



August 3, 2006

Ms. Claudia Bridgeford
US Senate Finance Committee
Washington, DC 20510

Re: S. 2805

Dear Ms. Bridgeford,

Albemarle Corporation is writing today to ask for denial of a duty suspension request for 2,6 DTBP as described in S. 2805. Albemarle is a manufacturer of specialty chemicals that include brominated flame retardants for computers and televisions as well as bulk ibuprofen. We are headquartered in Richmond, Virginia with facilities also in Orangeburg, South Carolina, Pasadena, Texas, Tyrone, Pennsylvania, Dayton, Ohio, Magnolia Arkansas and Baton Rouge, Louisiana. We have 1300 employees in the US and \$2.5 billion in sales annually.

One of the products we produce for the plastics industry is 2,6-di-tert-butylphenol, also known as 2,6 DTBP. This chemical is used as an antioxidant in lubricants and fuels, as an intermediate for antioxidants used in plastics, and as an intermediate in fragrances and skin care products. We manufacture this product in Orangeburg, South Carolina where we have 500 employees.

Approval of this duty suspension would adversely affect our US market for this very competitive product as well as our US manufacturing facility in Orangeburg. Albemarle operates a production facility in Orangeburg capable of producing tens of thousands of metric tons and could easily supply additional quantities for this US customer.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Little

Barbara A. Little
Vice President, Government Relations
Albemarle Corporation
1155 15th St., N.W.
Suite 611
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 223-1848
Barbara_Little@albemarle.com



August 14, 2006

The Honorable Charles Grassley
Chairman, Committee on Finance
United States Senate
219 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-6200

The Honorable Max Baucus
Ranking Member
United States Senate
219 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-6200

Re: S. 2805

Dear Chairman Grassley and Senator Baucus:

SI Group, Inc. is writing to express our objection to S. 2805, which seeks to temporarily suspend the duty on imports of the chemical commonly known as 2,6-DTBP (2,6-Di-tert-butylphenol). 2,6-DTBP is a key raw material in the manufacture of antioxidants that are used in plastics, rubber, lubricants and other products. 2,6-DTBP is the primary building block and key ingredient in the effectiveness of the antioxidant to protect materials from degradation.

SI Group is a global producer of specialty chemicals with domestic manufacturing facilities in New York, Texas and Tennessee, and over 2,300 employees worldwide including 520 employees in the U.S. We are headquartered in the Upstate New York region, and are one of the largest employers in this region. A significant portion of our workforce is dedicated to the manufacture of 2,6-DTBP at our facility in Freeport, Texas, and has been for twenty years.

Over the past several years, we have made significant investments in expanding our 2,6-DTBP production capacity, in improving the safety of our 2,6-DTBP operation, and in reducing the impact of our manufacturing operations on the environment. Our primary competitors for 2,6-DTBP are in Russia and other Asian countries. We believe that these competitors have not invested as heavily in improving safety and protecting the environment. As a result, overseas producers are able to sell 2,6-DTBP at a significant discount to U.S. market rates. The purpose of the original 2,6-DTBP duty was to help level the playing field for U.S. manufacturers. These same competitive pressures continue today.

If the duty on 2,6-DTBP is suspended, U.S. manufacturers of this product will suffer a loss of market share to foreign competitors. The consequential financial impact to SI Group's 2,6-DTBP business could be severe. Furthermore, an erosion of the U.S. based 2,6-DTBP industry could have a collateral adverse effect on U.S. antioxidant producers. Many foreign producers of 2,6 DTBP also produce and sell antioxidants globally. Increasing the earnings of foreign competitors through an improved position on 2,6 DTBP will enhance their overall competitive position *vis-à-vis* U.S. based antioxidant producers.