

FUEL TECH, INC.
Form 10-K
March 05, 2008
Table of Contents

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-K

(Mark One)

ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 [NO FEE REQUIRED]

For the fiscal year ended: December 31, 2007

OR

TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 [NO FEE REQUIRED]

For the transition period from _____ to _____

Commission File No. 000-33059

Fuel Tech, Inc.

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Delaware

20-5657551

(State or other jurisdiction of incorporation (I.R.S. Employer Identification Number) of organization)

Fuel Tech, Inc.
512 Kingsland Drive
Batavia, IL 60510-2299
630-845-4500

(Address and telephone number of principal executive offices)

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

Common Stock \$0.01 par value per share
(Title of Class)

The NASDAQ Stock Market, Inc
(Name of Exchange on Which Registered)

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act: None

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act.

Yes No

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Act.

Yes No

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of the registrant's knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K.

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant: (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days.

Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act).

Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, non-accelerated filer or a smaller reporting company (as defined in rule 12b-2 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934)

Large Accelerated Filer Accelerated Filer Non-accelerated Filer (Do not check if a smaller reporting company) Smaller reporting company

The aggregate market value of the voting stock held by non-affiliates of the registrant based on the average bid and asked prices of June 29, 2007 was \$606,931,000. The aggregate market value of the voting stock held by non-affiliates of the registrant based on the average bid and asked prices of February 4, 2008 was \$343,585,000.

Indicate number of shares outstanding of each of the registered classes of Common Stock at February 4, 2008: 22,415,064 shares of Common Stock, \$0.01 par value.

Documents incorporated by reference:

Certain portions of the Proxy Statement for the annual meeting of stockholders to be held in 2007 are incorporated by reference in Parts II, III, and IV hereof.

Table of Contents**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
<u>PART I</u>	
<u>Item 1.</u>	<u>Business</u> 1
<u>Item 1A.</u>	<u>Risk Factors</u> 6
<u>Item 1B.</u>	<u>Unresolved Staff Comments</u> 7
<u>Item 2.</u>	<u>Properties</u> 7
<u>Item 3.</u>	<u>Legal Proceedings</u> 7
<u>Item 4.</u>	<u>Submission of Matters to Vote of Security Holders</u> 7
<u>PART II</u>	
<u>Item 5.</u>	<u>Market for Registrant’s Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchase of Equity Securities</u> 8
<u>Item 6.</u>	<u>Selected Financial Data</u> 10
<u>Item 7.</u>	<u>Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u> 11
<u>Item 7A.</u>	<u>Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk</u> 18
<u>Item 8.</u>	<u>Financial Statements and Supplementary Data</u> 19
<u>Item 9.</u>	<u>Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants and Financial Disclosure</u> 45
<u>Item 9A.</u>	<u>Controls and Procedures</u> 45
<u>Item 9B.</u>	<u>Other Information</u> 45
<u>PART III</u>	
<u>Item 10.</u>	<u>Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance</u> 46
<u>Item 11.</u>	<u>Executive Compensation</u> 47
<u>Item 12.</u>	<u>Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters</u> 47
<u>Item 13.</u>	<u>Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence</u> 47
<u>Item 14.</u>	<u>Principal Accounting Fees and Services</u> 47
<u>PART IV</u>	
<u>Item 15.</u>	<u>Exhibits and Financial Statement Schedules</u> 48
<u>Signatures and Certifications</u>	51

Table of Contents

TABLE OF DEFINED TERMS

Term	Definition
ABC	American Bailey Corporation
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990
CAIR	Clean Air Interstate Rule
CAVR	Clean Air Visibility Rule
CDT	Clean Diesel Technologies, Inc.
CFD	Computational Fluid Dynamics
Common Shares	Shares of the Common Stock of Fuel Tech
Common Stock	Common Stock of Fuel Tech
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EPRI	Electric Power Research Institute
FUEL CHEM®	A trademark used to describe Fuel Tech’s fuel and flue gas treatment processes, including its TIFI™ Targeted In-Furnace Injection™ technology to control slagging, fouling, corrosion and a variety of sulfur trioxide-related issues
Fuel Tech	Fuel Tech, Inc. and its subsidiaries
Investors	The purchasers of Fuel Tech securities pursuant to a Securities Purchase Agreement as of March 23, 1998
Loan Notes	Nil Coupon Non-redeemable Convertible Unsecured Loan Notes of Fuel Tech
NO _x	Oxides of nitrogen
NO _x OUT CASCADE®	A trademark used to describe Fuel Tech’s combination of NO _x OUT and SCR
NO _x OUT® Process	A trademark used to describe Fuel Tech’s SNCR process for the reduction of NO _x
NO _x OUT-SCR®	A trademark used to describe Fuel Tech’s direct injection of urea as a catalyst reagent

NOxOUT ULTRA®	A trademark used to describe Fuel Tech's process for generating ammonia for use as SCR reagent
Rich Reagent Injection Technology (RRI)	An SNCR-type process that broadens the NOx reduction capability of the NOxOUT Process at a cost similar to NOxOUT. RRI can also be applied on a stand-alone basis.
SCR	Selective Catalytic Reduction
SIP Call	State Implementation Plan Regulation
SNCR	Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction
TCI™ Targeted Corrosion Inhibition™	A FUEL CHEM program designed for high-temperature slag and corrosion control, principally in waste-to-energy boilers
TIFI™ Targeted In-Furnace Injection™	A proprietary technology that enables the precise injection of a chemical reagent into a boiler or furnace as part of a FUEL CHEM program

Table of Contents

iv

Table of Contents

PART I

Forward Looking Statements

Statements in this Form 10-K that are not historical facts, so-called "forward-looking statements," are made pursuant to the safe harbor provisions of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. Investors are cautioned that all forward-looking statements involve risks and uncertainties, including those detailed in Fuel Tech's filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission. See "Risk Factors" in Item 1A.

ITEM 1. BUSINESS

Fuel Tech

Fuel Tech, Inc. ("Fuel Tech") is a fully integrated company that uses a suite of advanced technologies to provide boiler optimization, efficiency improvement and air pollution reduction and control solutions to utility and industrial customers worldwide. Originally incorporated in 1987 under the laws of the Netherlands Antilles as Fuel-Tech N.V., Fuel Tech became domesticated in the United States on September 30, 2006, and continues as a Delaware corporation with its corporate headquarters at 512 Kingsland Drive, Batavia, Illinois, 60510-2299. Fuel Tech maintains an Internet web site at www.ftek.com.

Fuel Tech's special focus is the worldwide marketing of its nitrogen oxide ("NOx") reduction and FUEL CHEM® processes. The NOx reduction technology segment, which includes the NOxOUT®, NOxOUT CASCADE®, NOxOUT ULTRA® and NOxOUT-SCR® processes, reduces NOx emissions in flue gas from boilers, incinerators, furnaces and other stationary combustion sources. The FUEL CHEM technology segment improves the efficiency, reliability and environmental status of combustion units by controlling slagging, fouling, corrosion, opacity, acid plume and loss on ignition, as well as the formation of sulfur trioxide, ammonium bisulfate, particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), carbon dioxide and NOx through the addition of chemicals into the fuel or via TIFI™ Targeted In-Furnace Injection™ programs. Fuel Tech has other technologies, both commercially available and in the development stage, all of which are related to the NOxOUT and FUEL CHEM processes or are similar in their technological base. Fuel Tech's business is materially dependent on the continued existence and enforcement of worldwide air quality regulations.

American Bailey Corporation

Ralph E. Bailey, Executive Chairman and Director of Fuel Tech, and Douglas G. Bailey, Deputy Chairman and Director of Fuel Tech, are shareholders of American Bailey Corporation ("ABC"), which is a related party. Please refer to Note 9 to the consolidated financial statements in this document for information about transactions between Fuel Tech and ABC. Additionally, see the more detailed information relating to this subject under the caption "Certain Relationships and Related Transactions" in Fuel Tech's Proxy Statement, to be distributed in connection with Fuel Tech's 2008 Annual Meeting of Shareholders, which information is incorporated by reference.

NOx Reduction

Regulations and Markets

The U.S. air pollution control market is the primary driver in Fuel Tech's NOx reduction technology segment. This market is dependent on air pollution regulations and their continued enforcement. These regulations are based on the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (the "CAAA"), which require reductions in NOx emissions on varying timetables with respect to various sources of emissions. Under the SIP (State Implementation Plan) Call, a regulation promulgated under the Amendments (discussed further below), over 1,000 utility and large industrial boilers in 19

states were required to achieve NOx reduction targets by May 31, 2004.

In 1994, governors of 11 Northeastern states, known collectively as the Ozone Transport Region, signed a Memorandum of Understanding requiring utilities to reduce their NOx emissions by 55% to 65% from 1990 levels by May 1999. In 1998, the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) announced more stringent regulations. The Ozone Transport SIP Call regulation, designed to mitigate the effects of wind-aided ozone transported from the Midwestern and Southeastern U.S. into the Northeastern non-attainment areas, required, following the litigation described below, 19 states to make even deeper aggregate reductions of 85% from 1990 levels by May 31, 2004. Over 1,000 utility and large industrial boilers are affected by these mandates. Additionally, most other states with non-attainment areas were also required to meet ambient air quality standards for ozone by 2007.

Although the SIP Call was the subject of litigation, an appellate court of the D.C. Circuit upheld the validity of this regulation. This court’s ruling was later affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court.

In February 2001, the U.S. Supreme Court, in a unanimous decision, upheld EPA’s authority to revise the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for ozone to 0.080 parts per million averaged through an eight-hour period from the current 0.120 parts per million for a one-hour period. This more stringent standard provided clarity and impetus for air pollution control efforts well beyond the then current ozone attainment requirement of 2007. In keeping with this trend, the Supreme Court, only days later, denied industry’s attempt to stay the SIP Call, effectively exhausting all means of appeal.

Table of Contents

On December 23, 2003, the EPA proposed a new regulation affecting the SIP Call states by specifying more expansive NO_x reduction. This rule, under the name “Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR),” was issued by the EPA on March 10, 2005. Commencing in 2009, CAIR specifies that additional annual NO_x reduction requirements be extended to most SIP-affected units in 28 eastern states, while permitting a cap and trade format similar to the SIP Call. The Company expects an additional 1,300 electric generating units using coal and other fuels to be affected by this rule. In an action related to CAIR, on June 15, 2005, the EPA issued the “Clean Air Visibility Rule (CAVR),” which is a nationwide initiative to improve federally preserved areas through reduction of NO_x and other pollutants. CAVR expands the NO_x reduction market to Western states unaffected by CAIR or the SIP Call. Compliance begins in 2013 and CAVR will potentially affect an additional 230 western coal fired units. In addition, CAVR, along with the EPA rule for revised eight-hour ozone attainment, which was proposed on June 20, 2007, have the potential to impact thousands of boilers and industrial units in multiple industries nationwide for units burning coal and other fuels starting in 2013.

Fuel Tech also sells NO_x control systems outside the United States, specifically in Europe and in the People's Republic of China (PRC). NO_xOUT systems have long been sold in the traditional markets of Western Europe, but interest is growing in the newer markets of Eastern Europe as those nations join the European Union (EU) and become subject to tighter NO_x emission standards. Under EU Directives, certain waste incinerators and cement plants must come into compliance with specified NO_x reduction targets by 2008, while certain power plants must be in compliance by 2010. Fuel Tech was awarded its first air pollution control project in Romania during 2007.

The PRC also represents attractive opportunities for Fuel Tech as the Government's 11th Five-Year Economic Plan has set pollution control and energy efficiency and savings as the top two priorities. Fuel Tech has viable technologies to help achieve both objectives. The PRC has taken initial steps to reduce NO_x emissions on new electric utility units (principally low NO_x burners), and on-going research and demonstration projects are generating cost performance data for use in tightening standards in the near future, both for new and retrofit units. The PRC's dominant reliance on coal as an energy resource is not expected to diminish in the foreseeable future. Clean air has been and will continue to be a pressing issue, especially with the PRC's booming economy (8%-12% annual GDP increase), expected growth in power production (4%-5% average annual increase through 2020), and an increasingly expanded role in international events and organizations. The PRC is the host of the upcoming 2008 Beijing Summer Olympics and the 2010 Shanghai World Expo. Fuel Tech is looking to establish a market position in NO_x control resulting from the national demonstration projects utilizing NO_xOUT CASCADE technology at Jiangsu Kanshan (two new 600 megawatt units), NO_xOUT Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) technology at Jiangyin Ligang (four new 600 megawatt units), and NO_xOUT ULTRA technology on two retrofit projects in Beijing. These projects are expected to showcase a wide spectrum of Fuel Tech capabilities for NO_x emission control with the intent of gaining immediate penetration within the market for new power units, and establishing Fuel Tech as the leader for the larger market for retrofit units later.

Products

Fuel Tech's NO_x reduction technologies are installed worldwide on over 450 combustion units, including utility, industrial and municipal solid waste applications. Products include customized NO_x control systems and patented urea-to-ammonia conversion technology, which can provide safe reagent for use in Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) systems.

Fuel Tech's NO_xOUT process is a Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction process that uses non-hazardous urea as the reagent rather than ammonia. The NO_xOUT process on its own is capable of reducing NO_x by up to 35% for utilities and by potentially significantly greater amounts for industrial units in many types of plants with capital costs ranging from \$5 - \$20/kw for utility boilers and with total annualized operating costs ranging from \$1,000 - \$2,000/ton of NO_x removed.

Fuel Tech's NOxOUT CASCADE process uses a catalyst in addition to the NOxOUT process to achieve performance similar to SCR. Capital costs for NOxOUT CASCADE systems can range from \$30 - \$75/kw which is significantly less than that of SCRs, which can range as high as \$400/kw, while operating costs are competitive with those experienced by SCR systems.

Fuel Tech's NOxOUT-SCR process utilizes urea as a catalyst reagent to achieve NOx reductions of up to 85% from smaller stationary combustion sources with capital and operating costs competitive with equivalently sized, standard SCR systems.

Fuel Tech's NOxOUT ULTRA system is designed to convert urea to ammonia safely and economically for use as a reagent in the SCR process for NOx reduction. In this fashion, Fuel Tech intends to participate in the SCR segment of the United States SIP Call and CAIR driven markets. Recent local hurdles in the ammonia permitting process have raised concerns regarding the safety of ammonia storage in quantities sufficient to supply SCR. In addition, the Department of Homeland Security recently characterized anhydrous ammonia as a Toxic Inhalation Hazard (TIH) commodity. This is contributing to new restrictions by rail carriers on the movement of anhydrous ammonia and to an escalation in associated rail transport and insurance rates. Overseas, new coal-fired power plants incorporating SCR systems are expected to be constructed at a rapid rate in the PRC, and Fuel Tech's NOxOUT ULTRA process is believed to be a market leader for the safe delivery of ammonia, particularly near densely populated cities, major waterways, harbors or islands, or where the transport of anhydrous or aqueous ammonia is a safety concern.

Fuel Tech has licensed the Rich Reagent Injection Technology from Reaction Engineering International and Electric Power Research Institute. The technology has been proven in full-scale field studies on cyclone-fired units to reduce NOx by 25%-40%. The technology is a generic SNCR process, whose applicability is outside the temperature range of the NOxOUT process. The technology is seen as an add-on to Fuel Tech's NOxOUT systems, thus potentially broadening the NOx reduction of the combined system to almost 55% with minimal additional capital requirement.

Table of Contents

Sales of the NOx reduction technologies were \$47.8 million, \$46.4 million and \$32.6 million for the years ended December 31, 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively.

NOx Reduction Competition

Competition with Fuel Tech's NOx reduction products can be expected from combustion modifications, SCR and ammonia SNCR, as well as from other licensed market participants. In addition, Fuel Tech experiences competition in the urea-to-ammonia conversion market.

Combustion modifications, including low NOx burners, can be fitted to most types of boilers with cost and effectiveness varying with specific boilers. Combustion modifications may effect 20% - 50% NOx reduction economically with capital costs ranging from \$5 - \$40/kw and levelized total costs ranging from \$300 - \$1,500/ton of NOx removed. The modifications are designed to reduce the formation of NOx and are typically the first NOx reduction efforts employed. Such companies as Alstom, Foster Wheeler Corporation, The Babcock & Wilcox Company, Nalco Mobotec, Inc. and Babcock Power, Inc. are active competitors in the low-NOx burner business.

Once NOx is formed, then the SCR process is an effective and proven method of control for removal of NOx up to 90%. SCR has a high capital cost ranging from \$150 - \$400/kw on retrofit coal applications. Such companies as Alstom, The Babcock & Wilcox Company, Cormetech, Inc., Ceram Environmental, Inc., Foster Wheeler Corporation, Peerless Manufacturing Company, and Babcock Power, Inc., are active SCR system providers, or providers of the catalyst itself.

The use of ammonia as the reagent for the SNCR process was developed by the ExxonMobil Corporation. Fuel Tech understands that the ExxonMobil patents on this process have expired. This process can reduce NOx by 30% - 70% on incinerators, but has limited applicability in the utility industry. Ammonia system capital costs range from \$5 - \$20/kw, with annualized operating costs ranging from \$1,000 - \$3,000/ton of NOx removed. These systems require the use of either anhydrous or aqueous ammonia, both of which are hazardous substances.

Other NOx reduction competitors include Combustion Components Associates, Inc., which is a licensed implementer of NOxOUT SNCR systems, and Reaction Engineering International, which licenses Rich Reagent Injection Technology to Fuel Tech.

In addition to or in lieu of using the foregoing processes, certain customers may elect to close or derate plants, purchase electricity from third-party sources, switch from higher to lower NOx emitting fuels or purchase NOx emission allowances.

Lastly, with respect to urea-to-ammonia conversion technologies, a competitive approach to Fuel Tech's controlled urea decomposition system is available from Wahlco, Inc., which manufactures a system that hydrolyzes urea under high temperature and pressure.

Table of Contents

FUEL CHEM

Product and Markets

The FUEL CHEM technology segment revolves around the unique application of specialty chemicals to improve the efficiency, reliability and environmental status of plants operating in the electric utility, industrial, pulp and paper, and waste-to-energy markets. FUEL CHEM programs are currently in place on over 90 combustion units, treating a wide variety of solid and liquid fuels, including coal, heavy oil, biomass and municipal waste.

Central to the FUEL CHEM approach is the introduction of chemical reagents, such as magnesium hydroxide, to combustion units via in-body fuel application (pre-combustion) or via direct injection (post-combustion) utilizing Fuel Tech's proprietary TIFI technology. By attacking performance-hindering problems, such as slagging, fouling, corrosion, opacity, acid plume and loss on ignition (LOI), as well as the formation of sulfur trioxide (SO₃), ammonium bisulfate (ABS), particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), carbon dioxide (CO₂) and NO_x, the Company's programs offer numerous operational, financial and environmental benefits to owners of boilers, furnaces and other combustion units.

The key market dynamic for this product line is the continued use of coal as the principal fuel source for global electricity production. Coal accounts for approximately 49% of all U.S. electricity generation, with U.S. government projections forecasting an increase to approximately 57% by 2030. Coal's share of global electricity generation is forecast to be approximately 45% by 2030. Major coal consumers include the United States, the PRC and India.

The principal markets for this product line are electric power plants burning coals with slag-forming constituents. The slag-forming constituents include sodium, iron and high levels of sulfur. Sodium is typically found in the Powder River Basin coals of Wyoming and Montana. Iron is typically found in coals produced in the Illinois Basin (IB) region. High sulfur content is typical of IB coals and certain Appalachian coals. High sulfur content can give rise to unacceptable levels of SO₃ formation in plants with SCR systems and flue gas desulfurization units (scrubbers).

The combination of slagging coals and SO₃-related issues, such as "blue plume" formation, air pre-heater fouling and corrosion, SCR fouling and the proclivity to suppress certain mercury removal processes, represents attractive market potential for Fuel Tech.

Internationally, market opportunities exist in Europe and in the Asia-Pacific region, particularly the PRC and India, where high-slagging coals are fueling a large and growing fleet of power plants. To address the PRC market, where particular emphasis is being placed on energy efficiency, Fuel Tech entered into a one-year exclusive teaming agreement in June 2007 with ITOCHU Hong Kong Ltd., a subsidiary of ITOCHU Corporation. Working under this agreement, the first FUEL CHEM demonstration program in the PRC was announced in January 2008. In addition, Fuel Tech was awarded its first FUEL CHEM demonstration program in India in January 2008. TIFI initiatives aimed at energy efficiency improvements result in reduced CO₂ emissions, which potentially can be monetized under provisions of the Kyoto Protocol.

A potentially large fuel treatment market exists in Mexico, where high-sulfur, low-grade fuel oil containing vanadium and nickel is the primary source for electricity production. The presence of these metallic constituents promotes slag build-up, and the fuel properties can result in acid gas and particulate emissions in local combustion units. Fuel Tech has successfully treated such units with its TIFI technology.

Sales of the FUEL CHEM products were \$32.5 million, \$28.7 million and \$20.3 million for the years ended December 31, 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively.

Competition

Competition for Fuel Tech's FUEL CHEM product line includes chemicals sold by specialty chemical and combustion engineering companies, such as GE Infrastructure, Ashland Inc. and Environmental Energy Services, Inc. No substantive competition currently exists for Fuel Tech's TIFI technology, which is designed primarily for slag control and SO₃ abatement, but there can be no assurance that such lack of substantive competition will continue.

PLANT OPTIMIZATION SERVICES

While not a separate technology segment, Fuel Tech uses its advanced engineering capabilities to support the sale of its NO_x reduction and FUEL CHEM systems, particularly through the use of computational fluid dynamics (“CFD”) tools. These CFD tools assist in the prediction of the behavior of gas flows, thereby enhancing the design, marketing and sale of Fuel Tech’s NO_x reduction systems and FUEL CHEM product applications. To further aid the accuracy and expediency with which process solutions could be designed and delivered to a customer, Fuel Tech internally developed a virtual reality-based visualization software for exploring model results and discovering complex process behaviors. Fuel Tech intends to capitalize on its unique capabilities via offering plant optimization services to its customer base in conjunction with the NO_x reduction and FUEL CHEM systems.

In May 2009, the FASB issued pronouncements under ASC 855-10, *Subsequent Events* (formerly SFAS No. 165, *Subsequent Events*). ASC 855-10 provides authoritative accounting literature for a topic that was previously addressed only in the auditing literature. ASC 855-10 distinguishes events requiring recognition in the financial statements and those that may require disclosure in the financial statements. Furthermore, ASC 855-10 requires disclosure of the date through which subsequent events were evaluated. ASC 855-10 is effective on a prospective basis for interim or annual financial periods ending after June 15, 2009. The Company adopted ASC 855-10 beginning with the quarter ended June 30, 2009, and has evaluated subsequent events for the quarter ended September 30, 2009 through November 6, 2009. The adoption of ASC 855-10 did not have a material effect on the Company’s financial position, results of operations, or cash flows.

In June 2009, the FASB issued pronouncements under ASC 105-10, *Generally Accepted Accounting Principles* (formerly SFAS No. 168, *The FASB Accounting Standards Codification and the Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles*). ASC 105-10 establishes the FASB Accounting Standards Codification (Codification), which supersedes all existing accounting standards documents and will become the single source of authoritative non-governmental U.S. GAAP. All other accounting literature not included in the Codification is considered non-authoritative. The Codification was implemented on July 1, 2009 and is effective for interim and annual periods ending after September 15, 2009. The Company has adopted ASC 105-10 for the quarter ended September 30, 2009. The adoption of ASC 105-10 did not have a material effect on the Company’s financial position, results of operations, or cash flows.

In April 2009, the FASB issued pronouncements under ASC 825-10, *Financial Instruments* (formerly FSP No. FAS 107-1 and APB 28-1, *Interim Disclosures about Fair Value of Financial Instruments*). ASC 825-10 requires disclosures about fair value of financial instruments for interim reporting periods of publicly traded companies as well as in annual financial statements. This action also requires those disclosures in summarized financial information at interim periods. ASC 825-10 is effective for reporting periods ending after June 15, 2009 and was adopted by the Company beginning with the quarter ended June 30, 2009. The adoption of these pronouncements did not have a material impact on the Company’s financial statements.

Table of Contents**3. Inventories**

The cost of inventories is determined using the last-in, first-out (LIFO) method. Inventory costs include crude oil and other feedstocks, labor, processing costs and refining overhead costs. Inventories are valued at the lower of cost or market value.

Inventories consist of the following:

	September 30, 2009	December 31, 2008
Raw materials	\$ 4,197	\$ 24,955
Work in process	45,752	43,735
Finished goods	81,759	49,834
	\$ 131,708	\$ 118,524

The replacement cost of these inventories, based on current market values, would have been \$28,435 and \$27,517 higher as of September 30, 2009 and December 31, 2008, respectively. During the three months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008, the Company recorded \$9,475 and \$0, respectively, of gains in cost of sales in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations due to the liquidation of lower cost inventory layers. During the nine months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008, the Company recorded \$9,475 and \$50,826, respectively, of gains in cost of sales in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations due to the liquidation of lower cost inventory layers.

4. Acquisition of Penreco

On January 3, 2008 the Company acquired Penreco, a Texas general partnership, for \$269,118, net of the cash acquired. Penreco was owned by ConocoPhillips Company and M.E. Zukerman Specialty Oil Corporation. Penreco manufactures and markets highly-refined products and specialty solvents, including white mineral oils, petrolatums, natural petroleum sulfonates, cable-filling compounds, refrigeration oils, food-grade compressor lubricants and gelled products. The acquisition included facilities in Karns City, Pennsylvania and Dickinson, Texas, as well as several long-term supply agreements with ConocoPhillips Company.

The Company believes that this acquisition has provided several key strategic benefits, including market synergies within its solvents and lubricating oil product lines, additional operational and logistics flexibility and overhead cost reductions resulting from the acquisition. The acquisition has broadened the Company's customer base and given the Company access to new markets.

As a result of the acquisition, the assets and liabilities previously held by Penreco and results of the operations of these assets have been included in the Company's unaudited condensed consolidated balance sheets and unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations since the date of acquisition.

5. LyondellBasell Agreements

On September 29, 2009, the Company entered into multiyear agreements with Houston Refining LP, a wholly-owned subsidiary of LyondellBasell (Houston Refining), to form a long term exclusive specialty products affiliation. Under the terms of the agreement, Calumet will be the exclusive marketer of Houston Refining's naphthenic lubricating oil production and is required to market a minimum of approximately 3,000 barrels per day (bpd) from its Houston, TX refinery. In addition, Houston Refining will process at least approximately 800 bpd of white mineral oil for Calumet which Calumet will then sell to supplement Calumet's existing production at its Karns City, PA and Dickinson, TX facilities. Calumet also receives the exclusive right to use the LyondellBasell registered trademarks and tradenames including Tufflo, Duoprime, Duotreat, Crystex, Ideal and Aquamarine. The agreements were deemed to be effective as of November 4, 2009 upon the approval of LyondellBasell's motion for entry of an order by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court authorizing the rejection by LyondellBasell of the agreements in place with third parties covering these products.

Table of Contents**6. Sale of Mineral Rights**

In June 2008, the Company received \$6,065 associated with the lease of mineral rights on the real property at its Shreveport and Princeton refineries to an unaffiliated third party which were accounted for as a sale. The Company retained a royalty interest in any future production associated with these mineral rights. As a result of these transactions, the Company recorded a gain of \$5,770 in other income (expense) in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations for the nine months ended September 30, 2008. Under the Company's term loan agreement, cash proceeds resulting from this disposition of property, plant and equipment were used as a mandatory prepayment of the term loan.

7. Commitments and Contingencies

From time to time, the Company is a party to certain claims and litigation incidental to its business, including claims made by various taxation and regulatory authorities, such as the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the IRS and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), as the result of audits or reviews of the Company's business. Management is of the opinion that the ultimate resolution of any known claims, either individually or in the aggregate, will not have a material adverse impact on the Company's financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

Environmental

The Company operates crude oil and specialty hydrocarbon refining and terminal operations, which are subject to stringent and complex federal, state, and local laws and regulations governing the discharge of materials into the environment or otherwise relating to environmental protection. These laws and regulations can impair the Company's operations that affect the environment in many ways, such as requiring the acquisition of permits to conduct regulated activities, restricting the manner in which the Company can release materials into the environment, requiring remedial activities or capital expenditures to mitigate pollution from former or current operations, and imposing substantial liabilities for pollution resulting from its operations. Certain environmental laws impose joint and several, strict liability for costs required to remediate and restore sites where petroleum hydrocarbons, wastes, or other materials have been released or disposed.

Failure to comply with environmental laws and regulations may result in the triggering of administrative, civil and criminal measures, including the assessment of monetary penalties, the imposition of remedial obligations, and the issuance of injunctions limiting or prohibiting some or all of the Company's operations. On occasion, the Company receives notices of violation, enforcement and other complaints from regulatory agencies alleging non-compliance with applicable environmental laws and regulations. In particular, the LDEQ has proposed penalties totaling approximately \$400 and supplemental environmental capital projects for the following alleged violations: (i) a May 2001 notification received by the Cotton Valley refinery from the LDEQ regarding several alleged violations of various air emission regulations, as identified in the course of the Company's Leak Detection and Repair program, and also for failure to submit various reports related to the facility's air emissions; (ii) a December 2002 notification received by the Company's Cotton Valley refinery from the LDEQ regarding alleged violations for excess emissions, as identified in the LDEQ's file review of the Cotton Valley refinery; (iii) a December 2004 notification received by the Cotton Valley refinery from the LDEQ regarding alleged violations for the construction of a multi-tower pad and associated pump pads without a permit issued by the agency; and (iv) an August 2005 notification received by the Princeton refinery from the LDEQ regarding alleged violations of air emissions regulations, as identified by the LDEQ following performance of a compliance review, due to excess emissions and failures to continuously monitor and record air emissions levels. The Company anticipates that any penalties that may be assessed due to the alleged violations will be consolidated in a settlement agreement that the Company anticipates executing with the LDEQ in connection with the agency's Small Refinery and Single Site Refinery Initiative described below. The Company has recorded a liability for the proposed penalties within other current liabilities on the unaudited condensed consolidated balance sheets. Environmental expenses are recorded within other expenses in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations.

Table of Contents

The Company is party to ongoing discussions on a voluntary basis with the LDEQ regarding the Company's participation in that agency's Small Refinery and Single Site Refinery Initiative. This state initiative is patterned after the EPA's National Petroleum Refinery Initiative, which is a coordinated, integrated compliance and enforcement strategy to address federal Clean Air Act compliance issues at the nation's largest petroleum refineries. The Company expects that the LDEQ's primary focus under the state initiative will be on four compliance and enforcement concerns: (i) Prevention of Significant Deterioration/New Source Review; (ii) New Source Performance Standards for fuel gas combustion devices, including flares, heaters and boilers; (iii) Leak Detection and Repair requirements; and (iv) Benzene Waste Operations National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants. The Company is in discussions with the LDEQ regarding its participation in this regulatory initiative and the Company anticipates that it will be entering into a settlement agreement with the LDEQ pursuant to which the Company will be required to make emissions reductions requiring capital investments between approximately \$1,000 and \$3,000 in total over a three to five year period at its three Louisiana refineries. Because the settlement agreement is also expected to resolve the aforementioned alleged air emissions issues and other violations at the Company's Cotton Valley and Princeton refineries and consolidate any penalties associated with such issues, the Company further anticipates that a penalty of approximately \$400 will be assessed in connection with this settlement agreement.

Voluntary remediation of subsurface contamination is in process at each of the Company's refinery sites. The remedial projects are being overseen by the appropriate state environmental regulatory agencies. Based on current investigative and remedial activities, the Company believes that the groundwater contamination at these refineries can be controlled or remedied without having a material adverse effect on the Company's financial condition. However, such costs are often unpredictable and, therefore, there can be no assurance that the future costs will not become material. During 2008, the Company determined that it would incur approximately \$700 of costs at its Cotton Valley refinery in connection with continued remediation of groundwater impacts at that site. This remediation is expected to take place during 2010.

The Company and the EPA have resolved alleged deficiencies in risk management planning in connection with a fire-related incident arising out of tank cleaning and vacuum truck operations at the Company's Shreveport refinery on October 30, 2008. The incident involved a third-party contractor and resulted in damage to an on-site aboveground storage tank. Following an investigation of the matter, EPA issued five violations against the Company alleging, among other things, inadequate contractor training and oversight, and proposed a penalty of \$230, which the Company agreed to and paid in April 2009. Calumet has certified compliance with the requirements of the related Consent Agreement with EPA in October 2009.

The Company is indemnified by Shell Oil Company (Shell), as successor to Pennzoil-Quaker State Company and Atlas Processing Company, for specified environmental liabilities arising from the operations of the Shreveport refinery prior to the Company's acquisition of the facility. The indemnity is unlimited in amount and duration, but requires the Company to contribute up to \$1,000 of the first \$5,000 of indemnified costs for certain of the specified environmental liabilities.

The Company is indemnified on a limited basis by ConocoPhillips Company and M.E. Zuckerman Specialty Oil Corporation, former owners of Penreco, for pending, threatened, contemplated or contingent environmental claims against Penreco, if any, that were not known and identified as of the Penreco acquisition date. A significant portion of these indemnifications will expire on January 1, 2010 if there are no claims asserted by the Company and are generally subject to a \$2,000 limit.

Table of Contents**Health and Safety**

The Company is subject to various laws and regulations relating to occupational health and safety including OSHA laws and regulations, and comparable state laws. These laws and the implementing regulations strictly govern the protection of the health and safety of employees. In addition, OSHA's hazard communication standard requires that information be maintained about hazardous materials used or produced in the Company's operations and that this information be provided to employees, state and local government authorities and citizens. The Company maintains safety, training, and maintenance programs as part of its ongoing efforts to ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations. The Company's compliance with applicable health and safety laws and regulations has required and continues to require substantial expenditures. The Company has commissioned studies to assess the adequacy of its process safety management practices at its Shreveport refinery with respect to certain consensus codes and standards, some of which have been recently received. The Company expects to have fully reviewed the findings made in these studies during the first quarter of 2010 and may incur capital expenditures over the next several years to enhance its programs and equipment so that it may maintain its compliance with applicable requirements at the Shreveport refinery. The Company believes that its operations are in substantial compliance with OSHA and similar state laws.

Standby Letters of Credit

The Company has agreements with various financial institutions for standby letters of credit which have been issued to domestic vendors. As of September 30, 2009 and December 31, 2008, the Company had outstanding standby letters of credit of \$41,942 and \$21,355, respectively, under its senior secured revolving credit facility. The maximum amount of letters of credit the Company can issue is limited to its availability under its revolving credit facility or \$300,000, whichever is lower. As of September 30, 2009 and December 31, 2008, the Company had availability to issue letters of credit of \$89,511 and \$51,865, respectively, under its revolving credit facility. As discussed in Note 8, as of September 30, 2009 the Company also had a \$50,000 letter of credit outstanding under its senior secured first lien letter of credit facility for its fuel products hedging program, which bears interest at 4.0%.

8. Long-Term Debt

Long-term debt consisted of the following:

	September 30, 2009	December 31, 2008
Borrowings under senior secured first lien term loan with third-party lenders, interest at rate of three-month LIBOR plus 4.00% (4.43% and 6.15% at September 30, 2009 and December 31, 2008, respectively), interest and principal payments quarterly through September 30, 2014 with remaining borrowings due January 2015, effective interest rate of 6.18% at September 30, 2009	\$ 372,198	\$ 375,085
Borrowings under senior secured revolving credit agreement with third-party lenders, interest at prime plus 0.50% (3.75% and 3.75% at September 30, 2009 and December 31, 2008, respectively), interest payments monthly, borrowings due January 2013	69,104	102,539
Capital lease obligations, interest at 8.25%, interest and principal payments quarterly through January 2012	1,900	2,640
Less unamortized discount on senior secured first lien term loan with third-party lenders	(13,567)	(15,173)
Total long-term debt	429,635	465,091
Less current portion of long-term debt	4,670	4,811
	\$ 424,965	\$ 460,280

The Partnership's \$435,000 senior secured first lien term loan facility includes a \$385,000 term loan and a \$50,000 prefunded letter of credit facility to support crack spread hedging. The term loan bears interest at a rate equal (i) with respect to a LIBOR Loan, the LIBOR Rate plus 400 basis points (the Applicable Rate defined in the term loan credit agreement) and (ii) with respect to a Base Rate Loan, the Base Rate plus 300 basis points (as defined in the term loan credit agreement). The letter of credit facility to support crack spread hedging bears interest at 4.0%.

Lenders under the term loan facility have a first priority lien on the Company's fixed assets and a second priority lien on its cash, accounts receivable, inventory and other personal property. The term loan facility requires quarterly principal payments of \$963 until maturity on September 30, 2014, with the remaining balance due at maturity on January 3, 2015.

Table of Contents

On January 3, 2008, the Partnership amended its existing senior secured revolving credit facility dated as of December 9, 2005. Pursuant to this amendment, the revolving credit facility lenders agreed to, among other things, (i) increase the total availability under the revolving credit facility up to \$375,000, subject to borrowing base limitations, and (ii) conformed certain of the financial covenants and other terms in the revolving credit facility to those contained in the term loan credit agreement. The revolving credit facility, which is the Company's primary source of liquidity for cash needs in excess of cash generated from operations, currently bears interest at prime plus a basis points margin or LIBOR plus a basis points margin, at the Company's option. This margin is currently at 50 basis points for prime and 200 basis points for LIBOR; however, it fluctuates based on quarterly measurement of the Company's Consolidated Leverage Ratio (as defined in the credit agreement). The existing senior secured revolving credit facility matures on January 3, 2013.

The borrowing capacity at September 30, 2009 under the revolving credit facility was \$200,558 with \$89,511 available for additional borrowings based on collateral and specified availability limitations. Lenders under the revolving credit facility have a first priority lien on the Company's cash, accounts receivable and inventory and a second priority lien on the Company's fixed assets.

Compliance with the financial covenants pursuant to the Company's credit agreements is tested quarterly based upon performance over the most recent four fiscal quarters and as of September 30, 2009 the Company was in compliance with all financial covenants under its credit agreements.

While assurances cannot be made regarding the Company's future compliance with the financial covenants in its credit agreements, and being cognizant of the general uncertain economic environment, the Company anticipates that it will be able to maintain compliance with such financial covenants and to continue to improve its liquidity and distributable cash flow.

Failure to achieve the Company's anticipated results may result in a breach of certain of the financial covenants contained in its credit agreements. If this occurs, the Company will enter into discussions with its lenders to either modify the terms of the existing credit facilities or obtain waivers of non-compliance with such covenants. There can be no assurances of the timing of the receipt of any such modification or waiver, the term or costs associated therewith or the Company's ultimate ability to obtain the relief sought. The Company's failure to obtain a waiver of non-compliance with certain of the financial covenants or otherwise amend the credit facilities would constitute an event of default under its credit facilities and would permit the lenders to pursue remedies. These remedies could include acceleration of maturity under the credit facilities and limitations or the elimination of the Company's ability to make distributions to its unitholders. If the Company's lenders accelerate maturity under its credit facilities, a significant portion of its indebtedness may become due and payable immediately. The Company might not have, or be able to obtain, sufficient funds to make these accelerated payments. If the Company is unable to make these accelerated payments, its lenders could seek to foreclose on its assets.

As of September 30, 2009, maturities of the Company's long-term debt are as follows:

Year	Maturity
2009	\$ 1,184
2010	4,594
2011	4,460
2012	4,175
2013	72,954
Thereafter	355,835
Total	\$ 443,202

9. Derivatives

The Company is exposed to fluctuations in the price of crude oil, its principal raw material, as well as the sales prices of gasoline, diesel and jet fuel. Given the historical volatility of crude oil, gasoline, diesel and jet fuel prices, this exposure can significantly impact sales and gross profit. Therefore, the Company utilizes derivative instruments to

minimize its price risk and volatility of cash flows associated with the purchase of crude oil and natural gas, the sale of fuel products and interest payments. The Company employs various hedging strategies, which are further discussed below. The Company does not hold or issue derivative instruments for trading purposes.

Table of Contents

The Company recognizes all derivative instruments at their fair values (see Note 10) as either assets or liabilities on the unaudited condensed consolidated balance sheets. Fair value includes any premiums paid or received and unrealized gains and losses. Fair value does not include any amounts receivable from or payable to counterparties, or collateral provided to counterparties. Derivative asset and liability amounts with the same counterparty are netted against each other for financial reporting purposes. The Company had recorded the following derivative assets and liabilities at fair value as of September 30, 2009 and December 31, 2008:

	Derivative Assets		Derivative Liabilities	
	September 30, 2009	December 31, 2008	September 30, 2009	December 31, 2008
Derivative instruments designated as hedges:				
Fuel products segment:				
Crude oil swaps	\$ 66,539	\$ (93,197)	\$	\$ (40,283)
Gasoline swaps	(6,704)	115,172		4,459
Diesel swaps	(17,035)	50,652		39,685
Jet fuel swaps	(8,561)			
Specialty products segment:				
Crude oil collars				
Natural gas swaps				(206)
Interest rate swap			(3,226)	(3,582)
Total derivative instruments designated as hedges	34,239	72,627	(3,226)	73
Derivative instruments not designated as hedges:				
Fuel products segment:				
Crude oil swaps (1)	(12,533)	12,929		1,349
Gasoline swaps (1)	16,487	(14,357)		(1,494)
Diesel swaps				
Jet fuel crack spread collars (4)	300			
Specialty products segment:				
Crude oil collars (2)	27			(12,345)
Natural gas swaps (2)	(15)			(1,223)
Interest rate swaps (3)			(2,043)	(2,187)
Total derivative instruments not designated as hedges	4,266	(1,428)	(2,043)	(15,900)
Total derivative instruments	\$ 38,505	\$ 71,199	\$ (5,269)	\$ (15,827)

(1) The Company entered into derivative instruments to purchase the gasoline crack

spread which do not qualify for hedge accounting.

These derivatives were entered into to economically lock in a gain on a portion of the Company's gasoline and crude oil swap contracts that are designated as hedges.

- (2) The Company enters into combinations of crude oil options and swaps and natural gas swaps to economically hedge its exposures to price risk related to these commodities in its specialty products segment. The Company has not designated these derivative instruments as hedges.
- (3) The Company refinanced its long-term debt in January 2008 and as a result the interest rate swap designated as a hedge of the interest payments related to the

previous debt agreement no longer qualified for hedge accounting. The Company entered into an offsetting interest rate swap to fix the value of this derivative instrument and is settling this net position over the term of the derivative instruments.

- (4) The Company entered into jet fuel crack spread collars, which do not qualify for hedge accounting, to economically hedge its exposure to changes in the jet fuel crack spread.

Table of Contents

To the extent a derivative instrument is determined to be effective as a cash flow hedge of an exposure to changes in the fair value of a future transaction, the change in fair value of the derivative is deferred in accumulated other comprehensive income, a component of partners' capital in the unaudited condensed consolidated balance sheets, until the underlying transaction hedged is recognized in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations. The Company accounts for certain derivatives hedging purchases of crude oil and natural gas, sales of gasoline, diesel and jet fuel and the payment of interest as cash flow hedges. The derivatives hedging sales and purchases are recorded to sales and cost of sales, respectively, in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations upon recording the related hedged transaction in sales or cost of sales. The derivatives hedging payments of interest are recorded in interest expense in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations upon payment of interest. The Company assesses, both at inception of the hedge and on an ongoing basis, whether the derivatives that are used in hedging transactions are highly effective in offsetting changes in cash flows of hedged items.

For derivative instruments not designated as cash flow hedges and the portion of any cash flow hedge that is determined to be ineffective, the change in fair value of the asset or liability for the period is recorded to unrealized gain (loss) on derivative instruments in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations. Upon the settlement of a derivative not designated as a cash flow hedge, the gain or loss at settlement is recorded to realized gain (loss) on derivative instruments in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations.

The Company recorded the following amounts in its condensed consolidated balance sheets, unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations and its unaudited condensed consolidated statements of partners' capital as of, and for the three months ended, September 30, 2009 and 2008 related to its derivative instruments that were designated as cash flow hedges:

Type of Derivative	Amount of Gain (Loss) Recognized in		Location of (Gain) Loss	Amount of (Gain) Loss Reclassified from Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income into Net Income (Loss) (Effective Portion)		Location of Gain (Loss)	Amount of Gain (Loss) Recognized in Net Income (Loss) on Derivatives (Ineffective Portion) Three Months Ended	
	Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income on Derivatives (Effective Portion)			Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income into Net Income (Loss) (Effective Portion)			Income (Loss) on Derivatives (Ineffective Portion) Three Months Ended	
	September 30,			September 30,			September 30,	
	2009	2008		2009	2008		2009	2008
Fuel products segment:								
Crude oil swaps	\$ (19,056)	\$ (763,554)	Cost of sales	\$ 5,120	\$ (109,034)	Unrealized/ Realized	\$ (9)	\$ 11
Gasoline swaps	5,697	275,249	Sales	242	45,617	Unrealized/ Realized	556	(2,295)
Diesel swaps	22,660	522,548	Sales	(7,447)	78,828	Unrealized/ Realized	(1,682)	526
Jet fuel swaps	3,274		Sales			Unrealized/ Realized	446	

Specialty products
segment:

Crude oil collars		1,344	Cost of sales	(2,316)	Unrealized/ Realized		
Crude oil swaps			Cost of sales	(756)	Unrealized/ Realized		
Natural gas swaps		(1,424)	Cost of sales	(31)	Unrealized/ Realized		
Interest rate swaps	(673)	(891)	Interest expense	928	251	Unrealized/ Realized	
Total	\$ 11,902	\$ 33,272		\$ (1,157)	\$ 12,559	\$ (689)	\$ (1,758)

Table of Contents

The Company recorded the following gains (losses) in its unaudited condensed consolidated statement of operations for the three months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008 related to its derivative instruments not designated as cash flow hedges:

Type of Derivative	Amount of Gain (Loss) Recognized in Realized Gain (Loss) on Derivatives Three Months Ended September 30,		Amount of Gain (Loss) Recognized in Unrealized Gain (Loss) on Derivatives Three Months Ended September 30,	
	2009	2008	2009	2008
	Fuel products segment:			
Crude oil swaps	\$ 169	\$ 3,323	\$ 2,129	\$ (3,323)
Gasoline swaps	5,598	(2,846)	(7,384)	2,846
Diesel swaps	(1,664)	(1,931)	1,664	1,931
Jet fuel swaps				
Jet fuel collars			(85)	
Specialty products segment:				
Crude oil collars	176	(10,225)	(159)	(27,305)
Crude oil swaps		(101)		(191)
Natural gas swaps	(56)	(633)	(48)	(3,500)
Interest rate swaps	(207)	(208)	116	408
Total	\$ 4,016	\$ (12,621)	\$ (3,767)	\$ (29,134)

The Company recorded the following amounts in its condensed consolidated balance sheets, unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations and its unaudited condensed consolidated statements of partners' capital as of, and for the nine months ended, September 30, 2009 and 2008 related to its derivative instruments that were designated as cash flow hedges:

Type of Derivative	Amount of Gain (Loss) Recognized in Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income on Derivatives (Effective Portion)		Amount of (Gain) Loss Reclassified from Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income into Net Income (Effective Portion) Nine Months Ended		Amount of Gain (Loss) Recognized in Net Income on Derivatives (Ineffective Portion) Nine Months Ended			
	Location of September 30,		Location of September 30,		Location of September 30,			
	2009	2008	(Gain) Loss	2009	2008	(Loss)	2009	2008
Fuel products segment:								
Crude oil swaps	\$ 128,556	\$ 445,369	\$ 70,799	\$ (291,041)	\$ 14,142	\$ 600		

Edgar Filing: FUEL TECH, INC. - Form 10-K

			Cost of sales			Unrealized/ Realized		
Gasoline swaps	(105,715)	(123,648)	Sales	(23,586)	108,165	Unrealized/ Realized	2,582	(4,975)
Diesel swaps	(40,227)	(394,309)	Sales	(54,954)	212,358	Unrealized/ Realized	(14,397)	5,645
Jet fuel swaps	(8,562)		Sales			Unrealized/ Realized		
Specialty products segment:								
Crude oil collars		18,244	Cost of sales		(20,203)	Unrealized/ Realized		(709)
Crude oil swaps			Cost of sales		(756)	Unrealized/ Realized		
Natural gas swaps	(101)	(156)	Cost of sales	307	935	Unrealized/ Realized		311
Interest rate swaps	(1,836)	(284)	Interest expense	2,191	328	Unrealized/ Realized		
Total	\$ (27,885)	\$ (54,784)		\$ (5,243)	\$ 9,786		\$ 2,327	\$ 872

Table of Contents

The Company recorded the following gains (losses) in its unaudited condensed consolidated statement of operations for the nine months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008 related to its derivative instruments not designated as cash flow hedges:

Type of Derivative	Amount of Gain (Loss) Recognized in Realized Gain (Loss) on Derivatives Nine Months Ended September 30,		Amount of Gain (Loss) Recognized in Unrealized Gain (Loss) on Derivatives Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2009	2008	2009	2008
Fuel products segment:				
Crude oil swaps	\$ 15,821	\$ 9,969	\$ (35,084)	\$ (9,969)
Gasoline swaps	2,733	(8,538)	35,546	4,375
Diesel swaps	(4,991)	(7,886)	4,991	10,897
Jet fuel swaps				
Jet fuel collars			(262)	
Specialty products segment:				
Crude oil collars	(11,739)	(5,116)	12,372	(17,692)
Crude oil swaps		(101)		(191)
Natural gas swaps	(1,563)	(633)	1,207	(1,822)
Interest rate swaps	(617)	(666)	144	(336)
Total	\$ (356)	\$ (12,971)	\$ 18,914	\$ (14,738)

The Company is exposed to credit risk in the event of nonperformance by its counterparties on these derivative transactions. The Company does not expect nonperformance on any derivative instruments, however, no assurances can be provided. The Company's credit exposure related to these derivative instruments is represented by the fair value of contracts reported as derivative assets. To manage credit risk, the Company selects and periodically reviews counterparties based on credit ratings. The Company executes all of its derivative instruments with a small number of counterparties, the majority of which are large financial institutions and all have ratings of at least A2 and A by Moody's and S&P, respectively. In the event of default, the Company would potentially be subject to losses on derivative instruments with mark to market gains. The Company requires collateral from its counterparties when the fair value of the derivatives exceeds agreed upon thresholds in its contracts with these counterparties. The Company's contracts with these counterparties allow for netting of derivative instrument positions executed under each contract. Collateral received from or held by counterparties is reported in deposits and other current liabilities on the Company's condensed consolidated balance sheets and not netted against derivative assets or liabilities. The Company provides its counterparties with collateral when the fair value of its obligation exceeds specified amounts for each counterparty. As of September 30, 2009, the Company had provided the counterparties with no cash collateral or letters of credit above the \$50,000 prefunded letter of credit to support crack spread hedging. For financial reporting purposes, the Company does not offset the collateral provided to a counterparty against the fair value of its obligation to that counterparty. Any outstanding collateral is released to the Company upon settlement of the related derivative instrument liability.

Certain of the Company's outstanding derivative instruments are subject to credit support agreements with the applicable counterparties which contain provisions setting certain credit thresholds above which the Company may be required to post agreed-upon collateral, such as cash or letters of credit, with the counterparty to the extent that the Company's mark-to-market net liability, if any, on all outstanding derivatives exceeds the credit threshold amount per such credit support agreement. In certain cases, the Company's credit threshold is dependent upon the Company's maintenance of certain corporate credit ratings with Moody's and S&P. In the event that the Company's corporate credit rating was lowered below its current level by either Moody's or S&P, such counterparties would have the right

to reduce the applicable threshold to zero and demand full collateralization of the Company's net liability position on outstanding derivative instruments. As of September 30, 2009, there is no net liability associated with the Company's outstanding derivative instruments subject to such requirements. In addition, the majority of the credit support agreements covering the Company's outstanding derivative instruments also contain a general provision stating that if the Company experiences a material adverse change in its business, in the reasonable discretion of the counterparty, the Company's credit threshold could be lowered by such counterparty. The Company does not expect that it will experience a material adverse change in its business.

Table of Contents

The effective portion of the hedges classified in accumulated other comprehensive income is \$28,663 as of September 30, 2009 and, absent a change in the fair market value of the underlying transactions, will be reclassified to earnings by December 31, 2012 with balances being recognized as follows:

Year	Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income (Loss)
2009	\$ 12,108
2010	22,029
2011	(4,482)
2012	(992)
Total	\$ 28,663

Based on fair values as of September 30, 2009, the Company expects to reclassify \$14,608 of net gains on derivative instruments from accumulated other comprehensive income to earnings during the next twelve months due to actual crude oil purchases, gasoline, diesel and jet fuel sales, and the payment of variable interest associated with floating rate debt. However, the amounts actually realized will be dependent on the fair values as of the date of settlements.

Crude Oil Collar Contracts Specialty Products Segment

The Company is exposed to fluctuations in the price of crude oil, its principal raw material. The Company utilizes combinations of options and swaps to manage crude oil price risk and volatility of cash flows in its specialty products segment. These derivatives may be designated as cash flow hedges of the future purchase of crude oil if they meet the hedge criteria. The Company's policy is generally to enter into crude oil derivative contracts for up to 70% of expected purchases that mitigate its exposure to price risk associated with crude oil purchases related to specialty products production. Generally, the Company's policy is that these positions will be short term in nature and expire within three to nine months from execution; however, the Company may execute derivative contracts for up to two years forward if a change in the risks support lengthening the Company's position. As of September 30, 2009, the Company had the following crude oil derivatives related to crude oil purchases in its specialty products segment, none of which are designated as hedges.

Crude Oil Put/Swap/Call Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels	BPD	Average Bought Put (\$/Bbl)	Average Swap (\$/Bbl)	Average Sold Call (\$/Bbl)
October 2009	248,000	8,000	\$57.33	\$71.09	\$81.09
November 2009	150,000	5,000	56.17	69.64	79.64
December 2009	62,000	2,000	56.30	68.55	78.55
Totals	460,000		\$56.81	\$70.27	\$80.27

At December 31, 2008, the Company had the following crude oil derivatives related to crude oil purchases in its specialty products segment, none of which were designated as hedges.

Crude Oil Put/Call Spread Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels	BPD	Average Bought Put (\$/Bbl)	Average Sold Put (\$/Bbl)	Average Bought Call (\$/Bbl)	Average Sold Call (\$/Bbl)
--	----------------	------------	--	--	---	---

Edgar Filing: FUEL TECH, INC. - Form 10-K

January 2009	217,000	7,000	\$ 50.32	\$ 60.32	\$ 70.32	\$ 80.32
February 2009	84,000	3,000	38.33	48.33	58.33	68.33
Totals	301,000					
Average price			\$ 46.98	\$ 56.98	\$ 66.98	\$ 76.98

Crude Oil Put/Call Spread Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels	BPD	Average Sold Put (\$/Bbl)	Average Bought Call (\$/Bbl)
January 2009	186,000	6,000	\$ 68.57	\$ 90.83
February 2009	112,000	4,000	74.85	96.25
March 2009	93,000	3,000	79.37	101.67
Totals	391,000			
Average price			\$ 72.94	\$ 94.96

Table of Contents**Crude Oil Swap Contracts**

The Company is exposed to fluctuations in the price of crude oil, its principal raw material. The Company utilizes swap contracts to manage crude oil price risk and volatility of cash flows in its fuel products segment. The Company's policy is generally to enter into crude oil swap contracts for a period no greater than five years forward and for no more than 75% of crude oil purchases used in fuels production. At September 30, 2009, the Company had the following derivatives related to crude oil purchases in its fuel products segment, all of which are designated as hedges.

Crude Oil Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels		
	Purchased	BPD	(\$/Bbl)
Fourth Quarter 2009	2,070,000	22,500	66.26
Calendar Year 2010	7,300,000	20,000	67.29
Calendar Year 2011	5,384,000	14,751	76.24
Totals	14,754,000		
Average price			\$ 70.41

At September 30, 2009, the Company had the following derivatives related to crude oil sales in its fuel products segment, none of which are designated as hedges.

Crude Oil Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels		
	Sold	BPD	(\$/Bbl)
Fourth Quarter 2009	460,000	5,000	62.66
Calendar Year 2010	547,500	1,500	58.25
Totals	1,007,500		
Average price			\$ 60.26

At December 31, 2008, the Company had the following derivatives related to crude oil purchases in its fuel products segment, all of which were designated as hedges.

Crude Oil Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels		
	Purchased	BPD	(\$/Bbl)
First Quarter 2009	2,025,000	22,500	\$ 66.26
Second Quarter 2009	2,047,500	22,500	66.26
Third Quarter 2009	2,070,000	22,500	66.26
Fourth Quarter 2009	2,070,000	22,500	66.26
Calendar Year 2010	7,300,000	20,000	67.29
Calendar Year 2011	3,009,000	8,244	76.98
Totals	18,521,500		
Average price			\$ 68.41

At December 31, 2008, the Company had the following derivatives related to crude oil sales in its fuel products segment, none of which are designated as hedges.

Crude Oil Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels Sold		
	BPD	(\$/Bbl)	
First Quarter 2009	450,000	5,000	\$ 62.66
Second Quarter 2009	455,000	5,000	62.66
Third Quarter 2009	460,000	5,000	62.66
Fourth Quarter 2009	460,000	5,000	62.66
Totals	1,825,000		

Average price

\$ 62.66

22

Table of Contents***Fuel Products Swap Contracts***

The Company is exposed to fluctuations in the prices of gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel. The Company utilizes swap contracts to manage diesel, gasoline and jet fuel price risk and volatility of cash flows in its fuel products segment. The Company's policy is generally to enter into diesel and gasoline swap contracts for a period no greater than five years forward and for no more than 75% of forecasted fuel sales.

Diesel Swap Contracts

At September 30, 2009, the Company had the following derivatives related to diesel and jet fuel sales in its fuel products segment, all of which are designated as hedges.

Diesel Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels Sold	BPD	(\$/Bbl)
Fourth Quarter 2009	1,196,000	13,000	80.51
Calendar Year 2010	4,745,000	13,000	80.41
Calendar Year 2011	2,371,000	6,496	90.58
Totals	8,312,000		
Average price			\$ 83.32

At December 31, 2008, the Company had the following derivatives related to diesel and jet fuel sales in its fuel products segment, all of which were designated as hedges.

Diesel Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels Sold	BPD	(\$/Bbl)
First Quarter 2009	1,170,000	13,000	\$ 80.51
Second Quarter 2009	1,183,000	13,000	80.51
Third Quarter 2009	1,196,000	13,000	80.51
Fourth Quarter 2009	1,196,000	13,000	80.51
Calendar Year 2010	4,745,000	13,000	80.41
Calendar Year 2011	2,371,000	6,496	90.58
Totals	11,861,000		
Average price			\$ 82.48

Jet Fuel Swap Contracts

At September 30, 2009, the Company had the following derivatives related to diesel and jet fuel sales in its fuel products segment, all of which are designated as hedges.

Jet Fuel Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels Sold	BPD	(\$/Bbl)
Calendar Year 2011	2,284,000	6,258	\$ 87.88
Totals	2,284,000		
Average price			\$ 87.88

Gasoline Swap Contracts

At September 30, 2009, the Company had the following derivatives related to gasoline sales in its fuel products segment, all of which are designated as hedges.

Gasoline Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels Sold	BPD	(\$/Bbl)
Fourth Quarter 2009	874,000	9,500	73.83
Calendar Year 2010	2,555,000	7,000	75.28
Calendar Year 2011	729,000	1,997	83.53
Totals	4,158,000		

Average price

\$ 76.42

23

Table of Contents

At September 30, 2009, the Company had the following derivatives related to gasoline purchases in its fuel products segment, none of which are designated as hedges.

Gasoline Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels Purchased	BPD	(\$/Bbl)
Fourth Quarter 2009	460,000	5,000	60.53
Calendar Year 2010	547,500	1,500	58.42
Totals	1,007,500		
Average price			\$ 59.38

At December 31, 2008, the Company had the following derivatives related to gasoline sales in its fuel products segment, all of which were designated as hedges.

Gasoline Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels Sold	BPD	(\$/Bbl)
First Quarter 2009	855,000	9,500	\$ 73.83
Second Quarter 2009	864,500	9,500	73.83
Third Quarter 2009	874,000	9,500	73.83
Fourth Quarter 2009	874,000	9,500	73.83
Calendar Year 2010	2,555,000	7,000	75.28
Calendar Year 2011	638,000	1,748	83.42
Totals	6,660,500		
Average price			\$ 75.30

At December 31, 2008, the Company had the following derivatives related to gasoline purchases in its fuel products segment, none of which were designated as hedges.

Gasoline Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels Purchased	BPD	(\$/Bbl)
First Quarter 2009	450,000	5,000	\$ 60.53
Second Quarter 2009	455,000	5,000	60.53
Third Quarter 2009	460,000	5,000	60.53
Fourth Quarter 2009	460,000	5,000	60.53
Totals	1,825,000		
Average price			\$ 60.53

Jet Fuel Put Spread Contracts

At September 30, 2009, the Company had the following jet fuel put options related to jet fuel crack spreads in its fuel products segment, none of which are designated as hedges.

Jet Fuel Put Option Crack Spread Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels	BPD	Average Sold Put (\$/Bbl)	Average Bought Put (\$/Bbl)
January 2011	216,500	6,984	\$ 4.00	\$ 6.00
February 2011	197,000	7,036	4.00	6.00
March 2011	216,500	6,984	4.00	6.00
Totals	630,000			
Average price			\$ 4.00	\$ 6.00

Table of Contents***Natural Gas Swap Contracts***

Natural gas purchases comprise a significant component of the Company's cost of sales, therefore, changes in the price of natural gas also significantly affect its profitability and cash flows. The Company utilizes swap contracts to manage natural gas price risk and volatility of cash flows. The Company's policy is generally to enter into natural gas derivative contracts to hedge approximately 50% or more of its upcoming fall and winter months' anticipated natural gas requirement for a period no greater than three years forward. At September 30, 2009, the Company had the following derivatives related to natural gas purchases, none of which are designated as hedges.

Natural Gas Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	MMBtus	\$/MMBtu
Fourth Quarter 2009	50,000	4.04
Totals	50,000	
Average price		\$ 4.04

At December 31, 2008, the Company had the following derivatives related to natural gas purchases, of which 90,000 MMBtus were designated as hedges.

Natural Gas Swap Contracts by Expiration Dates	MMBtus	\$/MMBtu
First Quarter 2009	330,000	\$ 10.38
Totals	330,000	
Average price		\$ 10.38

Interest Rate Swap Contracts

The Company's profitability and cash flows are affected by changes in interest rates, specifically LIBOR and prime rates. The primary purpose of the Company's interest rate risk management activities is to hedge its exposure to changes in interest rates. In 2008, the Company entered into a forward swap contract to manage interest rate risk related to a portion of its current variable rate senior secured first lien term loan which closed January 3, 2008. The Company has hedged the future interest payments related to \$150,000 and \$50,000 of the total outstanding term loan indebtedness in 2009 and 2010, respectively, pursuant to this forward swap contract. This swap contract is designated as a cash flow hedge of the future payment of interest with three-month LIBOR fixed at 3.09% and 3.66% per annum in 2009 and 2010, respectively.

In 2006, the Company entered into a forward swap contract to manage interest rate risk related to a portion of its then existing variable rate senior secured first lien term loan. Due to the repayment of \$19,000 of the outstanding balance of the Company's then existing term loan facility in August 2007 and subsequent refinancing of the remaining term loan balance, this swap contract was not designated as a cash flow hedge of the future payment of interest. The entire change in the fair value of this interest rate swap is recorded to unrealized gain on derivative instruments in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations. In the first quarter of 2008, the Company fixed its unrealized loss on this interest rate swap derivative instrument by entering into an offsetting interest rate swap which is not designated as a cash flow hedge.

10. Fair Value of Financial Instruments

The Company's financial instruments which require fair value disclosure consist primarily of cash and cash equivalents, accounts receivable, financial derivatives, accounts payable and indebtedness. The carrying value of cash and cash equivalents, accounts receivable and accounts payable are considered to be representative of their respective fair values, due to the short maturity of these instruments. Derivative instruments are reported in the accompanying unaudited condensed consolidated financial statements at fair value. The fair value of the Company's long-term debt excluding capital lease obligations was \$402,221 and \$305,084 at September 30, 2009 and December 31, 2008, respectively. Refer to Note 7 for the carrying values of the Company's long-term debt. In addition, based upon fees charged for similar agreements, the face values of outstanding standby letters of credit approximated their fair value at September 30, 2009 and December 31, 2008.

Table of Contents**11. Fair Value Measurements**

The Company uses a three-tier fair value hierarchy, which prioritizes the inputs used in measuring fair value. These tiers include: Level 1, defined as observable inputs such as quoted prices in active markets; Level 2, defined as inputs other than quoted prices in active markets that are either directly or indirectly observable; and Level 3, defined as unobservable inputs in which little or no market data exists, therefore requiring an entity to develop its own assumptions. In determining fair value, the Company uses various valuation techniques and prioritizes the use of observable inputs. The availability of observable inputs varies from instrument to instrument and depends on a variety of factors including the type of instrument, whether the instrument is actively traded, and other characteristics particular to the instrument. For many financial instruments, pricing inputs are readily observable in the market, the valuation methodology used is widely accepted by market participants, and the valuation does not require significant management judgment. For other financial instruments, pricing inputs are less observable in the marketplace and may require management judgment.

As of September 30, 2009, the Company held certain assets and liabilities that are required to be measured at fair value on a recurring basis. These included the Company's derivative instruments related to crude oil, gasoline, diesel, jet fuel, natural gas and interest rates, and investments associated with the Company's non-contributory defined benefit plan (Pension Plan).

The Company's derivative instruments consist of over-the-counter (OTC) contracts, which are not traded on a public exchange. Substantially all of the Company's derivative instruments are with counterparties that have long-term credit ratings of at least A2 and A by Moody's and S&P, respectively. The fair values of the Company's derivative instruments for crude oil, gasoline, diesel, jet fuel, natural gas and interest rates are determined primarily based on inputs that are readily available in public markets or can be derived from information available in publicly quoted markets. Generally, the Company obtains this data through surveying its counterparties and performing various analytical tests to validate the data. The Company determines the fair value of its crude oil option contracts utilizing a standard option pricing model based on inputs that can be derived from information available in publicly quoted markets, or are quoted by counterparties to these contracts. In situations where the Company obtains inputs via quotes from its counterparties, it verifies the reasonableness of these quotes via similar quotes from another counterparty as of each date for which financial statements are prepared. The Company also includes an adjustment for non-performance risk in the recognized measure of fair value of all of the Company's derivative instruments. The adjustment reflects the full credit default spread (CDS) applied to a net exposure by counterparty. When the Company is in a net asset position, it uses its counterparty's CDS, or a peer group's estimated CDS when a CDS for the counterparty is not available. The Company uses its own peer group's estimated CDS when it is in a net liability position. As a result of applying the applicable CDS, at September 30, 2009, the Company's asset was reduced by approximately \$324 and its liability was reduced by \$385. Based on the use of various unobservable inputs, principally non-performance risk and unobservable inputs in forward years for gasoline, jet fuel and diesel, the Company has categorized these derivative instruments as Level 3. The Company has consistently applied these valuation techniques in all periods presented and believes it has obtained the most accurate information available for the types of derivative instruments it holds.

The Company's investments associated with its Pension Plan consist of mutual funds that are publicly traded and for which market prices are readily available, thus these investments are categorized as Level 1.

Table of Contents

The Company's assets measured at fair value at September 30, 2009 were as follows:

	Fair Value Measurements			Total
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	
Assets:				
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 2,567	\$	\$	\$ 2,567
Crude oil swaps			54,006	54,006
Gasoline swaps			9,783	9,783
Diesel swaps				
Jet fuel swaps				
Natural gas swaps				
Crude oil options			27	27
Jet fuel options			300	300
Pension Plan investments	12,018			12,018
Total assets at fair value	\$ 14,585	\$	\$ 64,116	\$ 78,701
Liabilities:				
Crude oil swaps	\$	\$	\$	\$
Gasoline swaps				
Diesel swaps			(17,035)	(17,035)
Jet fuel swaps			(8,561)	(8,561)
Natural gas swaps			(15)	(15)
Crude oil options				
Jet fuel options				
Interest rate swaps			(5,269)	(5,269)
Total liabilities at fair value	\$	\$	\$ (30,880)	\$ (30,880)

The table below sets forth a summary of net changes in fair value of the Company's Level 3 financial assets and liabilities for the nine months ended September 30, 2009:

	Derivative Instruments, Net
Fair value at January 1, 2009	\$ 55,372
Realized losses	3,213
Unrealized gains	17,672
Comprehensive income (loss)	(27,885)
Purchases, issuances and settlements	(15,136)
Transfers in (out) of Level 3	
Fair value at September 30, 2009	\$ 33,236
Total gains (losses) included in net income (loss) attributable to changes in unrealized gains (losses) relating to financial assets and liabilities held as of September 30, 2009	\$ 17,672

All settlements from derivative instruments that are deemed effective and were designated as cash flow hedges are included in sales for gasoline, diesel and jet fuel derivatives, cost of sales for crude oil and natural gas derivatives, and interest expense for interest rate derivatives in the unaudited condensed consolidated financial statements of operations in the period that the hedged cash flow occurs. Any ineffectiveness associated with these derivative instruments are recorded in earnings immediately in unrealized gain (loss) on derivative instruments in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations. All settlements from derivative instruments not designated as cash flow hedges are recorded in realized gain (loss) on derivative instruments in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations. See Note 8 for further information on ASC 815 and hedging.

Table of Contents**12. Comprehensive Income (Loss)**

Comprehensive income (loss) for the Company includes the change in fair value of cash flow hedges and the minimum pension liability adjustment that have not been recognized in net income (loss). Comprehensive income (loss) for the three and nine months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008 was as follows:

	Three Months Ended September 30,		Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2009	2008	2009	2008
Net income (loss)	\$ 3,967	\$ (12,515)	\$ 53,618	\$ 25,901
Cash flow hedge (gain) loss reclassified to net income (loss) upon settlement	(1,157)	5,853	(5,243)	10,993
Change in fair value of cash flow hedges	11,902	39,978	(27,885)	(55,991)
Minimum pension liability adjustment	94		283	
Total comprehensive income (loss)	\$ 14,806	\$ 33,316	\$ 20,773	\$ (19,097)

13. Unit-Based Compensation and Distributions

The Company's general partner adopted a Long-Term Incentive Plan (the "Plan") on January 24, 2006, which was amended and restated effective January 22, 2009, for its employees, consultants, directors and its affiliates who perform services for the Company. The Plan provides for the grant of restricted units, phantom units, unit options, substitute awards and, with respect to unit options and phantom units, the grant of distribution equivalent rights ("DERs"). Subject to adjustment for certain events, an aggregate of 783,960 common units may be delivered pursuant to awards under the Plan. Units withheld to satisfy the Company's general partner's tax withholding obligations are available for delivery pursuant to other awards under the Plan. The Plan is administered by the compensation committee of the Company's general partner's board of directors.

Non-employee directors of the Company's general partner have been granted phantom units under the terms of the Plan as part of their director compensation package related to fiscal years 2007 and 2008. These phantom units have a four year service period with one quarter of the phantom units vesting annually on each December 31 of the vesting period. Although ownership of common units related to the vesting of such phantom units does not transfer to the recipients until the phantom units vest, the recipients have DERs on these phantom units from the date of grant. The Company uses the market price of its common units on the grant date to calculate the fair value and related compensation cost of the phantom units. The Company amortizes this compensation cost to partners' capital and selling, general and administrative expenses in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations using the straight-line method over the four year vesting period, as it expects these units to fully vest.

On January 22, 2009, the board of directors of the Company's general partner approved discretionary contributions to participant accounts for certain directors and employees in the form of phantom units under the Calumet Specialty Products Partners, L.P. Executive Deferred Compensation Plan. The phantom unit awards vest in one-quarter increments over a four year service period, subject to early vesting on a change in control or upon termination without cause or due to death. These phantom units also carry DERs from the date of grant.

A summary of the Company's nonvested phantom units as of September 30, 2009 and the changes during the nine months ended September 30, 2009 is presented below:

Nonvested Phantom Units	Grant	Weighted Average Grant Date Fair Value
Nonvested at December 31, 2008	27,708	\$ 12.91
Granted	32,132	11.61

Vested	(4,618)		12.91
Forfeited			
Nonvested at September 30, 2009	55,222	\$	12.15

For the three months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008, compensation expense of \$57 and \$29, respectively, was recognized in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations related to vested phantom unit grants. For the nine months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008, compensation expense of \$242 and \$90, respectively, was recognized in the unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations related to vested phantom unit grants. The vesting of phantom units during fiscal year 2009 was due to the retirement of a director of the Company's general partner. As of September 30, 2009 and 2008, there was a total of \$429 and \$212 of unrecognized compensation costs related to nonvested phantom unit grants. These costs are expected to be recognized over a weighted-average period of approximately two years.

Calumet's distribution policy is as defined in its partnership agreement. For the nine months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008, Calumet made distributions of \$44,447 and \$51,339, respectively, to its partners.

Table of Contents**14. Employee Benefit Plans**

The components of net periodic pension and other post retirement benefits cost for the three months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008 were as follows:

	For the Three Months Ended September 30,	
	2009	2008
Pension Benefits		
Service cost	\$ 63	\$ 236
Interest cost	331	324
Expected return on assets	(187)	(334)
Recognized actuarial loss	95	
Net periodic benefit cost	\$ 302	\$ 226

	For the Three Months Ended September 30,	
	2009	2008
Other Post Retirement Employee Benefits		
Service cost	\$ 2	\$ 2
Interest cost	11	13
Expected return on assets		
Recognized actuarial gain	(1)	
Net periodic benefit cost	\$ 12	\$ 15

The components of net periodic pension and other post retirement benefits cost for the nine months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008 were as follows:

	For the Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2009	2008
Pension Benefits		
Service cost	\$ 188	\$ 708
Interest cost	995	974
Expected return on assets	(561)	(1,002)
Recognized actuarial loss	286	
Net periodic benefit cost	\$ 908	\$ 680

	For the Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2009	2008
Other Post Retirement Employee Benefits		
Service cost	\$ 7	\$ 7
Interest cost	33	38
Expected return on assets		

Recognized actuarial gain		(3)		
Net periodic benefit cost		\$	37	\$ 45

During each of the three and nine months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008, the Company made no contributions to its Pension Plan and other post retirement employee benefit plans, respectively, and expects to make no contributions for the remainder of 2009.

Table of Contents

15. Transactions with Related Parties

In addition to the Company's Legacy Resources Co., L.P. existing agreement covering crude oil purchases for its Princeton refinery, in September 2009 the Company entered into a Crude Oil Supply Agreement (the Agreement) with Legacy Resources Co., L.P. (Legacy). Under the agreement, Legacy will supply the Partnership's Shreveport refinery with a portion of its crude oil requirements on a just in time basis utilizing a market-based pricing mechanism. The Master Crude Oil Purchase and Sale Agreement with Legacy Resources Co., L.P., entered into in January 2009, whereby the Company began purchasing certain of its crude oil requirements for its Shreveport refinery, is not currently in use. Legacy is owned in part by three of the Company's limited partners, an affiliate of the Company's general partner, the Company's chief executive officer and president, F. William Grube, and Jennifer G. Straumins, the Company's senior vice president. The volume of crude oil purchased under the Agreement fluctuates based on the volume of crude oil needed by the Shreveport refinery and can range from zero to 15,000 barrels per day. During the three and nine months ended September 30, 2009, the Company had crude oil purchases of \$110,185 and \$252,294, respectively, from Legacy. Accounts payable to Legacy at September 30, 2009 were \$37,682.

16. Segments and Related Information

a. Segment Reporting

The Company has two reportable segments: Specialty Products and Fuel Products. The Specialty Products segment produces a variety of lubricating oils, solvents, waxes and asphalt and other by-products. These products are sold to customers who purchase these products primarily as raw material components for basic automotive, industrial and consumer goods. The Fuel Products segment produces a variety of fuel and fuel-related products including gasoline, diesel and jet fuel. Because of their similar economic characteristics, certain operations have been aggregated for segment reporting purposes.

Table of Contents

The accounting policies of the segments are the same as those described in the summary of significant accounting policies in the notes to consolidated financial statements in the Company's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2008 except that the Company evaluates segment performance based on income (loss) from operations. The Company accounts for intersegment sales and transfers at cost plus a specified mark-up. Reportable segment information is as follows:

Three Months Ended September 30, 2009	Specialty Products	Fuel Products	Combined Segments	Eliminations	Consolidated Total
Sales:					
External customers	\$ 261,966	\$ 230,465	\$ 492,431	\$	\$ 492,431
Intersegment sales	203,965	5,143	209,108	(209,108)	
Total sales	\$ 465,931	\$ 235,608	\$ 701,539	\$ (209,108)	\$ 492,431
Depreciation and amortization	18,766		18,766		18,766
Operating income	9,253	4,589	13,842		13,842
Reconciling items to net income:					
Interest expense					(8,243)
Loss on derivative instruments					(440)
Other					(1,271)
Income tax benefit					79
Net income					\$ 3,967
Capital expenditures	\$ 7,373	\$	\$ 7,373	\$	\$ 7,373
Three Months Ended September 30, 2008	Specialty Products	Fuel Products	Combined Segments	Eliminations	Consolidated Total
Sales:					
External customers	\$ 486,165	\$ 238,206	\$ 724,371	\$	\$ 724,371
Intersegment sales	328,821	4,895	333,716	(333,716)	
Total sales	\$ 814,986	\$ 243,101	\$ 1,058,087	\$ (333,716)	\$ 724,371
Depreciation and amortization	16,480		16,480		16,480
Operating income	34,431	7,175	41,606		41,606
Reconciling items to net loss:					
Interest expense					(10,670)
Debt extinguishment costs					
Loss on derivative instruments					(43,513)
Gain on sale of mineral rights					
Other					210
Income tax expense					(148)
Net loss					\$ (12,515)
Capital expenditures	\$ 9,264	\$	\$ 9,264	\$	\$ 9,264

Table of Contents

Nine Months Ended September 30, 2009	Specialty Products	Fuel Products	Combined Segments	Eliminations	Consolidated Total
Sales:					
External customers	\$ 701,222	\$ 649,513	\$ 1,350,735	\$	\$ 1,350,735
Intersegment sales	499,482	13,555	513,037	(513,037)	
Total sales	\$ 1,200,704	\$ 663,068	\$ 1,863,772	\$ (513,037)	\$ 1,350,735
Depreciation and amortization	54,582		54,582		54,582
Operating income	45,591	15,401	60,992		60,992
Reconciling items to net income:					
Interest expense					(25,333)
Debt extinguishment costs					
Gain on derivative instruments					20,885
Other					(2,856)
Income tax expense					(70)
Net income					\$ 53,618
Capital expenditures	\$ 20,718	\$	\$ 20,718	\$	\$ 20,718
Nine Months Ended September 30, 2008	Specialty Products	Fuel Products	Combined Segments	Eliminations	Consolidated Total
Sales:					
External customers	\$ 1,268,629	\$ 721,686	\$ 1,990,315	\$	\$ 1,990,315
Intersegment sales	941,943	24,675	966,618	(966,618)	
Total sales	\$ 2,210,572	\$ 746,361	\$ 2,956,933	\$ (966,618)	\$ 1,990,315
Depreciation and amortization	43,410		43,410		43,410
Operating income	17,887	54,109	71,996		71,996
Reconciling items to net income:					
Interest expense					(24,373)
Debt extinguishment costs					(898)
Loss on derivative instruments					(26,837)
Gain on sale of mineral rights					5,770
Other					551
Income tax expense					(308)
Net income					\$ 25,901
Capital expenditures	\$ 161,811	\$	\$ 161,811	\$	\$ 161,811
			September 30, 2009	December 31, 2008	
Segment assets:					
Specialty products			\$ 2,735,792	\$	2,208,741
Fuel products			2,052,574		1,483,457

Combined segments		4,788,366		3,692,198
Eliminations		(3,740,334)		(2,611,136)
Total assets		\$ 1,048,032	\$	1,081,062

b. Geographic Information

International sales accounted for less than 10% of consolidated sales in each of the three and nine months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008. All of the Company's long-lived assets are domestically located.

Table of Contents***c. Product Information***

The Company offers products primarily in five general categories consisting of lubricating oils, solvents, waxes, fuels and asphalt and by-products. Fuel products primarily consist of gasoline, diesel and jet fuel. The following table sets forth the major product category sales:

	Three Months Ended September 30,	
	2009	2008
Specialty products:		
Lubricating oils	\$ 133,388	\$ 271,365
Solvents	70,591	118,680
Waxes	27,186	39,638
Fuels	1,558	7,747
Asphalt and other by-products	29,243	48,735
Total	\$ 261,966	\$ 486,165
Fuel products:		
Gasoline	79,193	82,550
Diesel	91,056	96,134
Jet fuel	47,502	57,335
By-products	12,714	2,187
Total	\$ 230,465	\$ 238,206
Consolidated sales	\$ 492,431	\$ 724,371
	Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2009	2008
Specialty products:		
Lubricating oils	\$ 362,432	\$ 671,959
Solvents	186,218	343,688
Waxes	71,383	110,982
Fuels	6,462	27,254
Asphalt and other by-products	74,727	114,746
Total	\$ 701,222	\$ 1,268,629
Fuel products:		
Gasoline	229,398	259,492
Diesel	274,724	302,526
Jet fuel	128,867	148,953
By-products	16,524	10,715
Total	\$ 649,513	\$ 721,686
Consolidated sales	\$ 1,350,735	\$ 1,990,315

d. Major Customers

During the three and nine months ended September 30, 2009, the Company had no customer that represented 10% or greater of consolidated sales. During the nine months ended September 30, 2008, the Company had one customer, Murphy Oil U.S.A., which represented approximately 11% of consolidated sales. No other customer represented 10% or greater of consolidated sales in the three and nine months ended September 30, 2008.

17. Subsequent Events

On October 20, 2009, the Company declared a quarterly cash distribution of \$0.45 per unit on all outstanding units, or \$14,811, for the quarter ended September 30, 2009. The distribution will be paid on November 13, 2009 to unitholders of record as of the close of business on November 3, 2009. This quarterly distribution of \$0.45 per unit equates to \$1.80 per unit, or \$59,244 on an annualized basis.

The fair value of the Company's derivatives and long-term debt, excluding capital leases, have increased by approximately \$8,400 and \$0, respectively, subsequent to September 30, 2009.

Table of Contents**Item 2. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations**

The historical consolidated financial statements included in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q reflect all of the assets, liabilities and results of operations of Calumet Specialty Products Partners, L.P. (Calumet). The following discussion analyzes the financial condition and results of operations of Calumet for the three and nine months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008. Unitholders should read the following discussion and analysis of the financial condition and results of operations for Calumet in conjunction with the historical unaudited condensed consolidated financial statements and notes of Calumet included elsewhere in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Overview

We are a leading independent producer of high-quality, specialty hydrocarbon products in North America. We own plants located in Princeton, Louisiana, Cotton Valley, Louisiana, Shreveport, Louisiana, Karns City, Pennsylvania, and Dickinson, Texas, and a terminal located in Burnham, Illinois. Our business is organized into two segments: specialty products and fuel products. In our specialty products segment, we process crude oil and other feedstocks into a wide variety of customized lubricating oils, white mineral oils, solvents, petrolatums and waxes. Our specialty products are sold to domestic and international customers who purchase them primarily as raw material components for basic industrial, consumer and automotive goods. In our fuel products segment, we process crude oil into a variety of fuel and fuel-related products, including gasoline, diesel and jet fuel. In connection with our production of specialty products and fuel products, we also produce asphalt and a limited number of other by-products. The asphalt and other by-products produced in connection with the production of specialty products at our Princeton, Cotton Valley and Shreveport refineries are included in our specialty products segment. The by-products produced in connection with the production of fuel products at our Shreveport refinery are included in our fuel products segment. The fuels produced in connection with the production of specialty products at our Princeton and Cotton Valley refineries and our Karns City facility are included in our specialty products segment. For the three and nine months ended September 30, 2009, approximately 81.5% and 82.4%, respectively, of our gross profit was generated from our specialty products segment and approximately 18.5% and 17.6%, respectively, of our gross profit was generated from our fuel products segment.

Refining Industry Dynamics

The overall refining industry continues to experience challenging economic times. Fuel products crack spreads remain at low levels and, in response, numerous refiners have announced the idling of assets or entire facilities. The stability in crude oil prices during the third quarter allowed gross profit related to specialty products to stabilize and improve slightly; however, prices are still below third quarter 2008 levels. Overall demand for specialty products did show some signs of strengthening during the quarter, but remain below third quarter 2008 levels. These market conditions have led to continued lower gross profit per barrel of product as compared to the prior year for most refiners, including Calumet. Calumet believe the majority of refiners have continued to see an overall reduction in demand for their products due to the weakness in the overall economic environment, especially in demand for products closely tied to the automotive and construction industries. Given these factors, upcoming quarters will likely continue to be challenging for refiners, including specialty products refiners like us.

Calumet seeks to differentiate itself from its competitors, especially in this challenging economic environment, through (i) continued focus on a wide range of specialty products sold in many different industries and (ii) enhanced operations, including increasing throughput rates at our recently expanded Shreveport refinery. Despite the continuing economic weakness during the third quarter of 2009, we were able to pay approximately \$14.8 million in distributions to our unitholders, maintain compliance with the financial covenants of our credit agreements and improve our liquidity position as of September 30, 2009 as compared to prior quarters in 2009. In addition, Calumet entered into new agreements with a subsidiary of LyondellBasell to expand its specialty products business related to naphthenic lubricating oils and white mineral oils. For further discussion of these new agreements, which we expect to become effective in early November 2009, please see LyondellBasell Agreements .

Table of Contents**LyondellBasell Agreements**

On September 29, 2009, the Company entered into multiyear agreements with Houston Refining LP, a wholly-owned subsidiary of LyondellBasell (Houston Refining), to form a long term exclusive specialty products affiliation. Under the terms of the agreement, Calumet will be the exclusive marketer of Houston Refining s naphthenic lubricating oil production and is required to market a minimum of approximately 3,000 barrels per day (bpd) from their Houston, TX refinery. In addition, Houston Refining will process at least approximately 800 bpd of white mineral oil for Calumet which Calumet will then sell to supplement Calumet s existing production at its Karns City, PA and Dickinson, TX facilities. Calumet also receives the exclusive right to use the LyondellBasell registered trademarks and tradenames including Tufflo, Duoprime, Duotreat, Crystex, Ideal and Aquamarine. The agreements were deemed effective as of November 4, 2009 upon the approval of LyondellBasell s motion for entry of an order by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court authorizing the rejection by LyondellBasell of the agreements in place with third parties covering these products.

While no fixed assets will be purchased under the agreements with LyondellBasell, Calumet does expect these agreements to increase its working capital requirements by approximately \$20 million to \$30 million at current market prices. Please refer to discussion within Liquidity and Capital Resources for further information.

Penreco Acquisition

On January 3, 2008, we acquired Penreco, a Texas general partnership, for \$269.1 million. Penreco was owned by ConocoPhillips Company and M.E. Zukerman Specialty Oil Corporation. Penreco manufactures and markets highly refined products and specialty solvents including white mineral oils, petrolatums, natural petroleum sulfonates, cable-filling compounds, refrigeration oils, food-grade compressor lubricants and gelled products. The acquisition included facilities in Karns City, Pennsylvania and Dickinson, Texas, as well as several long-term supply agreements with ConocoPhillips Company. We funded the transaction through a portion of the combined proceeds from a public equity offering and a new senior secured first lien term loan facility. For further discussion, please read Liquidity and Capital Resources Debt and Credit Facilities. We believe that this acquisition has provided several key long-term strategic benefits, including market synergies within our solvents and lubricating oil product lines, additional operational and logistics flexibility and overhead cost reductions. The acquisition has broadened our customer base and has given the Company access to new specialty product markets.

Shreveport Expansion

In the second quarter of 2008 we completed a \$374.0 million expansion project at our Shreveport refinery to increase aggregate crude oil throughput capacity from approximately 42,000 bpd to approximately 60,000 bpd and improve feedstock flexibility. For 2008, the Shreveport refinery had a total average feedstock throughput rate of 37,096 bpd, which represents an increase of approximately 2,744 bpd from 2007 before completion of the Shreveport expansion project. The Shreveport refinery did not achieve the expected significant increase in feedstock throughput in 2008 compared to 2007 due primarily to unscheduled downtime due to Hurricane Ike in September 2008 and scheduled downtime in the fourth quarter of 2008 to complete a three-week turnaround. In the nine months ended September 30, 2009, feedstock throughput rates at the Shreveport refinery averaged approximately 45,324 bpd, a 22.2% increase over the 2008 fiscal year average throughput rate.

Key Performance Measures

Our sales and net income are principally affected by the price of crude oil, demand for specialty and fuel products, prevailing crack spreads for fuel products, the price of natural gas used as fuel in our operations and our results from derivative instrument activities.

Table of Contents

Our primary raw materials are crude oil and other specialty feedstocks and our primary outputs are specialty petroleum and fuel products. The prices of crude oil, specialty products and fuel products are subject to fluctuations in response to changes in supply, demand, market uncertainties and a variety of additional factors beyond our control. We monitor these risks and enter into financial derivatives designed to mitigate the impact of commodity price fluctuations on our business. The primary purpose of our commodity risk management activities is to economically hedge our cash flow exposure to commodity price risk so that we can meet our cash distribution, debt service and capital expenditure requirements despite fluctuations in crude oil and fuel products prices. We enter into derivative contracts for future periods in quantities which do not exceed our projected purchases of crude oil and natural gas and sales of fuel products. Please read Item 3 Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk Commodity Price Risk. As of September 30, 2009, we have hedged approximately 14.8 million barrels of fuel products through December 2011 at an average refining margin of \$11.65 per barrel. As of September 30, 2009, we have approximately 0.5 million barrels of crude oil swaps and options through December 2009 to hedge our purchases of crude oil for specialty products production. The strike prices of these crude oil swaps and options vary. Please refer to Note 8 under Item 1 Financial Statements Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements for a detailed listing of our derivative instruments.

Our management uses several financial and operational measurements to analyze our performance. These measurements include the following:

sales volumes;

production yields; and

specialty products and fuel products gross profit.

Sales volumes. We view the volumes of specialty products and fuels products sold as an important measure of our ability to effectively utilize our refining assets. Our ability to meet the demands of our customers is driven by the volumes of crude oil and feedstocks that we run at our facilities. Higher volumes improve profitability both through the spreading of fixed costs over greater volumes and the additional gross profit achieved on the incremental volumes.

Production yields. We seek the optimal product mix for each barrel of crude oil we refine, which we refer to as production yield, in order to maximize our gross profit and minimize lower margin by-products.

Specialty products and fuel products gross profit. Specialty products and fuel products gross profit are important measures of our ability to maximize the profitability of our specialty products and fuel products segments. We define specialty products and fuel products gross profit as sales less the cost of crude oil and other feedstocks and other production-related expenses, the most significant portion of which include labor, plant fuel, utilities, contract services, maintenance, depreciation and processing materials. We use specialty products and fuel products gross profit as indicators of our ability to manage our business during periods of crude oil and natural gas price fluctuations, as the prices of our specialty products and fuel products generally do not change immediately with changes in the price of crude oil and natural gas. The increase in selling prices typically lags behind the rising costs of crude oil feedstocks for specialty products. Other than plant fuel, production-related expenses generally remain stable across broad ranges of throughput volumes, but can fluctuate depending on maintenance activities performed during a specific period.

In addition to the foregoing measures, we also monitor our selling, general and administrative expenditures, substantially all of which are incurred through our general partner, Calumet GP, LLC.

Table of Contents**Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2009 and 2008 Results of Operations**

The following table sets forth information about our combined operations. Facility production volume differs from sales volume due to changes in inventory.

	Three Months Ended September 30,		Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2009	2008	2009	2008
	(In bpd)		(In bpd)	
Total sales volume (1)	58,630	57,054	57,297	58,938
Total feedstock runs (2)	59,949	57,263	61,069	57,985
Facility production: (3)				
Specialty products:				
Lubricating oils	13,118	13,257	11,481	13,108
Solvents	7,923	7,779	7,868	8,489
Waxes	1,274	1,518	1,082	1,851
Fuels	941	1,141	811	1,157
Asphalt and other by-products	7,667	6,691	7,694	6,872
Total	30,923	30,386	28,936	31,477
Fuel products:				
Gasoline	9,144	8,394	9,841	8,636
Diesel	12,079	10,548	12,662	10,580
Jet fuel	7,328	6,613	7,184	6,089
By-products	562	271	529	344
Total	29,113	25,826	30,216	25,649
Total facility production	60,036	56,212	59,152	57,126

(1) Total sales volume includes sales from the production of our facilities and certain third-party facilities pursuant to supply and/or processing agreements, and sales of inventories.

(2) Total feedstock runs represents

the barrels per day of crude oil and other feedstocks processed at our facilities and certain third-party facilities pursuant to supply and/or processing agreements. The increase in feedstock runs for the three months ended September 30, 2009 compared to the prior period is primarily due to increased run rates at the Shreveport refinery due to increased operational efficiencies.

- (3) Total facility production represents the barrels per day of specialty products and fuel products yielded from processing crude oil and other feedstocks at our facilities and certain third-party facilities pursuant to supply and/or processing agreements. The difference between total

production and total feedstock runs is primarily a result of the time lag between the input of feedstock and production of finished products and volume loss.

Table of Contents

The following table reflects our consolidated results of operations and includes the non-GAAP financial measures EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA. For a reconciliation of EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA to net income and net cash provided by operating activities, our most directly comparable financial performance and liquidity measures calculated in accordance with GAAP, please read **Non-GAAP Financial Measures**.

	Three Months Ended		Nine Months Ended	
	September 30,		September 30,	
	2009	2008	2009	2008
	(In millions)		(In millions)	
Sales	\$ 492.4	\$ 724.4	\$ 1,350.7	\$ 1,990.3
Cost of sales	451.2	647.4	1,212.2	1,817.6
Gross profit	41.2	77.0	138.5	172.7
Operating costs and expenses:				
Selling, general and administrative	7.4	12.0	23.7	29.7
Transportation	18.5	21.7	49.8	66.7
Taxes other than income taxes	1.2	1.3	3.1	3.4
Other	0.3	0.4	0.9	0.9
Operating income	13.8	41.6	61.0	72.0
Other income (expense):				
Interest expense	(8.2)	(10.7)	(25.3)	(24.4)
Debt extinguishment costs				(0.9)
Realized gain (loss) on derivative instruments	4.0	(12.6)	3.2	(13.0)
Unrealized gain (loss) on derivative instruments	(4.5)	(30.9)	17.7	(13.9)
Gain on sale of mineral rights				5.8
Other	(1.2)	0.2	(2.9)	0.6
Total other income (expense)	(9.9)	(54.0)	(7.3)	(45.8)
Net income (loss) before income taxes	3.9	(12.4)	53.7	26.2
Income tax (benefit) expense	(0.1)	0.1	0.1	0.3
Net income (loss)	\$ 4.0	\$ (12.5)	\$ 53.6	\$ 25.9
EBITDA	\$ 27.7	\$ 13.6	\$ 125.4	\$ 91.3
Adjusted EBITDA	\$ 42.5	\$ 51.6	\$ 119.3	\$ 114.4

Non-GAAP Financial Measures

We include in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q the non-GAAP financial measures EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA, and provide reconciliations of EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA to net income (loss) and net cash provided by operating activities, our most directly comparable financial performance and liquidity measures calculated and presented in accordance with GAAP.

EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA are used as supplemental financial measures by our management and by external users of our financial statements such as investors, commercial banks, research analysts and others, to assess:

the financial performance of our assets without regard to financing methods, capital structure or historical cost basis;

the ability of our assets to generate cash sufficient to pay interest costs, support our indebtedness, and meet minimum quarterly distributions;

our operating performance and return on capital as compared to those of other companies in our industry, without regard to financing or capital structure; and

the viability of acquisitions and capital expenditure projects and the overall rates of return on alternative investment opportunities.

We define EBITDA as net income plus interest expense (including debt issuance and extinguishment costs), taxes and depreciation and amortization. We define Adjusted EBITDA to be Consolidated EBITDA as defined in our credit facilities. Consistent with that definition, Adjusted EBITDA means, for any period: (1) net income plus (2)(a) interest expense; (b) taxes; (c) depreciation and amortization; (d) unrealized losses from mark to market accounting for hedging activities; (e) unrealized items decreasing net income (including the non-cash impact of restructuring, decommissioning and asset impairments in the periods presented); and (f) other non-recurring expenses reducing net income which do not represent a cash item for such period; minus (3)(a) tax credits; (b) unrealized items increasing net income

Table of Contents

(including the non-cash impact of restructuring, decommissioning and asset impairments in the periods presented); (c) unrealized gains from mark to market accounting for hedging activities; and (d) other non-recurring expenses and unrealized items that reduced net income for a prior period, but represent a cash item in the current period.

We are required to report Adjusted EBITDA to our lenders under our credit facilities and it is used to determine our compliance with the consolidated leverage and consolidated interest coverage tests thereunder. Please refer to

Liquidity and Capital Resources Debt and Credit Facilities within this item for additional details regarding our credit agreements.

EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA should not be considered alternatives to net income (loss), operating income, net cash provided by operating activities or any other measure of financial performance presented in accordance with GAAP. Our EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA may not be comparable to similarly titled measures of another company because all companies may not calculate EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA in the same manner. The following tables present a reconciliation of both net income (loss) to EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA and EBITDA to net cash provided by operating activities, our most directly comparable GAAP financial performance and liquidity measures, for each of the periods indicated.

	Three Months Ended		Nine Months Ended	
	September 30,		September 30,	
	2009	2008	2009	2008
	(In millions)		(In millions)	
Reconciliation of Net Income (Loss) to EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA:				
Net income (loss)	\$ 4.0	\$ (12.5)	\$ 53.6	\$ 25.9
Add:				
Interest expense and debt extinguishment costs	8.2	10.7	25.3	25.3
Depreciation and amortization	15.6	15.3	46.4	39.8
Income tax (benefit) expense	(0.1)	0.1	0.1	0.3
EBITDA	\$ 27.7	\$ 13.6	\$ 125.4	\$ 91.3
Add:				
Unrealized (gain) loss from mark to market accounting for hedging activities	\$ 11.4	\$ 33.4	\$ (10.4)	\$ 15.2
Prepaid non-recurring expenses and accrued non-recurring expenses, net of cash outlays	3.4	4.6	4.3	7.9
Adjusted EBITDA	\$ 42.5	\$ 51.6	\$ 119.3	\$ 114.4

	Nine Months Ended	
	September 30,	
	2009	2008
	(In millions)	
Reconciliation of Adjusted EBITDA and EBITDA to net cash provided by operating activities:		
Adjusted EBITDA	\$ 119.3	\$ 114.4
Add:		
Unrealized gain (loss) from mark to market accounting for hedging activities	10.4	(15.2)
Prepaid non-recurring expenses and accrued non-recurring expenses, net of cash outlays	(4.3)	(7.9)

EBITDA	\$ 125.4	\$ 91.3
Add:		
Interest expense and debt extinguishment costs, net	(22.6)	(22.7)
Unrealized (gain) loss on derivative instruments	(17.6)	13.9
Income taxes	(0.1)	(0.3)
Provision for doubtful accounts	(0.8)	1.3
Debt extinguishment costs		0.9
Changes in assets and liabilities:		
Accounts receivable	(17.9)	(64.4)
Inventory	(13.2)	84.6
Other current assets	3.0	4.6
Derivative activity	6.7	7.5
Accounts payable	38.3	(39.5)
Other current liabilities	2.8	4.2
Other, including changes in noncurrent assets and liabilities	6.6	(5.7)
Net cash provided by operating activities	\$ 110.6	\$ 75.7

Table of Contents**Three Months Ended September 30, 2009 Compared to Three Months Ended September 30, 2008**

Sales. Sales decreased \$232.0 million, or 32.0%, to \$492.4 million in the three months ended September 30, 2009 from \$724.4 million in the three months ended September 30, 2008. Sales for each of our principal product categories in these periods were as follows:

	Three Months Ended September 30,		
	2009	2008	% Change
	(Dollars in millions)		
Sales by segment:			
Specialty products:			
Lubricating oils	\$ 133.4	\$ 271.4	(50.9)%
Solvents	70.6	118.7	(40.5)%
Waxes	27.2	39.6	(31.4)%
Fuels (1)	1.6	7.7	(79.9)%
Asphalt and by-products (2)	29.2	48.8	(40.0)%
Total specialty products	\$ 262.0	\$ 486.2	(46.1)%
Total specialty products sales volume (in barrels)	2,402,000	2,619,000	(8.3)%
Fuel products:			
Gasoline	\$ 79.2	\$ 82.6	(4.1)%
Diesel	91.0	96.1	(5.3)%
Jet fuel	47.5	57.3	(17.2)%
By-products (3)	12.7	2.2	481.3%
Total fuel products	\$ 230.4	\$ 238.2	(3.3)%
Total fuel products sales volume (in barrels)	2,992,000	2,630,000	13.8%
Total sales	\$ 492.4	\$ 724.4	(32.0)%
Total sales volume (in barrels)	5,394,000	5,249,000	2.8%

(1) Represents fuels produced in connection with the production of specialty products at the Princeton, Cotton Valley and Karns City facilities.

(2) Represents asphalt and other by-products produced in connection with the production of specialty products at the Princeton, Cotton Valley and Shreveport refineries.

(3) Represents by-products produced in connection with the production of fuels at the Shreveport refinery.

Specialty products segment sales for the three months ended September 30, 2009 decreased \$224.2 million, or 46.1%, as a result of the 41.3% decrease in the average selling price per barrel and an 8.3% decrease in sales volume as compared the same period in 2008. Specialty products pricing decreased in all categories compared to a 43.4 % decrease in the average cost of crude oil per barrel from the three months ended September 30, 2009 as compared to the same period in 2008. Sales volume decreased from approximately 2.6 million barrels in the third quarter of 2008 to approximately 2.4 million barrels in the third quarter of 2009 primarily as a result of reduced demand for lubricating oils and waxes caused by the current economic downturn.

Fuel products segment sales for the three months ended September 30, 2009 decreased \$7.8 million, or 3.3%, due to a 45.9% decrease in the average selling price per barrel as compared to the third quarter of 2008 as compared to the 43.6% decrease in the average cost of crude oil per barrel for the same period. The average sales price per barrel

decreased for all fuel products, with diesel and jet fuel sales prices experiencing the most significant decrease. The decrease in sales prices exceeded the decrease in the average cost of crude oil due primarily to lower crack spreads for all fuel products in the third quarter of 2009 as compared to the same period in 2008 as a result of reduced fuel products demand in the current economic downturn. The decreased sales prices were partially offset by a 13.8% increase in sales volume and a \$131.7 million increase in derivative gains on our fuel products cash flow hedges recorded in sales. Please see **Gross Profit** below for discussion of the net impact of our crude oil and fuel products derivative instruments designated as hedges.

Gross Profit. Gross profit decreased \$35.8 million, or 46.5%, to \$41.1 million for the three months ended September 30, 2009 from \$77.0 million for the three months ended September 30, 2008. Gross profit for our specialty products and fuel products segments was as follows:

Table of Contents

	Three Months Ended September 30,		
	2009	2008	% Change
	(Dollars in millions)		
Gross profit (loss) by segment:			
Specialty products	\$33.5	\$66.1	(49.3)%
Percentage of sales	12.8%	13.6%	
Fuel products	\$ 7.6	\$10.9	(30.3)%
Percentage of sales	3.31%	4.6%	
Total gross profit	\$41.1	\$77.0	(46.6)%
Percentage of sales	8.4%	10.6%	

The decrease of \$32.6 million in specialty products segment gross profit was primarily due to a reduction in sales volume of 8.3%, as discussed above, and average sales price per barrel decreasing by 41.3% while the average cost of crude oil per barrel fell by 43.4% for an overall reduction of approximately 37.2% in specialty products gross profit per barrel. Offsetting these reductions were lower operating costs primarily due to lower natural gas and electricity costs as market prices for natural gas declined significantly as compared to the prior period.

Fuel products segment gross profit was negatively impacted by the average selling price per barrel of our fuel products falling by 45.9% while the average cost of crude oil cost per barrel fell by 43.6%. This resulted in an overall reduction of approximately 62.2% in our fuel products gross profit per barrel due to decreasing crack spreads. Partially offsetting this decrease in gross profit per barrel was an 13.8% increase in fuel products sales volume, as discussed above, combined with derivative gains on our fuel products hedges increasing \$24.3 million in the third quarter of 2009 compared to the third quarter of 2008. In addition, in 2009, we recognized lower cost of sales of \$3.5 million in the fuel products segment due to the liquidation of lower cost inventory layers with no comparable activity in the third quarter of 2008.

Selling, general and administrative. Selling, general and administrative expenses decreased \$4.6 million, or 38.0%, to \$7.4 million in the three months ended September 30, 2009 from \$12.0 million in the three months ended September 30, 2008. This decrease is primarily due to reduced incentive compensation costs of \$1.8 million in 2009 as compared to 2008 and higher bad debt expense in the prior period of \$1.3 million.

Transportation. Transportation expenses decreased \$3.1 million, or 14.5%, to \$18.5 million in the three months ended September 30, 2009 from \$21.7 million in the three months ended September 30, 2008 as a result of reduced lubricating oils, solvents and waxes sales volumes.

Interest Expense. Interest expense decreased \$2.4 million, or 22.7%, to \$8.2 million in the three months ended September 30, 2009 from \$10.7 million in the three months ended September 30, 2008 primarily due to lower interest rates and lower balances being carried on the revolver and term loan at September 30, 2009 as compared to September 30, 2008.

Realized gain on derivative instruments. Realized gain on derivative instruments increased \$16.7 million to \$4.0 million in the three months ended September 30, 2009 from \$12.6 million in realized loss for the three months ended September 30, 2008. This increased gain was primarily due to realized gains of \$4.5 million in 2009 on our crack spread derivatives that were executed to economically lock in gains on a portion of our fuel products segment derivative hedging activity, with no comparable activity in 2008. In addition, the derivatives used to hedge our specialty products segment crude oil purchases had experienced significant losses in the third quarter of 2008 with no comparable activity in 2009.

Unrealized loss on derivative instruments. Unrealized loss on derivative instruments decreased \$26.4 million, to \$4.5 million in the three months ended September 30, 2009 from a loss of \$30.9 million in the three months ended September 30, 2008. This decreased loss is primarily due to significant declines in the market price of crude oil in the third quarter of 2008 resulting in larger derivative losses compared to the same period in 2009.

Table of Contents***Nine Months Ended September 30, 2009 Compared to Nine Months Ended September 30, 2008***

Sales. Sales decreased \$639.6 million, or 32.1%, to \$1,350.7 million in the nine months ended September 30, 2009 from \$1,990.3 million in the nine months ended September 30, 2008. Sales for each of our principal product categories in these periods were as follows:

	Nine Months Ended September 30,		
	2009	2008	% Change
	(Dollars in millions)		
Sales by segment:			
Specialty products:			
Lubricating oils	\$ 362.4	\$ 672.0	(46.1)%
Solvents	186.2	343.7	(45.8)%
Waxes	71.4	111.0	(35.7)%
Fuels (1)	6.5	27.3	(76.3)%
Asphalt and by-products (2)	74.7	114.6	(34.9)%
Total specialty products	\$ 701.2	\$ 1,268.6	(44.7)%
Total specialty products volume (in barrels)	6,983,000	8,279,000	(15.6)%
Fuel products:			
Gasoline	\$ 229.4	\$ 259.5	(11.6)%
Diesel	274.7	302.5	(9.2)%
Jet fuel	128.9	149.0	(13.5)%
By-products (3)	16.5	10.7	54.2%
Total fuel products	\$ 649.5	\$ 721.7	(10.0)%
Total fuel products sales volumes (in barrels)	8,659,000	7,870,000	10.0%
Total sales	\$ 1,350.7	\$ 1,990.3	(32.1)%
Total sales volumes (in barrels)	15,642,000	16,149,000	(3.1)%

(1) Represents fuels produced in connection with the production of specialty products at the Princeton and Cotton Valley refineries.

(2) Represents asphalt and other by-products produced in connection with

the production of specialty products at the Princeton, Cotton Valley and Shreveport refineries.

- (3) Represents by-products produced in connection with the production of fuels at the Shreveport refinery.

Specialty products segment sales for the nine months ended September 30, 2009 decreased \$567.4 million, or 44.7%, primarily due to a 34.5% decrease in the average selling price per barrel, with prices decreasing across all specialty product categories except waxes. In addition, specialty products segment volumes sold decreased by 15.6%. Specialty pricing decreased in response to the 50.9% decrease in the average cost of crude oil per barrel from the nine months ended September 30, 2008 to the same period in 2009. Sales volume decreased from approximately 8.3 million barrels in the nine months ended September 30, 2008 to approximately 7.0 million barrels in the nine months ended September 30, 2009 primarily due to lower demand for lubricating oils, solvents and waxes as a result of the current economic downturn.

Fuel products segment sales for the nine months ended September 30, 2009 decreased \$72.2 million, or 10.0%, primarily due to a 50.2% decrease in the average selling price per barrel as compared to a 51.3% decrease in the overall cost of crude oil per barrel. The decrease in sales price per barrel was across all fuel products categories. Fuel products segment sales were positively impacted by a 10.0% increase in sales volumes, from approximately 7.8 million barrels in the nine months ended September 30, 2008 to 8.7 million barrels in the nine months ended September 30, 2009, primarily due to increases in diesel and jet fuel sales volume as a result of the startup of the Shreveport refinery expansion project during the second quarter of 2008. Further offsetting the decrease in pricing was a \$399.1 million increase in derivative gains on our fuel products cash flow hedges, recorded in sales. Please see Gross Profit below for the net impact of our crude oil and fuel products derivative instruments designated as hedges.

Table of Contents

Gross Profit. Gross profit decreased \$34.2 million, or 19.8%, to \$138.5 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2009 from \$172.7 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2008. Gross profit for our specialty and fuel products segments was as follows:

	Nine Months Ended September 30,		
	2009	2008	% Change
	(Dollars in millions)		
Gross profit by segment:			
Specialty products	\$ 114.1	\$ 109.9	3.8%
Percentage of sales	16.3%	8.7%	
Fuel products	\$ 24.4	\$ 62.8	(61.1)%
Percentage of sales	3.8%	8.7%	
Total gross profit	\$ 138.5	\$ 172.7	(19.8)%
Percentage of sales	10.3%	8.7%	

The increase in specialty products segment gross profit was primarily due to the 50.9% reduction in the cost of crude oil, offset by the 34.5% reduction in average selling price per barrel and 15.6% decrease in sales volume previously discussed. Further improving gross profit were lower operating costs primarily as a result of the decrease in natural gas costs. Partially offsetting the improvements to gross profit was a \$22.2 million reduction in derivative gains in 2009 as compared to 2008. In addition, in the nine months ended September, 30 2008 we recognized a \$39.1 million gain from the liquidation of lower cost inventory layers with no comparable activity in the same period in 2009.

The decrease in fuel products segment gross profit was primarily due to the 50.2% reduction in the average selling price per barrel of fuel products as compared to the 51.3% reduction in crude oil cost per barrel for an overall reduction of approximately 43.3% in our gross profit per barrel. Fuel product sales volume has not changed significantly in 2009 as compared to 2008. In addition, in the nine months ended September 30, 2009 and 2008, we recognized lower cost of sales of \$3.5 million and \$8.7 million, respectively, in the fuel products segment due to the liquidation of lower cost inventory layers. Partially offsetting the decrease in gross profit were increased derivative gains of \$44.0 million from our crack spread cash flow hedges.

Selling, general and administrative. Selling, general and administrative expenses decreased \$6.0 million, or 20.1%, to \$23.7 million in the nine months ended September 30, 2009 from \$29.7 million in the nine months ended September 30, 2008. This decrease is primarily due to synergies achieved in 2009 related to the Penreco acquisition of approximately \$1.0 million as compared to 2008 and lower compensation expenses of \$1.9 million along with reduced bad debt expense of \$2.6 million, which includes a recovery in 2009 of \$0.9 million from a fully reserved account receivable.

Transportation. Transportation expenses decreased \$16.9 million, or 25.4%, to \$49.8 million in the nine months ended September 30, 2009 from \$66.7 million in the nine months ended September 30, 2008 as a result of reduced lubricating oils, solvents and waxes sales volumes.

Interest expense. Interest expense increased \$1.0 million, or 3.9%, to \$25.3 million in the nine months ended September 30, 2009 from \$24.4 million in the nine months ended September 30, 2008. This increase was primarily due to the completion of the Shreveport refinery expansion project in the second quarter of 2008 resulting in higher average debt balances in 2009 compared to the prior year, partially offset by lower interest rates.

Realized gain on derivative instruments. Realized gain on derivative instruments increased \$16.2 million to \$3.2 million in the nine months ended September 30, 2009 from a \$13.0 million loss in the nine months ended September 30, 2008. This increased gain was primarily due to realized gains on our crack spread derivatives that were executed to lock in gains on a portion of our fuel products segment derivative hedging activity in 2009 with no comparable activity in 2008. In addition, the derivatives used to hedge our specialty products crude oil purchases had experienced significant losses in the third quarter of 2008 with no comparable activity in 2009.

Unrealized gain on derivative instruments. Unrealized gain on derivative instruments increased \$31.5 million, to a gain of \$17.6 million in the nine months ended September 30, 2009 from a loss of \$13.9 million for the nine months

ended September 30, 2008. This increase was primarily due to the derivatives used to economically hedge our specialty products crude oil purchases experiencing significant losses in 2008 as market prices declined in the third quarter with no comparable losses in 2009.

Table of Contents

Gain on sale of mineral rights. We recorded a \$5.8 million gain in 2008 resulting from the lease of mineral rights on the real property at our Shreveport and Princeton refineries to an unaffiliated third party which was accounted for as a sale. We have retained a royalty interest in any future production associated with these mineral rights.

Liquidity and Capital Resources

Our principal sources of cash have historically included cash flow from operations, proceeds from public equity offerings and bank borrowings. Principal uses of cash have included capital expenditures, acquisitions, distributions and debt service. We expect that our principal uses of cash in the future will be for distributions to our limited partners and general partner, debt service, and capital expenditures related to internal growth projects and acquisitions from third parties or affiliates. Future internal growth projects or acquisitions may require expenditures in excess of our then-current cash flow from operations and cause us to issue debt or equity securities in public or private offerings or incur additional borrowings under bank credit facilities to meet those costs. Given the current credit environment and our continued efforts to reduce leverage to ensure continued covenant compliance under our credit facilities, we do not anticipate completing any significant acquisitions, internal growth projects or replacement and environmental capital expenditures which would cause total spending in these areas to exceed \$5.0 million during the remainder of 2009 and \$30.0 million during 2010. With the uncertain status of the credit and equity markets, we anticipate future capital expenditures will be funded with current cash flow from operations and borrowings under our existing revolving credit facility.

Cash Flows

We believe that we have sufficient liquid assets, cash flow from operations and borrowing capacity to meet our financial commitments, debt service obligations, and anticipated capital expenditures. However, we are subject to business and operational risks that could materially adversely affect our cash flows. A material decrease in our cash flow from operations including a significant, sudden decrease in crude oil prices would likely produce a corollary material adverse effect on our borrowing capacity under our revolving credit facility and potentially our ability to comply with the covenants under our credit facilities. A significant, sudden increase in crude oil prices, if sustained, would likely result in increased working capital requirements which would be funded by borrowings under our revolving credit facility.

The following table summarizes our primary sources and uses of cash in each of the periods presented:

	Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2009	2008
	(In millions)	
Net cash provided by operating activities	\$ 110.6	\$ 75.7
Net cash used in investing activities	\$ (19.9)	\$ (430.9)
Net cash provided by (used in) financing activities	\$ (88.1)	\$ 355.3

Operating Activities. Operating activities provided \$110.6 million in cash during the nine months ended September 30, 2009 compared to \$75.7 million during the nine months ended September 30, 2008. The increase in cash provided by operating activities was primarily due to increased net income of \$27.7 million and an improvement in net working capital as compared to the prior year primarily due to increased accounts payable partially offset by increased accounts receivable and inventory.

Investing Activities. Cash used in investing activities decreased to \$19.0 million during the nine months ended September 30, 2009 compared to \$430.9 million during the nine months ended September 30, 2008. The 2008 period includes the acquisition of Penreco for \$269.1 million and capital expenditures related to the Shreveport expansion project in the first nine months of 2008.

Financing Activities. Financing activities used cash of \$88.1 million during the nine months ended September 30, 2009 as compared to cash provided of \$355.3 million during the nine months ended September 30, 2008. The 2008 period includes the net cash proceeds of approximately \$327.9 million received from the term loan facility which closed on January 3, 2008.

Table of Contents

On October 20, 2009, the Company declared a quarterly cash distribution of \$0.45 per unit on all outstanding units, or \$14.8 million, for the quarter ended September 30, 2009. The distribution will be paid on November 13, 2009 to unitholders of record as of the close of business on November 3, 2009. This quarterly distribution of \$0.45 per unit equates to \$1.80 per unit, or \$59.3 million, on an annualized basis.

Capital Expenditures

Our capital expenditure requirements consist of capital improvement expenditures, replacement capital expenditures and environmental capital expenditures. Capital improvement expenditures include expenditures to acquire assets to grow our business and to expand existing facilities, such as projects that increase operating capacity. Replacement capital expenditures replace worn out or obsolete equipment or parts. Environmental capital expenditures include asset additions to meet or exceed environmental and operating regulations.

The following table sets forth our capital improvement expenditures, replacement capital expenditures and environmental capital expenditures in each of the periods shown.

	Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2009	2008
	(In millions)	
Capital improvement expenditures	\$ 8.0	\$ 157.7
Replacement capital expenditures	10.2	2.6
Environmental expenditures	2.5	1.5
Total	\$ 20.7	\$ 161.8

We anticipate that future capital expenditure requirements will be provided through cash provided by operations and available borrowings under our revolving credit facility unless the debt and equity capital markets improve in the near term. Management expects to invest approximately \$5.0 million in expenditures at its various locations during the remainder of 2009 and approximately \$30.0 million during 2010, with the majority of the spending for replacement and environmental capital expenditures. We plan to continue to maintain a conservative capital expenditure budget until additional improvements in our liquidity and debt covenant compliance performance metrics have been achieved.

Debt and Credit Facilities

As of September 30, 2009, our credit facilities consist of:

a \$375.0 million senior secured revolving credit facility, subject to borrowing base restrictions, with a standby letter of credit sublimit of \$300.0 million; and

a \$435.0 million senior secured first lien credit facility consisting of a \$385.0 million term loan facility and a \$50.0 million letter of credit facility to support crack spread hedging. In connection with the execution of the above senior secured first lien credit facility, we incurred total debt issuance costs of \$23.4 million, including \$17.4 million of issuance discounts.

Borrowings under the amended revolving credit facility are limited by advance rates of percentages of eligible accounts receivable and inventory (the borrowing base) as defined by the revolving credit agreement. As such, the borrowing base fluctuates based on changes in selling prices of our products and our current material costs, primarily the cost of crude oil. The borrowing base cannot exceed the total commitments of the lender group. The lender group under our revolving credit facility is comprised of a syndicate of nine lenders with total commitments of \$375.0 million. The number of lenders in our facility has been reduced from ten due to an acquisition. If further acquisitions occur, we will increase the concentration of our exposure to certain financial institutions. Currently, the largest member of our bank group provides a commitment for \$87.5 million. The smallest commitment is \$15.0 million and the median commitment is \$42.5 million. In the event of a default by one of the lenders in the syndicate, the total commitments under the revolving credit facility would be reduced by the defaulting lenders

commitment, unless another lender or a combination of lenders increase their commitments to replace the defaulting lender. In the alternative, the revolving credit facility also permits us to replace a defaulting lender. Although we do not expect any current lenders to default under the revolving credit facility, we can provide no assurances. Our borrowing base at September 30, 2009 was \$200.6 million, thus, we would have to experience defaults in commitments totaling \$174.4 million from our lender group before it would impact our liquidity as of September 30, 2009. This would require at least three of our nine lenders to default in order for it to impact our current liquidity position under the revolving credit facility.

Table of Contents

The revolving credit facility, which is our primary source of liquidity for cash needs in excess of cash generated from operations, currently bears interest at prime plus a basis points margin or LIBOR plus a basis points margin, at our option. This margin is currently at 50 basis points for prime and 200 basis points for LIBOR; however, it fluctuates based on quarterly measurement of our Consolidated Leverage Ratio as discussed below. The lenders under our revolving credit facility have a first priority lien on our cash, accounts receivable and inventory and a second priority lien on our fixed assets. The revolving credit facility matures in January 2013. On September 30, 2009, we had availability on our revolving credit facility of \$89.5 million, based upon a \$200.6 million borrowing base, \$41.9 million in outstanding standby letters of credit, and outstanding borrowings of \$69.1 million under the revolving credit facility. The continued improvement in our availability of \$37.6 million from December 31, 2008 is due to cash generated from operations, offset by distributions to partners, debt service requirements and a net increase in working capital primarily due to increased inventory levels. We believe that we have sufficient cash flow from operations and borrowing capacity to meet our financial commitments, minimum quarterly distributions to unit holders, debt service obligations, contingencies and anticipated capital expenditures. However, we are subject to business and operational risks that could materially adversely affect our cash flows. A material decrease in our cash flow from operations or a significant, sustained decline in crude oil prices would likely produce a corollary material adverse effect on our borrowing capacity under our revolving credit facility and potentially our ability to comply with the financial covenants under our credit facilities. Substantial declines in crude oil prices, if sustained, may materially diminish our borrowing base which is based, in part, on the value of our crude oil inventory and could result in a material reduction in our borrowing capacity under our revolving credit facility.

The term loan facility, fully drawn at \$385.0 million on January 3, 2008, bears interest at a rate of LIBOR plus 400 basis points or prime plus 300 basis points, at our option. Management has historically kept the outstanding balance on a LIBOR basis, however, that decision is evaluated every three months to determine if a portion is to be converted back to the prime rate. Each lender under this facility has a first priority lien on our fixed assets and a second priority lien on our cash, accounts receivable and inventory. Our term loan facility matures in January 2015. We are required to make mandatory repayments of approximately \$1.0 million at the end of each fiscal quarter, beginning with the fiscal quarter ended March 31, 2008 and ending with the fiscal quarter ending September 30, 2014, with the remaining balance due at maturity on January 3, 2015.

Our letter of credit facility to support crack spread hedging bears interest at a rate of 4.0% and is secured by a first priority lien on our fixed assets. We have issued a letter of credit in the amount of \$50.0 million, the full amount available under this letter of credit facility, to one counterparty. As long as this first priority lien is in effect and such counterparty remains the beneficiary of the \$50.0 million letter of credit, we will have no obligation to post additional cash, letters of credit or other collateral with such counterparty to provide additional credit support for a mutually-agreed maximum volume of executed crack spread hedges. In the event such counterparty's exposure to us exceeds \$100.0 million, we would be required to post additional credit support to enter into additional crack spread hedges up to the aforementioned maximum volume. In addition, we have other crack spread hedges in place with other approved counterparties under the letter of credit facility whose credit exposure to us in certain situations are also secured by a first priority lien on our fixed assets.

Our credit facilities permit us to make distributions to our unitholders as long as we are not in default and would not be in default following the distribution. Under the credit facilities, we have historically been obligated to comply with certain financial covenants requiring us to maintain a Consolidated Leverage Ratio of no more than 4.0 to 1 and a Consolidated Interest Coverage Ratio of no less than 2.50 to 1 (as of the end of each fiscal quarter and after giving effect to a proposed distribution or other restricted payments as defined in the credit agreement) and Available Liquidity (as such term is defined in our credit agreements) of at least \$35.0 million (after giving effect to a proposed distribution or other restricted payments as defined in the credit agreements). As of the fiscal quarter ended June 30, 2009 and all future quarters, we are obligated to maintain a Consolidated Leverage Ratio of no more than 3.75 to 1 and a Consolidated Interest Coverage Ratio of no less than 2.75 to 1. The Consolidated Leverage Ratio is defined under our credit agreements to mean the ratio of our Consolidated Debt (as defined in the credit agreements) as of the last day of any fiscal quarter to our Adjusted EBITDA (as defined below) for the last four fiscal quarter periods ending on such date. The Consolidated Interest Coverage Ratio is defined as the ratio of Consolidated EBITDA for the last

four fiscal quarters to Consolidated Interest Charges for the same period. available liquidity is a measure used under our revolving credit facility and is the sum of the cash and borrowing capacity that we have as of a given date.

Adjusted EBITDA means Consolidated EBITDA as defined in our credit facilities to mean, for any period: (1) net income plus (2)(a) interest expense; (b) taxes; (c) depreciation and amortization; (d) unrealized losses from mark to market accounting for hedging activities; (e) unrealized items decreasing net income (including the non-cash impact of

Table of Contents

restructuring, decommissioning and asset impairments in the periods presented); (f) other non-recurring expenses reducing net income which do not represent a cash item for such period; and (g) all non-recurring restructuring charges associated with the Penreco acquisition minus (3)(a) tax credits; (b) unrealized items increasing net income (including the non-cash impact of restructuring, decommissioning and asset impairments in the periods presented); (c) unrealized gains from mark to market accounting for hedging activities; and (d) other non-recurring expenses and unrealized items that reduced net income for a prior period, but represent a cash item in the current period.

In addition, if at any time that our borrowing capacity under our revolving credit facility falls below \$35.0 million, meaning we have Available Liquidity of less than \$35.0 million, we will be required to immediately measure and maintain a Fixed Charge Coverage Ratio of at least 1 to 1 (as of the end of each fiscal quarter). The Fixed Charge Coverage Ratio is defined under our credit agreements to mean the ratio of (a) Adjusted EBITDA minus Consolidated Capital Expenditures minus Consolidated Cash Taxes, to (b) Fixed Charges (as each such term is defined in our credit agreements).

Compliance with the financial covenants pursuant to the Company's credit agreements is tested quarterly based upon performance over the most recent four fiscal quarters and as of September 30, 2009 the Company was in compliance with all financial covenants under its credit agreements.

While assurances cannot be made regarding our future compliance with these covenants and being cognizant of the general uncertain economic environment, we anticipate that we will maintain compliance with such financial covenants and improve our liquidity.

Failure to achieve our anticipated results may result in a breach of certain of the financial covenants contained in our credit agreements. If this occurs, we will enter into discussions with our lenders to either modify the terms of the existing credit facilities or obtain waivers of non-compliance with such covenants. There can be no assurances of the timing of the receipt of any such modification or waiver, the term or costs associated therewith or our ultimate ability to obtain the relief sought. Our failure to obtain a waiver of non-compliance with certain of the financial covenants or otherwise amend the credit facilities would constitute an event of default under our credit facilities and would permit the lenders to pursue remedies. These remedies could include acceleration of maturity under our credit facilities and limitations on, or the elimination of, our ability to make distributions to our unitholders. If our lenders accelerate maturity under our credit facilities, a significant portion of our indebtedness may become due and payable immediately. We might not have, or be able to obtain, sufficient funds to make these accelerated payments. If we are unable to make these accelerated payments, our lenders could seek to foreclose on our assets.

In addition, our credit agreements contain various covenants that limit our ability, among other things, to: incur indebtedness; grant liens; make certain acquisitions and investments; make capital expenditures above specified amounts; redeem or prepay other debt or make other restricted payments such as distributions to unitholders; enter into transactions with affiliates; enter into a merger, consolidation or sale of assets; and cease our refining margin hedging program (our lenders have required us to obtain and maintain derivative contracts for fuel products margins in our fuel products segment for a rolling period of 1 to 12 months for at least 60% and no more than 90% of our anticipated fuels production, and for a rolling 13-24 months forward for at least 50% and no more than 90% of our anticipated fuels production).

If an event of default exists under our credit agreements, the lenders will be able to accelerate the maturity of the credit facilities and exercise other rights and remedies. An event of default is defined as nonpayment of principal interest, fees or other amounts; failure of any representation or warranty to be true and correct when made or confirmed; failure to perform or observe covenants in the credit agreement or other loan documents, subject to certain grace periods; payment defaults in respect of other indebtedness; cross-defaults in other indebtedness if the effect of such default is to cause the acceleration of such indebtedness under any material agreement if such default could have a material adverse effect on us; bankruptcy or insolvency events; monetary judgment defaults; asserted invalidity of the loan documentation; and a change of control in us. We believe we are in compliance with all debt covenants and have adequate liquidity to conduct our business as of September 30, 2009.

Table of Contents**Contractual Obligations and Commercial Commitments**

A summary of our total contractual cash obligations as of September 30, 2009, is as follows:

	Total	Less Than 1 Year	Payments Due by Period		More Than 5 Years
			1-3 Years	3-5 Years	
			(In thousands)		
Long-term debt obligations, excluding capital lease obligations	\$ 441,302	\$ 3,850	\$ 7,700	\$ 76,804	\$ 352,948
Interest on long-term debt at contractual rates	104,633	22,726	44,483	33,299	4,125
Capital lease obligations	1,900	820	1,080		
Operating lease obligations (1)	35,735	11,016	14,828	8,311	1,580
Letters of credit (2)	91,942	41,942		50,000	
Purchase commitments (3)	160,203	160,203			
Pension obligations	13,000		8,000	5,000	
Employment agreements (4)	495	371	124		
Total obligations	\$ 849,210	\$ 240,928	\$ 76,215	\$ 173,414	\$ 358,653

(1) We have various operating leases for the use of land, storage tanks, pressure stations, railcars, equipment, precious metals and office facilities that extend through August 2015.

(2) Letters of credit supporting crude oil purchases, precious metals leasing and hedging activities.

(3) Purchase commitments consist of

obligations to purchase fixed volumes of crude oil and other feedstock from various suppliers based on current market prices at the time of delivery.

- (4) Annual base salary compensation under the employment agreement of F. William Grube, chief executive officer and president.

In connection with the closing of the Penreco acquisition on January 3, 2008, we entered into a feedstock purchase agreement with ConocoPhillips Company related to the LVT unit at its Lake Charles, Louisiana refinery (the LVT Feedstock Agreement). Pursuant to the LVT Feedstock Agreement, ConocoPhillips is obligated to supply a minimum quantity (the Base Volume) of feedstock for the LVT unit for a term of ten years. Based upon this minimum supply quantity, we expect to purchase \$46.8 million of feedstock for the LVT unit in each fiscal year of the term based on pricing estimates as of September 30, 2009. If the Base Volume is not supplied at any point during the first five years of the ten year term, a penalty for each gallon of shortfall must be paid to us as liquidated damages.

In connection with the agreements entered into with Houston Refining on September 29, 2009, we are required to purchase a minimum of approximately 3,000 bpd of naphthenic lubricating oils from Houston Refining and to have approximately 800 bpd of white oils processed at their Houston refinery. These requirements became effective when the agreements were deemed effective as of November 4, 2009 upon the approval of LyondellBasell's motion for entry of an order by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court authorizing the rejection by LyondellBasell of the agreements currently in place with third parties covering these products.

Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

We have no material off-balance sheet arrangements.

Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates

For additional discussion regarding our critical accounting policies and estimates, see Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates under Item 7 of our 2008 Annual Report on Form 10-K.

Recent Accounting Pronouncements

Please refer to Note 2 under Item 1 Financial Statements Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements for a listing of applicable recent accounting pronouncements.

Table of Contents

Item 3. *Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk*

The following should be read in conjunction with Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk included under Item 7A in our 2008 Annual Report on Form 10-K. There have been no material changes in that information other than as discussed below. Also, see Note 8 and Note 10 under Item 1 Financial Statements Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements for additional discussion related to derivative instruments and hedging activities.

Table of Contents**Commodity Price Risk**

As of September 30, 2009, we estimate we have executed derivative instruments to hedge approximately 15% to 20% of forecasted specialty products segment crude oil purchases through December 31, 2009. Also, as of September 30, 2009 we estimate we are over 60% and 50% hedged for the forward twelve and twenty-four months, respectively, for our fuel products segment crack spread exposure. The Company enters into crude oil, gasoline, diesel and jet fuel hedges to hedge an implied crack spread. Therefore, any increase in crude oil swap mark-to-market valuation due to changes in commodity prices will generally be accompanied by a decrease in gasoline, diesel and jet fuel swap mark-to-market valuation. The change in fair value expected from a \$1 per unit change in commodity prices are shown in the table below:

	In millions
Crude oil swaps	\$ 14.8
Diesel swaps	\$ (8.3)
Jet fuel swaps	\$ (2.3)
Gasoline swaps	\$ (4.2)
Crude oil collars	\$ 0.5
Jet fuel collars	\$
Natural gas swaps	\$ 0.1

Interest Rate Risk

We are exposed to market risk from fluctuations in interest rates. Our profitability and cash flows are affected by changes in interest rates, specifically LIBOR and prime rates. The primary purpose of our interest rate risk management activities is to hedge our exposure to changes in interest rates. As of September 30, 2009, we had approximately \$441.3 million of variable rate debt. Holding other variables constant (such as debt levels), a one hundred basis point change in interest rates on our variable rate debt as of September 30, 2009 would be expected to have an impact on net income and cash flows of approximately \$4.4 million.

We have a \$375.0 million revolving credit facility as of September 30, 2009, bearing interest at the prime rate or LIBOR, at our option, plus the applicable margin. We had borrowings of \$69.1 million outstanding under this facility as of September 30, 2009, bearing interest at the prime rate plus the applicable margin of 50 basis points.

Existing Commodity Derivative Instruments***Fuel Products Segment***

The following table provides a summary of the implied crack spreads for the crude oil, diesel and gasoline swaps as of September 30, 2009 disclosed in Note 8 under Item 1 Financial Statements Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements, all of which are designated as hedges.

Crude Oil and Fuel Products Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels	BPD	Implied Crack Spread (\$/Bbl)
Fourth Quarter 2009	2,070,000	22,500	11.43
Calendar Year 2010	7,300,000	20,000	11.32
Calendar Year 2011	5,384,000	14,751	12.19
Totals	14,754,000		
Average price			\$ 11.65

Table of Contents

The following table provides a summary of our derivative instruments and implied crack spreads for the crude oil and gasoline swaps as of September 30, 2009 disclosed in Note 8 under Item 1 Financial Statements Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements, none of which are designated as hedges. These trades were used to economically freeze a portion of the mark-to-market valuation gain for the above crack spread trades.

Crude Oil and Fuel Products Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels	BPD	Implied Crack Spread (\$/Bbl)
Fourth Quarter 2009	460,000	5,000	(2.13)
Calendar 2010	547,500	1,500	0.17
Totals	1,007,000		
Average price			\$ (0.88)

At September 30, 2009, the Company had the following jet fuel put options related to jet fuel crack spreads in its fuel products segment, none of which are designated as hedges.

Jet Fuel Put Option Crack Spread Contracts by Expiration Dates	Barrels	BPD	Average Sold Put (\$/Bbl)	Average Bought Put (\$/Bbl)
January 2011	216,500	6,984	\$ 4.00	\$ 6.00
February 2011	197,000	7,036	4.00	6.00
March 2011	216,500	6,984	4.00	6.00
Totals	630,000			
Average price			\$ 4.00	\$ 6.00

Specialty Products Segment

At September 30, 2009, the Company had 460,000 barrels of crude oil derivative positions related to crude oil purchases in its specialty products segment, none of which are designated as hedges. Please refer to Note 8 under Item 1 Financial Statements Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements for detailed information on these derivatives. At September 30, 2009, we have provided no cash collateral in credit support to our hedging counterparties.

Item 4. Controls and Procedures

(a) Evaluation of disclosure controls and procedures.

Our principal executive officer and principal financial officer have evaluated, as required by Rule 13a-15(b) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the Exchange Act), our disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rule 13a-15(e) under the Exchange Act) as of the end of the period covered by this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q. Based on that evaluation, the principal executive officer and principal financial officer concluded that the design and operation of our disclosure controls and procedures are effective in ensuring that information we are required to disclose in the reports that we file or submit under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in the Securities and Exchange Commission's rules and forms.

(b) Changes in Internal Controls

During the fiscal quarter covered by this report, there were no changes in our internal control over financial reporting (as defined in Rule 13a-15(f) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934) that materially affected, or were reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.

Table of Contents**PART II****Item 1. *Legal Proceedings***

We are not a party to any material litigation. Our operations are subject to a variety of risks and disputes normally incident to our business. As a result, we may, at any given time, be a defendant in various legal proceedings and litigation arising in the ordinary course of business. Please see Note 6 *Commitments and Contingencies* in Part I *Item 1 Financial Statements Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements* for a description of our current regulatory matters related to the environment.

Item 1A. *Risk Factors*

There have been no material changes in the risk factors previously disclosed in our Annual Report on Form 10-K or our Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q filed on May 8, 2009 and August 7, 2009.

Item 2. *Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds*

None.

Item 3. *Defaults Upon Senior Securities*

None.

Item 4. *Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders*

None.

Item 5. *Other Information*

None.

Item 6. *Exhibits*

The following documents are filed as exhibits to this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q:

Exhibit**Number****Description**

- | | |
|------|--|
| 10.1 | Amendment No. 1 to Crude Oil Supply Agreement, dated as of September 30, 2009 and effective September 1, 2009, between Calumet Shreveport Fuels, LLC., customer, and Legacy Resources Co., L.P., supplier. |
| 10.2 | Crude Oil Supply Agreement, dated September 1, 2009, between Calumet Shreveport Fuels, LLC and Legacy Resources Co., L.P., (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to the Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Commission on September 4, 2009 (File No. 000-51734). |
| 31.1 | Sarbanes-Oxley Section 302 certification of F. William Grube. |
| 31.2 | Sarbanes-Oxley Section 302 certification of R. Patrick Murray, II. |
| 32.1 | Section 1350 certification of F. William Grube and R. Patrick Murray, II. |

Table of Contents

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

CALUMET SPECIALTY PRODUCTS PARTNERS, L.P.

By: Calumet GP, LLC
its general partner

By: /s/ R. Patrick Murray, II
R. Patrick Murray, II Vice President, Chief Financial
Officer and
Secretary of Calumet GP, LLC, general partner of
Calumet Specialty Products Partners, L.P.
(Authorized Person and Principal Accounting
Officer)

Date: November 6, 2009

Table of Contents

Index to Exhibits

Exhibit Number	Description
10.1	Amendment No. 1 to Crude Oil Supply Agreement, dated as of September 30, 2009 and effective September 1, 2009, between Calumet Shreveport Fuels, LLC, customer, and Legacy Resources Co., L.P., supplier.
10.2	Crude Oil Supply Agreement, dated September 1, 2009, between Calumet Shreveport Fuels, LLC and Legacy Resources Co., L.P., (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to the Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Commission on September 4, 2009 (File No. 000-51734).
31.1	Sarbanes-Oxley Section 302 certification of F. William Grube.
31.2	Sarbanes-Oxley Section 302 certification of R. Patrick Murray, II.
32.1	Section 1350 certification of F. William Grube and R. Patrick Murray, II.