



Article published Mar 16, 2006

**YOUR OPINION**

**Thursday**

**On target**

Critics of Buckeye Florida's environmental record over the past 45 years seem to be pretty much right on the mark. And a recent Star-Banner article ("Wastewater plant critics miss mark on quality," Feb. 26) serves to prove it.

The wildlife that depend upon the Fenholloway River for their very existence could care less about "percent reductions" in wastewater quality and quantity. The proof for wildlife is how long can they hold their breath until "further scientific studies" are completed.

Just to put things into perspective for the environmental activist, the so-called "additional scientific study," almost always in five-year increments, is a covert tactic used many times over to delay any real action by polluters.

The article's statement that 14 years and "many Fenholloway public hearings involving thousands of people, and numerous scientific studies of the river costing millions of dollars" proves what the environment is worth to the citizens of Florida.

The Clean Water Act was passed in 1972. What was Buckeye doing for the 20 years before they got started, under duress, to clean up their act 14 years ago? The "legal wrangling," as the article puts it, served their purpose of infinite delay to a T. And, it would be a point of added interest to the public to follow the money trail to see how Buckeye came to own 6,700 acres of public wetlands to use as a "treatment plant" for its wastewater. How and where does this fit into a wastewater treatment feasibility study or design plan, which seems to be at further expense to Florida's environment?

If one examines Buckeye's environmental record going back to the 1950s, I would say Linda Young and the Clean Water Network of Florida are right on the mark on the characterization of the questionable efforts by Buckeye to clean up the Fenholloway River and environs.

Harold T. Sansing  
Dunnellon