

# Robert Armstrong

---

August 6, 2006

Sent Via Fax (951) 358-5017 & USPS

Grover Trask, District Attorney  
**The District Attorney's Office**  
4075 Main Street  
Riverside, CA 92501

**RE: 230 S. Linclon Avenue Shell**

Dear Grover Trask:

On June 14, 2006 I met with Joseph Asbury regarding the matter of a possible environmental crime committed at a Shell station in Corona. It is my understanding that Shell Oil Company has "offered your office its full and complete cooperation in finding any abandoned equipment at 230 S. Lincoln and 1610 W. Sixth Street that are owned and operated by Satish Chopra."

It is also my understanding that Shell conducted an above floor GPR test that "failed" "due to concrete thickness and rebar" (the reinforcing steel in the concrete slab). In that I do work for an underground contractor that did all the underground work for the Ontario Mills Mall, I was able to show Joseph Asbury a simple way to do a GPR test in "pure dirt" from the side, below the grade of the concrete slab at the 230 S. Lincoln (the same test can also be done at the 1610 W. Sixth street location). See "The Solution" at **SeeitReal.com**. In that your office may not be familiar with the ease in which a "definitive non-failing GPR" can be conducted, I elected to make a website to demonstrate why I think Shell Oil did a failed test and is trying to deceive your office into believing it is the only test that can be conducted to find the items in question at those locations. As you can see from the attached letter and by going to the website, nothing could be further from the truth.

I am sure your office gets its share of individuals and corporations trying to hide the facts and evidence from your investigators. I trust **SeeitReal.com** will help your office in finding the truth in why Shell Oil Company would try such a maneuver over a single station in Corona. I am also confident your office will do the right thing in this matter and do the right test with Shell's expressed cooperation and "offer to do what ever testing is needed at Shell's expense." If I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to ask.

Regards,



Robert Armstrong

RA/pc/bcc

# Robert Armstrong

---

August 5, 2006

David Sexton, President  
**Shell Oil Products US**  
1 Shell Plaza, 910 Louisiana St.  
Houston, TX 77002

Sent via Fax (713) 241-7171  
& Email: d.sexton@shell.com

## RE: Notice of Impending Publication

Dear David Sexton:

I believe you take the Texaco problem seriously, serious enough to try and hide it by doing a failed GPR test. To end any confusion over that test, I created a website **SeeitReal.com** to expose Shell's attempt to cover up what I have been trying to get Shell to fix for a year now.

The other issue is the reason behind Shell selling all its service stations. I believe it is expressed quite clearly by Shell employees saying, "When Shell gets fined it pays millions and when retailers get fined they pay thousands" (visit **SeeitReal.com** for the complete explanation). Above is a card to direct Shell retailers to the website (for "select locations" only as it's free to fax or email the web address to anyone else).



**Shell Retailers**

Shell Oil is selling all its service stations. What they may not have told you is the true **failure rate of Shell's gasoline containment systems.**

If you purchased your station you or your lawyer should check it out at **SeeitReal.com**.

**It's "Real" so if you want to "See it"...**

**On your computer Go to SeeitReal.com**

It would be best for everyone if you and I cooperate. In that interest, I give Shell 10 days to get back to me, no later than August 16<sup>th</sup> with Shell's action plan to address this matter. After that, I will broadly publicize **SeeitReal.com**. No one else will be looking at this site for the 10 day period (other than the Riverside District Attorney and my own counsel), so if Shell has any objections speak now or forever hold your peace. **The issue is simple:** Is the equipment there or not? A definitive test proves it either way.

**Here's the simple reason you and I are fighting over Satish Chopra's station(s) in Corona:** You are a President for the 3<sup>rd</sup> largest corporation in the history of the human race. If you thought the equipment wasn't there, the test would not have failed. Accordingly, the mere fact that the test "failed" is evidence that the test was "deceptive." It's not too much to expect the public and the District Attorney to understand that fact.

This is the "tipping point" that caused you to meet with me. Please do not continue to misread Shell's ability to escape this issue. Absent a legitimate plan from Shell to meet your environmental responsibilities in Corona (the failed GPR test shows Shell's real intention and **SeeitReal.com** shows mine), this matter will get addressed and heard by the broadest possible means. David Sexton, you are on the wrong side of the truth in this issue. I believe the Shell board, the public and the District attorney will be able to see that fact given **SeeitReal.com**.

There is no reason in the world Shell cannot do a definitive test in Corona other than to hide an environmental crime once discovered will cause Shell to cleanup some number of 13,000 former Texaco stations. It's time to do a definitive test and prove what you say or prove what I say. If you weren't hiding it, it would have been done long ago.

Regards,



Robert Armstrong

cc: Riverside District Attorney  
RA/pc/bcc

# TAG

# Fax

To: Joseph Asbury – District Attorney’s Office From: Robert Armstrong

---

Fax: 951.358.5070 Pages: 2

---

Phone: Date: June 21, 2006

---

Re: Santa Ana Water Board Response CC:

---

Urgent     For Review     Please Comment     Please Reply     Please Recycle

---

Attached is for your information.

It was nice to meet you. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to ask.

---

# Robert Armstrong

---

June 21, 2006

Sent via Fax & USPS: (951) 782-4130

Kurt V. Berchtold  
**California Regional Water Quality Control Board**  
**Santa Ana Region**  
3737 Main Street 500  
Riverside, CA 92501

**RE: Request for Additional Evidence**

Dear Mr. Berchtold:

In response to your 6/16/06 letter, on June 14, 2006 I met with an investigator with the Riverside County District Attorney's Bureau of Investigation Environmental Crimes unit. I gave him the same information I have tried to give the attorneys for the State Water Resources Control Board. It is my understanding that Shell did a failed GPR test that none of you had the courtesy to tell me about, in spite of my persistent requests that you facilitate that test. I sincerely believe that follows a pattern of protection the State Water Resources Control Board has granted to Shell Oil Company in this matter. A lack of transparency in this affair benefits Shell Oil and not the citizens of California.

I do not wish to speak for the Riverside District Attorney's Office, so I will refrain from characterizing what we talked about. The DA's office appears to be the means to discover the truth. For the record, I was able to advise them of a way to do the test that would bypass any interference from the depth of the concrete slab or the rebar. There is also at least two other ways to do the GPR test using different techniques and equipment. I find it ridiculous that an ex-Texaco Marketing Representative has to tell Shell Oil Company what to do. Accordingly, I openly allege that Shell, being the third largest corporation in the world, is being deceptive in any representation that the above floor GPR test they did was the best and only means for finding the equipment in question. More over, I openly allege the test Shell did was conducted as a means of deception to the truth in order for Shell to not have to address fixing some number of the 13,000 Texaco stations Shell purchased. A proper equipment and expertly executed 3D GPR test should allow reading the "survey cube" from the bottom up in spite of the rebar interference and would find the items.

To back up that claim, I would be willing to conduct a 3D above floor GPR test with different equipment and personnel and pay for it myself. However, I gave the District Attorney's Office a means of conducting the test that bypasses the argument of slab depth and metal interference altogether. In that I have agreed to fully cooperate in any manner possible with the District Attorney, I suggest we let the DA's Office do their work. I am, however, at your complete disposal if and when the District Attorney's Office is unable to maintain Shell's cooperation in this matter or otherwise pursue the interests of Riverside County in this affair. If you have any specific questions in the interim, I will gladly answer them. In any event, if I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to ask. I am sure between the DA's Office and myself we can meet whatever needs you may have to act according to your mandate and public responsibilities.

Regards,



Robert Armstrong

cc: Riverside District Attorney

bcc/RA/pc