon Mobil Corp. agreed to pay \$400,000 in penalties to California for environmental violations at its Torrance refinery. Exxon Mobil also agreed to spend a maximum of \$2 million on supplemental environmental projects intended to cut excessive emissions of carbon dioxide and other pollutants at the refinery. The company paid \$250,000 for a March 22, 2007 incident that caused the release of nitrogen oxides, carbon dioxide and other substances. In addition, Exxon Mobil paid \$150,000 to settle 23 air permit and air quality violations at the Torrance facility that occurred between October 2005 and October 2006.

26. Price Fixing in El Salvador

Date: 10/02/2007 (Date of Announcement)

Misconduct Type: Antitrust

Enforcement Agency: International

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Administrative

Amount: \$852,000

Disposition: Fine

Synopsis: The government of El Salvador accused Esso Standard Oil (owned by Exxon Mobil) and Royal Dutch Shell's local subsidiary of price fixing and fined each company \$852,000. The government accused the companies of colluding to set artificially high gas prices.

27. Environmental Violations in Kazakhstan

Date: 10/04/2007 (Date of Media Accounts)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: International

Contracting Party: None
Court Type: Administrative
Amount: Unknown
Disposition: Fine

Synopsis: Kazakhstan's ecological ministry fined Tengizchevroil, a Chevron-led consortium developing the country's Tengiz oil field, \$609 million (later reduced to \$309 million on appeal) for environmental violations relating to the stockpiling of sulfur between 2003 and 2006. The fine was imposed in July 2007, although it wasn't announced until October. Chevron has a 50 percent stake in the consortium. Other members of the consortium include ExxonMobil, which has a 25 percent share, and Lukarco, a joint venture between Lukoil and BP, which has a 5 percent share. Tengizchevroil reportedly paid the fine, plus \$10 million in legal fees, in November 2007.

Pending Instances

Exxon Valdez Class Action (Punitive Damages)
Date: 01/28/2004 (Date of Decision)
Misconduct Type: Environment
Enforcement Agency: Non-Governmental
Contracting Party: None
Court Type: Civil
Amount: \$0
Disposition: Pending

Synopsis: "On September 24, 1996, the United States District Court for the District of Alaska entered a judgment in the amount of \$5 billion in punitive damages to a class composed of all persons and entities who asserted claims for punitive damages from the corporation as a result of the Exxon Valdez grounding. ExxonMobil appealed the judgment. On November 7, 2001, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit vacated the punitive damage award as being excessive under the Constitution and remanded the case to the District Court for it to determine the amount of the punitive damage award consistent with the Ninth Circuit's holding. The Ninth Circuit upheld the compensatory damage award which has been paid. On December 6, 2002, the District Court reduced the punitive damage award from \$5 billion to \$4 billion. Both the plaintiffs and ExxonMobil appealed that decision to the Ninth Circuit. The Ninth Circuit panel vacated the District Court's \$4 billion punitive damage award without argument and sent the case back for the District Court to reconsider in light of the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Campbell v. State Farm*. On January 28, 2004, the District Court reinstated the punitive damage award at \$4.5 billion plus interest." In May 2007, the Ninth Circuit rejected ExxonMobil's latest appeal and set punitive damages at \$2.5 billion. The company continues to litigate the matter.

Groundwater and Soil Contamination (Brooklyn, NY)
Date: 06/21/2006 (Date of First Legal Action)
Misconduct Type: Environment
Enforcement Agency: State/Local
Contracting Party: None
Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$0

Disposition: Pending

Synopsis: On June 21, 2006, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) announced that it "has agreed to initiate legal action against ExxonMobil Corporation to ensure that the company fulfills its obligation to clean up petroleum contamination in the Greenpoint, Brooklyn community. The contamination was caused by a number of oil spills and illegal discharges, including a 17 million gallon oil spill first detected in September 1978 that extended 52 acres under the Greenpoint area...The Greenpoint spill consists of groundwater contamination in the area between Monitor Street and Kingsland Avenue, just south of Greenpoint Avenue, and extending southeast to the vicinity of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway. The area also has residual petroleum contamination in soil and fill materials. DEC is currently monitoring petroleum product recovery operations as part of a 1990 consent order with ExxonMobil. To date, more than 9 million gallons of oil have been recovered in the plume area, with progress ongoing." In February 2007, the New York Attorney General's office filed a Notice of Intent to Sue ExxonMobil and other companies, including Chevron and BP America, for violations of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) in regard to solid or hazardous waste contamination of soil, groundwaters, surface waters and sediments in the Greenpoint area of Brooklyn. The following July, the Attorney General filed a federal lawsuit against Exxon Mobil Corporation and ExxonMobil Refining and Supply Company, seeking to stop oil currently spilling into the Greenpoint area; restore the Newtown Creek waterway, which divides Brooklyn and Queens; force heightened efforts to clean up and recover underground oil and contaminated groundwater and soil; and impose financial penalties on ExxonMobil.

Pollution at NJ Waterfront Refineries

Date: 06/06/2007 (Date of Opinion)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$0

Disposition: Pending

Synopsis: A New Jersey appeals court ordered Exxon Mobil to pay the state for lost recreational opportunities, such as swimming, fishing and bird watching, resulting from pollution at its waterfront refineries. The state filed suit in 2004 after Exxon Mobil, which had been working since 1991 to clean sites in Linden and Bayonne, balked at its request to also pay for the loss of natural recreation opportunities. Damages will be determined on remand to the trial court.

Indonesian Torture

Date: 06/11/2001 (Date of Filing)

Misconduct Type: Human Rights

Enforcement Agency: Non-Governmental

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$0

Disposition: Pending

Synopsis: The International Labor Rights Fund (ILRF) filed a lawsuit in Washington, D.C. against Exxon Mobil, accusing it of actively abetting human rights violations committed by

Indonesian military units Exxon hired to protect its natural gas fields and pipelines in Aceh province, northern Sumatra. The lawsuit, filed under the Alien Tort Claims Act and the Torture Victims Protection Act, implicates Exxon in the torture of 11 Indonesian villagers in 1997. The villagers claim that Exxon's Indonesian subsidiary allowed its facilities and equipment to be used by the government to kidnap, torture and murder the local population. A trial date has been set for June 2008.

Nationwide MTBE Groundwater Contamination Litigation

Date: 03/12/2008 (Date of Settlement - other cos.)

Misconduct Type: Environment

Enforcement Agency: State/Local

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$0

Disposition: Settlement

Synopsis: A dozen oil companies, including BP America Inc., Chevron Corp., Shell Oil Co. and Valero Energy Corp., agreed to pay over \$423 million to settle litigation with public water providers in 17 states over groundwater contamination from the gasoline additive methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE). The companies also agreed to pay cleanup costs that arise in the next 30 years. Defendant ExxonMobil refused to settle and faces numerous MTBE trials, scheduled to begin in September 2008.

Romdhani v. Exxon Mobil (Religious Discrimination)

Date: 11/05/2007 (Date of Filing)

Misconduct Type: Labor

Enforcement Agency: Non-Governmental

Contracting Party: None

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$0

Disposition: Pending

Synopsis: Sofiene Romdhani, Michelle Maloney and Bobbi Joe Zeller, former employees of an Exxon Mobil gas station in Delaware, filed a federal civil rights suit against the company alleging discrimination, harassment and retaliation. They claim that, because of their Muslim faith, they were targeted by superiors, taunted by co-workers and denied reasonable accommodations to take off for religious observances, and that, despite repeated complaints, Exxon Mobil officials ignored them.