

## **President Obama on Chemical Security 2006 to the Present**

### **1) White House web site: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/homeland\\_security/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/homeland_security/) (Accessed July 14, 2009)**

"We will invest in our Nation's most pressing short and long-term infrastructure needs, including modernizing our electrical grid; upgrading our highway, rail, maritime, and aviation infrastructure; enhancing security within our chemical and nuclear sectors; and safeguarding the public transportation systems that Americans use every day."

[http://www.barackobama.com/issues/homeland\\_security/index\\_campaign.php](http://www.barackobama.com/issues/homeland_security/index_campaign.php)

"Secure our Chemical Plants: Chemical plants are potential terrorist targets because they are often located near cities, are relatively easy to attack, and contain multi-ton quantities of hazardous chemicals. As president, Barack Obama will work with all stakeholders to enact permanent federal chemical security regulations."

### **2) White House Transition web site:**

**[http://change.gov/agenda/homeland\\_security\\_agenda](http://change.gov/agenda/homeland_security_agenda)**

"Secure our Chemical Plants: Work with all stakeholders to enact permanent federal chemical plant security regulations."

### **3) On October 30, 2008 on MSNBC: <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/27464980/>**

"I think that chemical plant security is another where the chemical industry has been resistant to mandates when it comes to hardening their sites. But, you know what? If you've got a chemical plant that threatens 100,000, or a million people in New Jersey, we better have some say in terms of how serious they are about guarding that facility.

"Well, I think it's a classic example of special interests lobbying. There has been resistance from the chemical industry. And it is this -- again, an ideological predisposition that says regulation's always bad. So, stay out of the market place. Well, look. I am a strong believer in the free market. I am a strong believer in capitalism. But, I am also a strong believer that there are certain common goods that you know -- our air, our water, making sure that people are safe -- that require us to have some regulation."

### **4) On September 26, 2008 in the first debate with Senator McCain he said,**

"We've got to make sure that we're hardening our chemical sites."

### **5) On September 10, 2008 Obama told Letterman,**

"if we had started hardening our chemical plants and our ports in ways we still haven't done and implemented the 9/11 Commission reports then, we couldn't guarantee that 9/11's not repeated, but we would be further along in making sure that America was safe."

**6) In “Change We Can Believe In Barack Obama’s Plan to Renew America’s Promise,” 2008, p. 116:**

“Secure our chemical plants by setting a clear set of federal regulations that all plants must follow, including improving barriers, containment, mitigation and safety training, and where possible, using safer technology, such as less toxic chemicals.”

**7) In response to Greenpeace's 2008 questionnaire to presidential candidates, Senator Obama said:**

"Yes. I introduced legislation in 2006 with Sen. Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ) to require facilities to use safer chemicals or processes whenever feasible. The Chemical Safety and Security Act would establish a clear set of federal regulations that all chemical plants must follow. The bill requires chemical facilities to enhance security, including improving barriers, containment, mitigation, and safety training, and, where possible, using safer technology, such as less toxic chemicals. It also included protections for wastewater treatment and drinking water treatment facilities, and makes clear that state and local governments are not preempted from adopting chemical security protections stronger than federal law."

**8) In response to the League of Conservation Voter's 2008 questionnaire to presidential candidates, Senator Obama said:**

"In March 2006, I joined with Senator Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ) to introduce a tough chemical plant security bill that contains many of the provisions in H.R. 5695."

**9) On June 21, 2006, in his opening statement at a Senate Environment and Public Works Committee hearing on IST:**

[http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Hearings.Choose&Hearing\\_id=d04878fe-802a-23ad-4b6e-5dfc40f1f744](http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Hearings.Choose&Hearing_id=d04878fe-802a-23ad-4b6e-5dfc40f1f744)

"Thank you, Chairman Inhofe and Ranking Member Jeffords for holding this hearing. I only wish that we could have held it sooner, before this Committee passed what I believe is an insufficient wastewater security bill and before the Senate Homeland Security Committee passed chemical plant security legislation that did not include strong IST provisions.

"I believe that IST is an integral part of chemical plant security, and I welcome a thorough debate of this issue. Because I think a lot of misleading arguments have been made about what IST is and isn't, and it's important to clear up these misconceptions..."

"But there is one thing we can all agree on: any chemical plant security legislation must be comprehensive and rational. It should balance the need to keep us safe with the need to continue producing chemical products that are essential to our economy. I believe the IST approach needs to be a part of rational comprehensive security legislation."

**10) On March 29, 2006 Announces chemical security legislation.**

<http://obamaspeeches.com/059-Improving-Chemical-Plant-Security-Obama-Podcast.htm>

[http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Improving\\_Chemical\\_Plant\\_Security](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Improving_Chemical_Plant_Security)

"It's a travesty that the 9/11 Commission, in looking at what has been done over the last five years gave us basically an "F" when it came to chemical plant security. So what I've done working with Senator Frank Lautenberg from New Jersey, is to introduce legislation that would protect our communities from this potential threat but in a balanced way.

There are features in this bill that I think have to be part of any chemical security legislation passed by this Congress, and Congress has to go ahead and actually act on legislation in this area.

"So, here are a couple things that the bill does. Number one: it establishes a general duty to improve security at facilities storing threshold amounts of chemicals. What that means is that chemical facilities would have to take steps to improve security including improving barriers, containment, mitigation, safety training, and where possible, use safer technology. That is known as Inherent Safer Technology, or 'IST,' what that means is essentially, plants should use less toxic chemicals, and employ safer procedures where possible."

**11) On March 30, 2006 on the Senate floor as he co-sponsored S. 2486, Senator Obama said,**

"But there are other ways to reduce risk that need to be part of the equation. Specifically, by employing safer technologies, we can reduce the attractiveness of chemical plants as a target.

"This concept, known as Inherently Safer Technology, involves methods such as changing the flow of chemical processes to avoid dangerous chemical byproducts, reducing the pressures or temperatures of chemical reactions to minimize the risk of explosions, reducing inventories of dangerous chemicals and replacing dangerous chemicals with benign ones. Each one of these methods reduces the danger that chemical plants pose to our communities and makes them less appealing targets for terrorists.

"Unfortunately, the chemical industry has been lobbying nonstop on this bill. They do not want IST, they do not want protection of state laws and they do not want strict regulations. So far, because the industry wields so much influence in Washington, it's been getting its way.

"This is wrong. We cannot allow chemical industry lobbyists to dictate the terms of this debate. We cannot allow our security to be hijacked by corporate interests."