

## Comments

I say AMEN to the fact the financial lending and investor markets are finally getting smart to the industries mentioned in this article. These industries do nothing to change unless they have to after a disaster, and even then, they will revert to business as usual. If these industries start to feel the pain of not being able to secure required financing, because future liabilities put the pay back of the financiers and the investors at risk due to the cost of defending environmental law suites and the cost of the companies being responsible for environmental clean-ups, the companies will make every effort to avoid the aforementioned costs.

### Tony Nocito

Managing Member  
ABCOV Conversion Systems, LLC  
New York, N.Y.



October 5, 2010

## Top Public Companies Cause One-Third of the World's Environmental Damage

The estimated cost of global environmental damage caused by human activity in 2008 is \$6.6 trillion, which is equivalent to 11 percent of global GDP, according to a study released by the UN-backed Principles for Responsible Investment (PRI) and the UN Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP FI). The study also finds that the top 3,000 public companies were responsible for \$2.15 trillion, or about one-third, of all global environmental damage.

The UN groups say the study, conducted by Trucost, is an initial effort to quantify in monetary terms the environmental harm caused by business and the possible future consequences for investor portfolios, fund returns and company earnings.

Another key finding of the study reveals that the most environmentally damaging business sectors are utilities, oil and gas producers, as well as industrial metals and mining. Those three accounted for almost a trillion dollars worth of environmental harm in 2008.

“This report sends a powerful message that the environment is also the business of business. Polluters must pay. Safeguarding the environment and using our natural assets efficiently entail collective action. Cohesive policy and regulation is required to fully account for externalities and speed up the integration of material environmental issues into investment decisions. The bottom line is that if we are to achieve a sustainable global economy, then we must stop drawing down our natural capital,” said Paul Clements-Hunt, Head, UN Environment Programme Finance Initiative.

The study, [“Why environmental externalities matter to institutional investors”](#) (PDF), estimates that the annual environmental damage from water and air pollution, general waste and depleted resources could reach \$28.6 trillion in 2050, or 23 percent lower if clean and resource-efficient technologies are introduced.

Environmental damage costs are typically higher than the cost of preventing or limiting pollution and resource depletion, according to the study. One result is that workers and retirees could see lower pension payments from funds invested in companies exposed to environmental costs.

In addition, as environmental damage and resource depletion increases, and governments start applying a “polluter pays” principle, the value of large portfolios will be impacted by higher insurance premiums on companies, taxes, inflated input prices and the price tags for clean-ups, according to the study.

Study recommendations include collaboration to encourage companies and policy makers to reduce environmental impact, and regular monitoring and reporting from investment managers on how they are addressing exposure to environmental risk.

Other suggestions include targeting laggards or the most influential companies within a sector to drive improvements across an industry, addressing issues related to air pollution, waste and heavy metals, as well as risks to biodiversity and ecosystem services, in addition to greenhouse gas emissions.

## Comments

The article covers a spectrum of EH&S issues, from the best case scenario to the worst case. It is interesting to see how the larger companies are very EH&S conscience and practice environmental sustainability compared to the smaller companies.

The larger deep pocketed companies should keep after external environmental operations, i.e. operations outside of their business, meaning handling of hazardous wastes in their plants and facilities so there is no cradle-to-grave liability, especially with hazardous wastes like asbestos. This effort would be positive to all and would avoid the effects of negative externality.

Good perspective, I look forward to the second article.

### Tony Nocito

Managing Member

ABCOV Conversion Systems, LLC

New York, N.Y.



## Streamlining Environment Health and Safety Programs, Part I · Environmental Leader · Green Business, Sustainable Business, and Green Strategy News for Corporate Sustainability Executives

Increased focus to comply with regulations and the need to manage risks is causing companies to adopt new strategies to streamline Environment Health and Safety (EH&S) programs. Companies are looking for ways to reduce the cost of compliance, improve the safety of people, product, and processes while at the same time surpass corporate goals around brand equity and share holder value. Aberdeen Group surveyed the EH&S group at 230 organizations in April 2010 to understand the performance, strategies and execution capabilities of some of most mature and successful EH&S programs in the industry.

### Market Pressures and Top Performance Revealed

Environmental, health and safety issues are becoming an increasingly important business concern. As new regulations evolve, internal and external stakeholders are increasingly putting their attention on sustainable business, and the need to stay in compliance to these regulations is at top of mind of these companies. The consequences of not being in compliance with EH&S regulations are drastic. It can result in penalties, fines, damage to the brand image, erosion of shareholder value, plant shutdowns, and in some cases even fatalities. Here are four Key Performance Indicators (KPI) criteria to distinguish the best-in-class from industry average and laggard organizations:

Table 1: Top Performers Earn Best-in-Class Status

Definition of Maturity Class	Mean Class Performance
Best-in-Class: Top 20% of aggregate performance scorers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• § 87% Overall Equipment Effectiveness</li><li>• § 1% Repeat Accident Rate</li><li>• § 0.1 Injury Frequency Rate</li><li>• § 10% Reduction in Energy Consumption</li></ul>
Industry Average: Middle 50% of aggregate performance scorers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• § 80% Overall Equipment Effectiveness</li><li>• § 2% Repeat Accident Rate</li><li>• § 0.2 Injury Frequency Rate</li><li>• § 4% Reduction in Energy</li></ul>

Definition of Maturity Class	Mean Class Performance
	Consumption
Laggard: Bottom 30% of aggregate performance scorers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• § 72% Overall Equipment Effectiveness</li> <li>• § 11% Repeat Accident Rate</li> <li>• § 1.3 Injury Frequency Rate</li> <li>• § 0.5% Increase in Energy Consumption</li> </ul>

Source: Aberdeen Group, April 2010

Best-in-class companies are able to effectively manage safety incidents by realizing only 1% repeat accidents and 0.1 injury frequency rate, while at the same time reducing energy consumption by 10%, and performing at 87% OEE. This means that the top companies are not only able to create a safe working environment for their employees but are also able to gain competitive edge in the marketplace by higher operational efficiencies at a reduced overall cost.

From a strategies perspective, there are two major themes that emerge from executing a successful EH&S program, that being: improve visibility into operations and optimizing processes, both being selected by a third of the responding companies as the top two strategies. Organizations understand the importance of improving visibility within operations, and having the capabilities in place to provide visibility to critical EH&S data to the right people, at the right time, and in the right form. Coupled with this, organizations are establishing strategies to use this visibility to optimize their day to day processes such as production, maintenance, and safety, among others.

This strategy aligns well with a certain program manager of a multi-billion dollar healthcare products company. Commenting about their EH&S strategy he states, “our EHS system has been very valuable in helping us better understand our business. We are better able to mitigate risk. And on a higher level, corporate can keep track of what is going on at each facility through the real-time reporting capability – and provide assistance before an adverse event were to occur”

An interesting trend was revealed while analyzing the drivers behind organizations focus on compliance. The research showed that depending on an organization’s maturity class there are different drivers behind their focus on compliance. For the best-in-class, these leaders are concerned with the complexity of managing EH&S compliances across global operations and conforming to the compliance of customer mandates. On the other end of the spectrum, we see that the less mature organizations are more focused on cost.

Laggards see that non-compliance directly impacts their bottom line and they want the pain to stop. In order to overcome the compliance pressures, organizations need to view compliance as more than just a cost-saving exercise, but rather view compliance as a path to better overall performance. Indeed, when organizations are effectively overcoming these pressures, and executing an effective EH&S program, they are more likely to perform at the best-in-class level.

Next month we will run part two of this series, in which we will discuss how best-in-class companies execute the strategies discussed in this article.

*Matthew Littlefield is Senior Research Analyst, [Aberdeen Group](#), [matthew.littlefield@aberdeen.com](mailto:matthew.littlefield@aberdeen.com).*

Mehul Shah, Senior Research Analyst, Aberdeen Group

## Comments

Hats Off to Ms. Cynthia Giles for statement: "we must be diligent in our enforcement efforts and work to ensure that companies are meeting their environmental obligations and for bringing \$3.25 million dollars back to our government. Also, having Plains spend \$41 million on repair to prevent oil spills. This is an ominous forewarning for all company CEOs. CEO are like Ostridges with their heads down in the sand leaving their butts hanging out, i.e. their heads are down always looking at the bottom line, production, production profit, profit would be their mantra. Preventive maintenance health and safety should be watched as much as the bottom line. If it is not, then those Butts, because they are not paying attention, get taken off by a freight train health and safety issues and preventive maintenance issues. CEOs should constantly and diligently monitor these activities. They should be constantly looking for new technologies that help prevent maintenance issues and health issues such as the release of hazardous material or waste. EPA is monitoring and enforcing environmental laws more diligently than ever.

### **Tony Nocito**

Managing Member  
ABCOV Conversion Systems, LLC  
New York, N.Y.

# WASTE & RECYCLING NEWS

## **Company to pay \$41M for oil spill prevention projects**

Aug. 11 -- A company that saw 273,000 barrels of crude oil spill from its 10,000 miles of pipeline in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Kansas over three years has agreed to spend \$41 million in oil spill prevention projects and fines.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Justice Department announced the agreement with Plains All American Pipeline this week.

"In the last year alone, transportation pipelines released more than two million gallons of oil into the environment, posing a serious threat to human health and natural habitats," said Cynthia Giles, assistant administrator for EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance. "These spills -- and the recent pipeline spill in the Kalamazoo River -- remind us that we must be diligent in our enforcement efforts and work to ensure that companies are meeting their environmental obligations."

Between June 2004 and September 2007, more than 273,000 barrels of crude oil spilled from pipelines and one tank owned and operated by Plains, some of which entered navigable waters or adjoining shorelines. The spills ranged in size from 2.5 barrels to 4,500 barrels and most were caused by pipeline corrosion, the EPA said.

As part of the agreement, the Houston-based company must replace or install corrosion control equipment, perform pipeline inspections, assess the integrity of newly acquired pipelines, improve leak detection practices and capabilities, and provide proper training for personnel. Tank improvements are also mandated.

The company must also pay a \$3.25 million fine as part of the agreement.

The agreement, filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, is subject to a 30-day public comment period and approval by the federal court. More information on the settlement is available at [www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/cases/civil/cwa/plainspipeline.html](http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/cases/civil/cwa/plainspipeline.html).

## Comments

CF Industries is a large, well known company that has been around for over 70 years. They are now learning the hard way dealing with their environmental issues. Companies must find an alternative to cradle-to-grave liability, and implant an on-site way to eliminate waste and protect the environment. The environmental departments for companies in the same situation as CF need to search out and find EPA approved technologies that can eliminate hazardous and regulated wastes. If companies like CF do not make an effort to find a solution they will be spending more money over time and and delaying sustainability to our environment. This is the job of every CEO!

### **Mayra Diaz**

ABCOV Conversion Systems, LLC  
New York, N.Y.



### **CF to Spend \$12M to Manage Haz Wastes at Florida Fertilizer Plant**

**Posted By Environmental Leader On August 9, 2010 (7:47 am) In Hazardous Waste, Penalties, Policy**

CF Industries will spend approximately \$12 million to reduce and manage hazardous wastes generated at its Plant City, Fla. phosphoric acid and ammoniated fertilizer manufacturing facility. Under a settlement with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Justice Department to resolve violations under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), CF also is required to pay a civil penalty of more than \$700,000.

EPA says this is the first case concluded under the agency's National Enforcement Initiative for Mining and Mineral Processing.

CF Industries operates a 400-acre phosphogypsum stack and associated ponds for storing mineral processing wastes from its phosphoric acid production operations. Between December 2004 and January 2005, inspectors from EPA and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection found that CF Industries was treating, storing and disposing of hazardous wastes in its stacks and associated ponds without a permit and failing to meet land disposal restrictions.

Since the company also failed to provide adequate financial assurance for closure, long-term care and third-party liability for its facility, it also is required to provide \$163.5 million in financial assurances under the agreement, says EPA.

As part of the settlement, CF Industries has implemented waste containment and spill prevention measures to better manage its wastes, reconfigured scrubbers to eliminate all hazardous wastes from fertilizer manufacturing and reduce ammonia releases to the environment, and constructed a treatment system for hazardous wastes generated in fertilizer operations.

The company also has completed the full site investigation required under the settlement to assess the degree of environmental contamination from the phosphogypsum stacks and ponds.

CF will remove and treat contaminated soils, and implement several management plans to ensure future compliance with RCRA.

EPA says mining and mineral processing facilities generate more toxic and hazardous waste than any other industrial sector, according to the agency's Toxic Release Inventory. Since 2003, EPA has investigated a total of 20 phosphoric acid facilities in seven states.

In April, the EPA proposed to add 16 more chemicals to the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) list of reportable chemicals.

## Comments

This comment is for General Peter W. Chiarelli, I think it is great that the Army has been able to reduce the burden on natural and manmade systems, creating a \$96 million dollar savings. I am also sure that the Army has a magnitude of hazardous waste it deals with. The government's fast track build-up of military bases, facilities, and ships mandated the pervasive use of asbestos. Is the General aware of the amount of money our government has spent on a technology that is EPA approved, non-thermal, simple to operate and destroys all 6 asbestoses in asbestos containing material, the ABCOV process of asbestos destruction. The U.S. Department of Defense has spent \$5 million plus on equipment that is used for the ABCOV process, but sitting idle in Aberdeen Proving Grounds, MD not constructively being used. As BRAC goes forth what is the Army going to do with all the asbestos containing material? Are they going to landfill it on site or off site at taxpayers cost for clean-up at a latter date? Or then turn the on-site landfill into a park for children as they are doing with the Badger Army Ammunition Plant, WI, which was infested with asbestos containing material that was landfilled on site, which taxpayers will pay tp clean-up at a later date. The General seems to be a proactive and astute person who would not leave a stone unturned in his hazardous-waste disposal options? Asbestos is and will be in the future a major problem for the Army to deal with as well as other government facilities with asbestos. Will they make the decision wisely for all and follow the governments own EPA mandate: the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), which dictates treatments that permanently reduce volume, mobility of hazardous substances and Toxicity. Using ABCOV complies with all three requirements of CERCLA. The question is will the general implement technologies to deal with hazardous wastes, such as the ABCOV technology, or will it be: I will be retired by the time those landfills become Superfund Sites This also applies to generals of industry.

### **Tony Nocito**

Managing Member  
ABCOV Conversion Systems, LLC  
New York, N.Y.



### **U.S. Army decreases waste generation by 20% in 2008**

Aug. 9 -- Newly released statistics indicate U.S. Army waste generation dropped by more than 20% from fiscal year 2007 to fiscal year 2008.

The newest Army Sustainability Report shows a drop of 20.5% for solid waste and construction and demolition debris, but also indicates the Army's overall recycling rate for those materials decrease from 65% to 58% year over year.

The Army also indicated that waste diversion from landfills and incinerators helped avoid \$96 million in disposal costs.

"The Army is currently in the midst of its eighth year of protracted conflict. With an eye toward rebalancing the force, sustainability has proven an effective tool for meeting operational requirements, while sustaining facilities and ranges, improving quality of life and reducing the burden on the natural and manmade systems on which we depend," said Gen. Peter W. Chiarelli, vice chief of staff of the Army.

The report is available at <http://www.aepi.army.mil>.

Entire contents copyright 2010 by [Crain Communications Inc.](#) All rights reserved.

## Comments

General Dynamics is a large company; like every large and small company must deal with their environmental issues in a constructive way, i.e. minimize waste and find alternative, on-site means to eliminate hazardous or regulated waste. This should be the primary goal of all environmental personnel. On-site technologies that once and for all eliminate any type of hazardous release should be found and implemented. If a contractor is bidding the environmental clean-up, the requirement to find technologies that eliminate hazardous or regulated waste that carry a cradle-to-grave liability should be put in the bidding document.

### **Tony Nocito**

Managing Member

ABCOV Conversion Systems, LLC

New York, N.Y.



### **General Dynamics pays fine to settle haz waste issues**

Aug. 6 -- General Dynamics Ordnance and Tactical Systems Inc. is paying a \$38,500 civil penalty to settle alleged hazardous waste regulation violations at its Red Lion, Pa., site.

The company was cited for allegedly operating a hazardous waste storage facility without a permit and failure to make hazardous waste determinations. The company also was cited for allegedly storing hazardous waste in containers that were not kept closed during storage and failing to perform weekly container storage area inspections, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency said. General Dynamics also allegedly failed to minimize the possibility of any release of hazardous waste.

The settlement penalty "reflects the company's compliance efforts, and its cooperation with EPA in the investigation and resolution of this matter," the EPA said. The company has certified it is now in compliance.

Entire contents copyright 2010 by [Crain Communications Inc.](#) All rights reserved.

## Comments

The Backridge Landfill expansion will last (7) years and according to EPA landfills in general only have a life span of 25 years. This is a dilemma that we face as a country and as individuals. We should all be diligent in recycling every thing we can. There is no question that landfill space will become scarcer and scarcer---this is a fact. It is also up to industry to recycle waste from their operations internally and externally, i.e. emissions, environmental clean-ups, unregulated and Hazardous-regulated waste. With EPA's enforcement of Section 108(b) Of the Comprehensive Environmental Response and Liability Act (CERCLA) requiring financial assurance for hazardous waste releases, companies must remain vigilant to search out technologies that reduce, recycle and reuse hazardous-regulated waste. These technologies should be used on site preventing dissemination of a hazardous waste and an incalculable expense to the bottom line. There is such a technology that is used on-site, as the asbestos is being removed, EPA approved and non-thermal, the ABCOV process. The ABCOV process stops all asbestos liability once used. Companies should seek out and test all onsite technologies that provide the removal of hazards from our biosphere.

### **Tony Nocito**

Managing Member

ABCOV Conversion Systems, LLC

New York, N.Y.



### **Backridge landfill expansion approved in Missouri**

Aug. 6 – A permit to construct a horizontal expansion at the Backridge landfill in Lewis County, Mo., has been issued by the Missouri Department of Natural Resources.

The landfill, owned by BFI Waste Systems of Missouri, is about 1.7 miles south of LaGrange, the agency said.

BFI Waste Systems of Missouri is a subsidiary of Republic Services Inc. of Phoenix, the nation's second largest solid waste management company.

The state previously said the landfill has a disposal area of 30 acres on a 70-acre site, and the permit would allow the disposal area to increase to 34 acres. This adds seven years of operating life to the location.

Entire contents copyright 2010 by [Crain Communications Inc.](#) All rights reserved.



## Comments

According to an EPA study, landfill life is 25 to 30 years. EPA constantly makes an effort to clean-up Superfund with the funding they receive, all being tax payer dollars. The enforcement of Section 108 (b) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability ACT (CERCLA) and the reinstatement of the environmental tax would support EPA's Superfund Clean-up efforts. The only problem is that when EPA cleans up one site they transport it to another that has the possibility of becoming a Superfund site making the government the Personal Responsible Party, which leaves our children to pay for the clean-up. EPA should seek out permanent solutions to the clean-up of a site that do not carry the cradle-to-grave liability that asbestos carries. Especially an asbestos site. There is an available on site non-thermal, EPA approved technology that does rid a site of asbestos once in for all.

### **Tony Nocito**

Managing Member  
ABC OV Conversion Systems, LLC  
291 Broadway, NY, NY 10007



### **Asbestos dump can be removed from Superfund site list**

Aug. 3 -- An asbestos dump Superfund site in Long Hill and Harding townships in Morris County, N.J., has been cleaned, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency said.

"The risk from the asbestos at this site has been addressed and now the site can come off the Superfund list," said EPA Regional Administrator Judith Enck. "Our assessment found that the cleanup was successful, clearing the way for the deletion of this property from the list of the country's most hazardous waste sites."

The dump site actually consisted of four separate properties in three distinct areas covering a total of 60 acres.

Several different manufacturing companies disposed of waste products containing asbestos between 1927 and 1975 throughout the site. National Gypsum Co. is the responsible party for the site, the U.S. EPA said.

The site's properties are currently owned by the state of New Jersey, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and private parties. The site was placed on the Superfund list in 1983.

Entire contents copyright 2010 by [Crain Communications Inc.](#) All rights reserved.

## Comments

Appropriately, the CEOs of companies will have to ask their environmental department heads to include environmental sustainability in their external hazardous waste disposal, i.e. non-internal to their operations, in order to practice complete sustainability. This would require alternative solutions to permanently rid the company of hazardous releases with no future liabilities attached, preferably ones that do not allow the hazards to leave the premises.

When external hazards are being released from a site, CEOs should require a constant vigilance to seek out and implement technologies that will constructively support their environmental initiatives and that will mitigate future cradle-to-grave liabilities.

[Tony Nocito](#) | [August 2nd, 2010](#)



Large U.S. companies continue to be involved in sustainability, and most companies see an alignment between sustainability and their overall business strategy, according to a new report and related podcast from Deloitte.

The Deloitte report, “Sustainability in Business Today: A Cross-Industry View,” and podcast, “Three Things Your Chief Sustainability Officer Won’t Tell You,” also find that many companies have a gap between their leaders’ sustainability aspirations and the way that sustainability is enabled within their organizations.

The survey indicates the importance of sustainability to the future of the respondents’ businesses and the challenges that sustainability leaders face in trying to align their organizations sustainability practices with their principles.

Among survey respondents, all but three said their sustainability priorities were at least partially aligned with their organizations’ business priorities, says Deloitte. However, a number of respondents noted that alignment was an ongoing process that occurred at different rates in different areas of the business.

BSR’s report, “The New Frontier in Sustainability: The Business Opportunity in Tackling Sustainable Consumption (PDF),” identifies opportunities for companies to deal with sustainable consumption through three key parts of the business value cycle — product design, consumer engagement and use, and end-of-use.

“For years, sustainable consumption has been framed as a limitation on business,” says Aron Cramer, BSR president and CEO, who recently led a workshop on the subject. “But in a world where our consumption patterns outpace the planet’s ability to regenerate resources by 30 percent, businesses that figure out how to deliver enhanced value by radically reducing material inputs and engaging consumers on product use will be well-positioned for success.”

As an example, cited by BSR, design choice for things like material weight and packaging have direct impacts on transportation costs and fuel use, while choices about energy efficiency directly impact energy consumption in a product’s use phase.

In some cases, a focus on sustainable consumption may result in a significant redesign of familiar products, and in other cases, there may be an opportunity to deliver the same value through services (such as car-sharing) rather than products (such as car sales), says BSR.

Findings from these two surveys fall in line with an earlier survey of CEOs released by the United Nations Global Compact and Accenture that found 93 percent of respondents see sustainability as crucial to their future success.

## Comments

Each one of the industries mentioned in this article are laden with asbestos. All of the aforementioned industries have asbestos in their facilities, and all of the aforementioned industries have asbestos liabilities, whether they are in their facilities, in a landfill or have caused exposure to humans who have contracted asbestoses or mesothelioma. Now that EPA must enforce Financial Assurance Requirements under Section 108(b). How will a company show that they can provide financial assurance for the worst environmental tragedy in history the use of asbestos. For any dangerous hazard on site treatments should be required by the CEO of a company to be searched out and used. The ABCOV process of asbestos destruction is such a process. It destroys asbestos in a period of 2 hrs or less, is done on site (no asbestos trucking through neighborhoods), EPA approved, non-thermal. I have found that the aforementioned industries are the hardest to change in their ways of dealing with hazards. The environmental tax should help the CEO think about how to best deal with this tax by finding on-site treatment solutions to all hazardous releases. The CEO who cures the ill before it leaves his premises, is a CEO with the most insight.

[Tony Nocito](#) | [July 28th, 2010](#)

June 22, 2010

### ***EPA Supports Superfund Tax Reinstatement***

[Email This Post](#) [Add your comments](#)



The EPA is supporting a reinstatement of the Superfund “polluter pays” tax, according to an agency [press release](#). Superfund is the federal government’s program that investigates and cleans up uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous waste sites.

According to the agency, the provision would provide a stable, dedicated source of revenue for the program and increase the pace of Superfund cleanup. The tax was allowed to lapse in 1995. According to a Bloomberg report, Congress has provided \$1.2 billion a year since then to fund cleanup of the sites, though costs usually run to \$3 billion.

The administration is proposing to reinstate the taxes as they were last in effect on crude oil, imported petroleum products, hazardous chemicals, and imported substances that use hazardous chemicals as a feedstock, and on corporate modified alternative minimum taxable income. Under the administration’s proposal, the excise taxes and corporate environmental taxes would be reinstated for a period of 10 years beginning in January 2011.

The American Chemical Council [attacked](#) the plan, saying chemical companies have already paid enough to clean up polluted sites and should not be taxed further. Sen. Jim Inhofe of Oklahoma opposes the tax, which would target the oil and gas and chemical sector, even in cases where companies are not directly responsible for the pollution of a site.

But cleanup of the sites has [slowed considerably](#) since the fund ran out of money in 2003. Only 19 sites were completed last year, compared to 89 in 1999. There are [1,279 sites](#) on the list.

The EPA also announced that it would be delaying the implementation of lead paint rules for companies.

## Comments:

**Tue, Jul 27, 2010 Tony Nocito New York City, New York**

W.R. Grace has worked on a process that destroys asbestos, but the process only destroyed one type of asbestos, Chrysotile (Serpentine). The driver behind the research and development of this process was the multi-millions, if not a billions, of square feet of asbestos spray-on fireproofing containing Chrysotile asbestos, in a fireproofing product developed and sold, throughout the world, by Grace, sprayed on beams and decking in buildings. Grace could not meet EPA approval on the process, because the process did not fall under the Clean Air Act standard for asbestos destruction. Grace is faced with many sites that have spray-on fireproofing as well as vermiculite from Libby Montana, and the Libby, Montana site itself. W.R. Grace is very aware of the ABCOV process of asbestos destruction that works on all 6 forms of asbestos in asbestos containing material. Grace also knows that ABCOV is a non-thermal, EPA approved process that stops all asbestos liability when used. Grace and Oldon are going to clean-up the Easthampton, Mass site only to put it in a another site ---- a landfill. Landfill regulation requires a cell for asbestos, when the asbestos is dumped from the height of a trailer it could create dust. As the signs posted outside an asbestos landfill explicitly explain the dangers of asbestos. Also, the landfill has a possibility of becoming a Superfund site that will need to be cleaned up at a later date. The EPA states that all hazardous wastes carry future costs. Gussess who will pay for those future costs-----taxpayers.



### **Grace, Oldon to Clean Up Asbestos in Easthampton, Mass.**

- Jul 20, 2010

W. R. Grace & Co. and Oldon Limited Partnership have agreed to pay an estimated \$833,000 to clean asbestos-contaminated soil at a site in Easthampton, Mass. They also agreed to pay the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's past cleanup costs of \$72,537.

The 2.3-acre site is located in a mixed residential, commercial and agricultural area and includes a facility owned by Oldon. Grace leased the facility, located on Wemelco Way, from Oldon between 1963 and 1992. During that time, Grace received asbestos-contaminated vermiculite concentrate from the Zonolite mine in Libby, Mont., and produced Zonolite attic insulation and fireproofing material.

Investigations by EPA have identified asbestos contamination at the facility including asbestos-contaminated soil behind the vacant building on the eastern half of the property and residual asbestos contamination inside the building. The settlement agreement requires this contaminated soil and the interior of the building to be cleaned up. The parties are also responsible for cleaning up asbestos-contaminated soils discovered on a railroad right-of-way owned by the town that is slated to become a bike trail, as well as soil on other properties immediately adjacent to the facility.

“The parties involved in this site have stepped up to the plate in cleaning their own facility,” said Curt Spalding, regional administrator of EPA’s New England office. “This kind of action helps protect the environment and public health and we applaud them for taking responsibility.”