

CALGON CARBON CORPORATION

Form 10-Q

May 06, 2011

Table of Contents

**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549
FORM 10-Q**

QUARTERLY REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the quarterly period ended March 31, 2011

OR

TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the transition period from _____ to _____

**Commission file number: 1-10776
CALGON CARBON CORPORATION
(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)**

Delaware
(State or other jurisdiction of
incorporation or organization)

25-0530110
(I.R.S. Employer
Identification No.)

P.O. Box 717, Pittsburgh, PA
(Address of principal executive offices)

15230-0717
(Zip Code)

(412) 787-6700
(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

[None]

(Former name, former address and former fiscal year, if changed since last report)

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 has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files).

Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of large accelerated filer, accelerated filer and smaller reporting company in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

Large accelerated filer Accelerated filer Non-accelerated filer Smaller reporting
company

(Do not check if a smaller
reporting company)

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

Yes No

Indicate the number of shares outstanding of each of the issuer's classes of common stock, as of the latest practicable date.

Edgar Filing: CALGON CARBON CORPORATION - Form 10-Q

| Class | Outstanding at May 2, 2011 |
|---|----------------------------|
| [Common Stock, \$.01 par value per share] | 56,468,522 shares |

CALGON CARBON CORPORATION
 FORM 10-Q
 QUARTER ENDED March 31, 2011

The Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q contains historical information and forward-looking statements. Forward-looking statements typically contain words such as expect, believe, estimate, anticipate, or similar words indicating that future outcomes are uncertain. Statements looking forward in time, including statements regarding future growth and profitability, price increases, cost savings, broader product lines, enhanced competitive posture and acquisitions, are included in this Form 10-Q and in the Company's most recent Annual Report pursuant to the safe harbor provision of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. They involve known and unknown risks and uncertainties that may cause the Company's actual results in future periods to be materially different from any future performance suggested herein. Further, the Company operates in an industry sector where securities values may be volatile and may be influenced by economic and other factors beyond the Company's control. Some of the factors that could affect future performance of the Company are higher energy and raw material costs, costs of imports and related tariffs, labor relations, availability of capital, environmental requirements as they relate both to our operations and to our customers, changes in foreign currency exchange rates, borrowing restrictions, validity of patents and other intellectual property, and pension costs. In the context of the forward-looking information provided in this Form 10-Q and in other reports, please refer to the discussions of risk factors and other information detailed in, as well as the other information contained in the Company's most recent Annual Report.

I N D E X

| | Page |
|--|------|
| <u>PART I CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u> | |
| <u>Item 1. Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements</u> | |
| <u>Introduction to the Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements</u> | 2 |
| <u>Condensed Consolidated Statements of Income (unaudited)</u> | 3 |
| <u>Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheets (unaudited)</u> | 4 |
| <u>Condensed Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows (unaudited)</u> | 5 |
| <u>Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements (unaudited)</u> | 6 |
| <u>Item 2. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Results of Operations and Financial Condition</u> | 29 |
| <u>Item 3. Qualitative and Quantitative Disclosures about Market Risk</u> | 44 |
| <u>Item 4. Controls and Procedures</u> | 44 |
| <u>PART II OTHER INFORMATION</u> | |
| <u>Item 1. Legal Proceedings</u> | 45 |
| <u>Item 1a. Risk Factors</u> | 45 |
| <u>Item 2c. Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds</u> | 45 |
| <u>Item 6. Exhibits</u> | 45 |
| <u>SIGNATURES</u> | 47 |
| <u>CERTIFICATIONS</u> | |
| <u>EX-31.1</u> | |
| <u>EX-31.2</u> | |
| <u>EX-32.1</u> | |
| <u>EX-32.2</u> | |
| <u>EX-101 INSTANCE DOCUMENT</u> | |
| <u>EX-101 SCHEMA DOCUMENT</u> | |
| <u>EX-101 CALCULATION LINKBASE DOCUMENT</u> | |
| <u>EX-101 LABELS LINKBASE DOCUMENT</u> | |
| <u>EX-101 PRESENTATION LINKBASE DOCUMENT</u> | |

Table of Contents

PART I CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Item 1. Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements

INTRODUCTION TO THE CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The unaudited interim condensed consolidated financial statements included herein have been prepared by Calgon Carbon Corporation and subsidiaries (the Company), without audit, pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Certain information and footnote disclosures normally included in annual financial statements prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America have been condensed or omitted pursuant to such rules and regulations. Management of the Company believes that the disclosures are adequate to make the information presented not misleading when read in conjunction with the Company's audited consolidated financial statements and the notes included therein for the year ended December 31, 2010, as filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission by the Company in Form 10-K. In management's opinion, the unaudited interim condensed consolidated financial statements reflect all adjustments, which are of a normal and recurring nature, and which are necessary for a fair presentation, in all material respects, of financial results for the interim periods presented. Operating results for the first three months of 2011 are not necessarily indicative of the results that may be expected for the year ending December 31, 2011.

Table of Contents

CALGON CARBON CORPORATION
CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF INCOME
(Dollars in Thousands Except Share and Per Share Data)
(Unaudited)

| | Three Months Ended March 31, | |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| | 2011 | 2010 |
| Net sales | \$ 124,380 | \$ 99,485 |
| Net sales to related parties | | 3,442 |
| Total | 124,380 | 102,927 |
| Cost of products sold (excluding depreciation and amortization) | 82,989 | 65,791 |
| Depreciation and amortization | 5,540 | 5,077 |
| Selling, general and administrative expenses | 20,743 | 18,164 |
| Research and development expenses | 1,768 | 1,487 |
| | 111,040 | 90,519 |
| Income from operations | 13,340 | 12,408 |
| Interest income | 63 | 116 |
| Interest expense | (18) | (8) |
| Gain on acquisitions (Note 1) | | 2,666 |
| Other expense net | (190) | (303) |
| Income from operations before income tax and equity in income from equity investments | 13,195 | 14,879 |
| Income tax provision | 4,718 | 5,515 |
| Income from operations before equity in income from equity investments | 8,477 | 9,364 |
| Equity in income from equity investments | | 112 |
| Net income | \$ 8,477 | \$ 9,476 |
| Net income per common share | | |
| Basic | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.17 |
| Diluted | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.17 |
| Weighted average shares outstanding | | |
| Basic | 56,124,101 | 55,708,492 |
| Diluted | 56,892,742 | 56,725,077 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these unaudited condensed consolidated financial statements.

Table of Contents

CALGON CARBON CORPORATION
CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS

(Dollars in Thousands)

(Unaudited)

| | March 31, 2011 | December 31, 2010 |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------|
| ASSETS | | |
| Current assets: | | |
| Cash and cash equivalents | \$ 27,014 | \$ 33,992 |
| Restricted cash | 1,246 | 1,173 |
| Receivables (net of allowance of \$1,330 and \$1,743) | 91,392 | 94,354 |
| Revenue recognized in excess of billings on uncompleted contracts | 9,395 | 7,461 |
| Inventories | 107,801 | 101,693 |
| Deferred income taxes current | 17,245 | 19,668 |
| Other current assets | 13,089 | 13,707 |
| Total current assets | 267,182 | 272,048 |
| Property, plant and equipment, net | 198,783 | 186,834 |
| Equity investments | 212 | 212 |
| Intangibles | 8,226 | 8,615 |
| Goodwill | 27,064 | 26,910 |
| Deferred income taxes long-term | 2,505 | 2,387 |
| Other assets | 4,308 | 4,557 |
| Total assets | \$ 508,280 | \$ 501,563 |
| LIABILITIES AND SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY | | |
| Current liabilities: | | |
| Accounts payable and accrued liabilities | \$ 61,490 | \$ 65,921 |
| Billings in excess of revenue recognized on uncompleted contracts | 3,560 | 2,971 |
| Payroll and benefits payable | 9,435 | 10,978 |
| Accrued income taxes | 653 | 659 |
| Short-term debt | | 21,442 |
| Current portion of long-term debt | 2,926 | 3,203 |
| Total current liabilities | 78,064 | 105,174 |
| Long-term debt | 24,226 | 3,721 |
| Deferred income taxes long-term | 7,754 | 6,979 |
| Accrued pension and other liabilities | 42,206 | 42,451 |
| Total liabilities | 152,250 | 158,325 |

| | | |
|--|------------|------------|
| Redeemable non-controlling interest (Note 1) | | 274 |
| Commitments and contingencies (Note 8) | | |
| Shareholders' equity: | | |
| Common shares, \$.01 par value, 100,000,000 shares authorized, 59,067,552 and 58,989,578 shares issued | 591 | 590 |
| Additional paid-in capital | 169,866 | 169,284 |
| Retained earnings | 216,492 | 208,015 |
| Accumulated other comprehensive income (loss) | 354 | (4,074) |
| | 387,303 | 373,815 |
| Treasury stock, at cost, 3,100,228 and 3,070,720 shares | (31,273) | (30,851) |
| | | |
| Total shareholders' equity | 356,030 | 342,964 |
| Total liabilities and shareholders' equity | \$ 508,280 | \$ 501,563 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these unaudited condensed consolidated financial statements.

Table of Contents

CALGON CARBON CORPORATION
CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS

(Dollars in Thousands)

(Unaudited)

| | Three Months Ended March 31, | |
|--|---------------------------------|----------|
| | 2011 | 2010 |
| Cash flows from operating activities | | |
| Net income | \$ 8,477 | \$ 9,476 |
| Adjustments to reconcile net income to net cash provided by operating activities: | | |
| Gain on acquisitions (Note 1) | | (2,666) |
| Depreciation and amortization | 5,540 | 5,077 |
| Equity in income from equity investments | | (112) |
| Employee benefit plan provisions | 411 | 917 |
| Stock-based compensation | 615 | 633 |
| Deferred income tax expense | 3,258 | 1,354 |
| Changes in assets and liabilities-net of effects from purchase of businesses and foreign exchange: | | |
| Decrease in receivables | 4,598 | 90 |
| Increase in inventories | (4,547) | (2,524) |
| Increase in revenue in excess of billings on uncompleted contracts and other current assets | (810) | (783) |
| (Decrease) increase in accounts payable, accrued liabilities, and accrued interest | (8,035) | 6,273 |
| Pension contributions | (1,420) | (2,052) |
| Other items net | (517) | 1,465 |
| Net cash provided by operating activities | 7,570 | 17,148 |
| | | |
| Cash flows from investing activities | | |
| Purchase of businesses net of cash (Note 1) | | (2,103) |
| Property, plant and equipment expenditures | (12,665) | (8,937) |
| Cash pledged for collateral | | (1,006) |
| Cash released from collateral | | 4,794 |
| Net cash used in investing activities | (12,665) | (7,252) |
| | | |
| Cash flows from financing activities | | |
| Revolving credit facility borrowings (Note 10) | 138,961 | |
| Revolving credit facility repayments (Note 10) | (138,912) | |
| Reductions of debt obligations | (778) | (127) |
| Treasury stock purchased | (422) | (933) |
| Common stock issued | 89 | 157 |
| Excess tax benefit from stock-based compensation | 121 | 364 |
| Net cash used in financing activities | (941) | (539) |

Edgar Filing: CALGON CARBON CORPORATION - Form 10-Q

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Effect of exchange rate changes on cash | (942) | (679) |
| (Decrease) increase in cash and cash equivalents | (6,978) | 8,678 |
| Cash and cash equivalents, beginning of period | 33,992 | 38,029 |
| Cash and cash equivalents, end of period | \$ 27,014 | \$ 46,707 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these unaudited condensed consolidated financial statements.

Table of Contents

CALGON CARBON CORPORATION
NOTES TO CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

(Dollars in Thousands)

(Unaudited)

1. Acquisitions

Zwicky Denmark and Sweden (Zwicky) and Hyde Marine, Inc. (Hyde)

On January 4, 2010, the Company acquired two Zwicky businesses. The Company acquired substantially all of the assets of Zwicky AS (Denmark) and acquired 100% of the outstanding shares of capital stock of Zwicky AB (Sweden). These companies are distributors of activated carbon products and providers of services associated with the reactivation of activated carbon and, subsequent to acquisition, their results are included in the Company's Activated Carbon and Service segment. As a result of the Zwicky acquisitions, the Company has increased its presence in Northern Europe.

On January 29, 2010, the Company acquired 100% of the capital stock of Hyde, a manufacturer of systems that use ultraviolet light technology to treat marine ballast water. The results of Hyde are included in the Company's Equipment segment. The Hyde acquisition provides the Company with immediate entry into the new global market for ballast water treatment and increases its knowledge base and experience in using ultraviolet light technology to treat water.

The aggregate purchase price for these acquisitions was \$4.3 million, including cash paid at closing of \$2.8 million as well as deferred payments and earnouts valued at \$1.5 million. The fair value of assets acquired less liabilities assumed for Hyde exceeded the purchase price thereby resulting in a pre-tax gain of \$0.3 million which is included in the gain on acquisitions in the Company's Condensed Consolidated Statement of Income for the period ended March 31, 2010. The Company recorded an estimated earnout liability of \$0.6 million payable to the former owner and certain employees of Hyde calculated based upon 5% of certain defined cash flow of the business through 2018, without limitation. This liability, which the Company evaluates and adjusts at the end of each reporting period, is recorded in accrued pension and other liabilities within the Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheet.

Calgon Mitsubishi Chemical Corporation (CMCC)

On March 31, 2010, the Company increased its ownership interest in its Japanese joint venture with CMCC from 49% to 80%. The increase in ownership was accomplished by CMCC borrowing funds and purchasing shares of capital stock directly from the former majority owner Mitsubishi Chemical Corporation (MCC) for approximately \$7.7 million. Subsequent to the share purchase and resultant control by the Company, the venture was re-named Calgon Carbon Japan KK (CCJ). CCJ also agreed to acquire the remaining shares held by MCC on March 31, 2011 (the redeemable noncontrolling interest) for approximately \$2.4 million. The original \$2.4 million obligation to purchase these remaining shares was reduced by \$2.1 million for working capital and other adjustments related to indemnification claims that were previously estimated. On March 31, 2011, the remaining shares held by MCC were acquired with no payment due. Therefore, the Company recorded a \$0.3 million gain in

Table of Contents

Other expense net within the Company's Condensed Consolidated Statement of Income for the period ended March 31, 2011. The ownership of CCJ triples the Company's sales revenue in Asia and adds to its workforce and infrastructure in Japan, the world's second largest activated carbon market. The results of CCJ are reflected in the Company's Activated Carbon and Service segment.

The acquisition date fair value of the Company's former 49% equity interest in CMCC was approximately \$9.8 million. The Company recorded a pre-tax gain of \$2.4 million related to this acquisition in 2010. The gain resulted from the remeasurement of the Company's equity interest to fair value as well as the fair value of assets acquired less liabilities assumed exceeding the purchase price.

The purchase price allocations and resulting impact on the corresponding Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheet relating to these acquisitions is as follows:

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Assets: | |
| Cash | \$ 708 |
| Accounts receivable | 19,511 |
| Inventory | 14,625 |
| Property, plant, and equipment, net | 7,606 |
| Intangibles* | 5,374 |
| Other current assets | 2,530 |
| Other assets | 546 |
| Total Assets | 50,900 |
| Liabilities: | |
| Accounts payable | (10,660) |
| Short-term debt | (14,777) |
| Current portion of long-term debt | (2,569) |
| Long-term debt | (5,160) |
| Accrued pension and other liabilities | (3,993) |
| Total Liabilities | (37,159) |
| Redeemable non-controlling interest | (274) |
| Net Assets | \$ 13,467 |
| Cash Paid for Acquisitions | \$ 2,812 |

* Weighted amortization period of 8.9 years.

Subsequent to their acquisition and excluding the related net gains of \$2.7 million, these entities contributed the following to the Company's consolidated operating results for the period ended March 31, 2010:

| | |
|----------|----------|
| Revenue | \$ 1,053 |
| Net loss | \$ (422) |

The aggregate purchase price for each acquisition was allocated to the assets acquired and liabilities assumed based on their respective estimated acquisition date fair values. The Company has finalized the valuations and completed the

purchase price allocations for each of its acquisitions.

7

Table of Contents**Pro Forma Information**

The operating results of the acquired companies have been included in the Company's consolidated financial statements from the dates each were acquired. The following unaudited pro forma results of operations assume that the acquisitions had been included for the full periods indicated. Such results are not necessarily indicative of the actual results of operations that would have been realized nor are they necessarily indicative of future results of operations.

| | Three Months Ended March 31, 2010 |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Sales | \$ 120,133 |
| Net income | \$ 8,167 |
| Net income per common share | |
| Basic | \$ 0.14 |
| Diluted | \$ 0.14 |

The 2010 pro forma amounts have been calculated after adjusting for sales and related profit resulting from the Company's sales of activated carbon to both CCJ and Zwicky. In addition, the equity earnings from the Company's former non-controlling interest in CCJ have been removed. The results also reflect additional amortization that would have been charged assuming fair value adjustments to amortizable intangible assets had been applied to the beginning of each period presented.

The results for the three month period ended March 31, 2010 exclude approximately \$2.7 million of gains associated with the acquisitions.

2. Inventories

| | March 31, 2011 | December 31, 2010 |
|----------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Raw materials | \$ 23,831 | \$ 24,178 |
| Finished goods | 83,970 | 77,515 |
| | \$ 107,801 | \$ 101,693 |

3. Supplemental Cash Flow Information

Cash paid for interest during the three months ended March 31, 2011 and 2010 was \$0.2 million and \$19 thousand, respectively. Income taxes paid, net of refunds, was \$0.7 million and \$1.8 million, for the three months ended March 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively.

The Company has reflected \$1.8 million and \$(2.1) million of its capital expenditures as a non-cash increase and decrease, respectively, in accounts payable and accrued liabilities for changes in unpaid capital expenditures for the three months ended March 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively.

Table of Contents**4. Dividends**

The Company's Board of Directors did not declare or pay a dividend for the quarters ended March 31, 2011 and 2010.

5. Comprehensive Income

| | Three Months Ended March 31, | |
|---|---------------------------------|----------|
| | 2011 | 2010 |
| Net income | \$ 8,477 | \$ 9,476 |
| Other comprehensive income (loss), net of taxes | 4,428 | (5,054) |
| Comprehensive income | \$ 12,905 | \$ 4,422 |

The only matters contributing to the other comprehensive income during the three months ended March 31, 2011 was the foreign currency translation adjustment of \$4.3 million, the changes in employee benefit accounts of \$0.2 million, and the change in the fair value of the derivative instruments of \$(47) thousand. The only matters contributing to the other comprehensive loss during the three months ended March 31, 2010 was the foreign currency translation adjustment of \$(5.8) million, the changes in employee benefit accounts of \$0.5 million, and the change in the fair value of the derivative instruments of \$0.2 million.

6. Segment Information

The Company's management has identified three segments based on the product line and associated services. Those segments include Activated Carbon and Service, Equipment, and Consumer. The Company's chief operating decision maker, its chief executive officer, receives and reviews financial information in this format. The Activated Carbon and Service segment manufactures granular activated carbon for use in applications to remove organic compounds from liquids, gases, water, and air. This segment also consists of services related to activated carbon including reactivation of spent carbon and the leasing, monitoring, and maintenance of carbon fills at customer sites. The service portion of this segment also includes services related to the Company's ion exchange technologies for treatment of groundwater and process streams. The Equipment segment provides solutions to customers' air and water process problems through the design, fabrication, and operation of systems that utilize the Company's enabling technologies: carbon adsorption, ultraviolet light, ballast water, and advanced ion exchange separation. The Consumer segment brings the Company's purification technologies directly to the consumer in the form of products and services including carbon cloth and activated carbon for household odors. The following segment information represents the results of operations:

Table of Contents

| | Three Months Ended March 31, | |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| | 2011 | 2010 |
| Net sales | | |
| Activated Carbon and Service | \$ 112,884 | \$ 90,452 |
| Equipment | 9,117 | 10,160 |
| Consumer | 2,379 | 2,315 |
| | \$ 124,380 | \$ 102,927 |
| Income (loss) from operations before depreciation and amortization | | |
| Activated Carbon and Service | \$ 19,067 | \$ 17,687 |
| Equipment | (382) | (315) |
| Consumer | 195 | 113 |
| | 18,880 | 17,485 |
| Depreciation and amortization | | |
| Activated Carbon and Service | 4,874 | 4,474 |
| Equipment | 547 | 485 |
| Consumer | 119 | 118 |
| | 5,540 | 5,077 |
| Income from operations | 13,340 | 12,408 |
| Reconciling items: | | |
| Interest income | 63 | 116 |
| Interest expense | (18) | (8) |
| Gain on acquisitions | | 2,666 |
| Other expense net | (190) | (303) |
| Income from operations before income tax and equity in income from equity investments | \$ 13,195 | \$ 14,879 |
| | | |
| | March 31, 2011 | December 31, 2010 |
| Total Assets | | |
| Activated Carbon and Service | \$ 452,877 | \$ 441,415 |
| Equipment | 45,184 | 49,860 |
| Consumer | 10,219 | 10,288 |
| Consolidated total assets | \$ 508,280 | \$ 501,563 |

7. Derivative Instruments

The Company's corporate and foreign subsidiaries use foreign currency forward exchange contracts and foreign exchange option contracts to limit the exposure of exchange rate fluctuations on certain foreign currency receivables, payables, and other known and forecasted transactional exposures for periods consistent with the expected cash flow of the underlying transactions. The foreign currency forward exchange and foreign exchange option contracts generally mature within eighteen months and are designed to limit exposure to exchange rate fluctuations. The Company also uses cash flow hedges to limit the exposure to changes in natural gas prices. The

Table of Contents

natural gas forward contracts generally mature within one to thirty-six months. The Company accounts for its derivative instruments under Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) 815 Derivatives and Hedging. The fair value of outstanding derivative contracts recorded as assets in the accompanying Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheets were as follows:

| Asset Derivatives | Balance Sheet Locations | March 31, 2011 | December 31, 2010 |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Derivatives designated as hedging instruments under ASC 815: | | | |
| Foreign exchange contracts | Other current assets | \$ 80 | \$ 321 |
| Natural gas contracts | Other current assets | 7 | 2 |
| Currency swap | Other assets | | 37 |
| Foreign exchange contracts | Other assets | 29 | |
| Natural gas contracts | Other assets | | 6 |
| Total derivatives designated as hedging instruments under ASC 815 | | 116 | 366 |
| Derivatives not designated as hedging instruments under ASC 815: | | | |
| Foreign exchange contracts | Other current assets | 23 | 34 |
| Total asset derivatives | | \$ 139 | \$ 400 |

The fair value of outstanding derivative contracts recorded as liabilities in the accompanying Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheets were as follows:

| Liability Derivatives | Balance Sheet Locations | March 31, 2011 | December 31, 2010 |
|---|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Derivatives designated as hedging instruments under ASC 815: | | | |
| Foreign exchange contracts | Accounts payable and accrued liabilities | \$ 608 | \$ 243 |
| Natural gas contracts | Accounts payable and accrued liabilities | 1,129 | 1,608 |
| Foreign exchange contracts | Accrued pension and other liabilities | 89 | 34 |
| Natural gas contracts | Accrued pension and other liabilities | 449 | 509 |
| Total derivatives designated as hedging instruments under ASC 815 | | 2,275 | 2,394 |
| Derivatives not designated as hedging Instruments under ASC 815: | | | |
| Foreign exchange contracts | | | 59 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------|
| Total liability derivatives | \$ 2,275 | \$ 2,453 |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------|

Fair value is defined as the price that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date. The fair value hierarchy distinguishes between (1) market participant assumptions developed based on market data obtained from independent sources (observable inputs) and (2) an entity's own assumptions about market participant assumptions developed based on the best information available in the circumstances (unobservable inputs). The fair value hierarchy consists of three broad levels, which gives the highest priority to unadjusted quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities (Level 1) and the lowest priority to unobservable inputs (Level 3). The three levels of the fair value hierarchy are described below:

Table of Contents

Level 1 Quoted prices (unadjusted) in active markets for identical assets or liabilities;

Level 2 Inputs, other than the quoted prices in active markets, that are observable either directly or indirectly; and

Level 3 Unobservable inputs that reflect the reporting entity's own assumptions.

In accordance with ASC 820, Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures, the fair value of the Company's foreign exchange forward contracts, foreign exchange option contracts, and natural gas forward contracts is determined using Level 2 inputs, which are defined as observable inputs. The inputs used are from market sources that aggregate data based upon market transactions.

Cash Flow Hedges

For derivative instruments that are designated and qualify as cash flow hedges, the effective portion of the gain or loss on the derivative is reported as a component of other comprehensive income (OCI) and reclassified into earnings in the same period or periods during which the hedged transaction affects earnings. Gains and losses on the derivative representing either hedge ineffectiveness or hedge components excluded from the assessment of effectiveness are recognized in current earnings and were not material for the three month periods ended March 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively.

The following table provides details on the changes in accumulated OCI relating to derivative assets and liabilities that qualified for cash flow hedge accounting.

| | Three Months Ended March 31, 2011 | |
|--|--|-------|
| Accumulated OCI derivative loss January 1, 2011 | \$ | 2,526 |
| Effective portion of changes in fair value | | 663 |
| Reclassifications from accumulated OCI derivative loss to earnings | | (650) |
| Foreign currency translation | | 1 |
| Accumulated OCI derivative loss at March 31, 2011 | \$ | 2,540 |

| | Amount of (Gain) or Loss Recognized in OCI on Derivatives (Effective Portion) Three Months Ended March 31, | |
|--|---|-------------|
| | 2011 | 2010 |
| Derivatives in ASC 815 Cash Flow Hedging Relationships: | | |
| Foreign Exchange Contracts | \$ 615 | \$ (738) |
| Natural Gas Contracts | 48 | 1,313 |
| Total | \$ 663 | \$ 575 |

Table of Contents

| Derivatives in ASC 815 Cash Flow Hedging Relationships: | Location of Gain or (Loss) Recognized in Income on Derivatives | Amount of Gain or (Loss) Reclassified from Accumulated OCI in Income (Effective Portion) * | |
|--|---|---|-------------|
| | | Three Months Ended March 31, | |
| | | 2011 | 2010 |
| Foreign Exchange Contracts | Cost of products sold | \$ 7 | \$ (40) |
| Currency Swap | Interest expense | | (121) |
| Natural Gas Contracts | Cost of products sold | (657) | (486) |
| Total | | \$ (650) | \$ (647) |

| Derivatives in ASC 815 Cash Flow Hedging Relationships: | Location of (Gain) or Loss Recognized in Income on Derivatives | Amount of (Gain) or Loss Recognized in Income on Derivatives (Ineffective Portion and Amount Excluded from Effectiveness Testing) ** | |
|--|---|---|-------------|
| | | Three Months Ended March 31, | |
| | in | 2011 | 2010 |
| Foreign Exchange Contracts | Other expense net | \$ 2 | \$ (1) |
| Currency Swap | Other expense net | | |
| Natural Gas Contracts | Other expense net | | |
| Total | | \$ 2 | \$ (1) |

* Assuming market rates remain constant with the rates at March 31, 2011, a loss of \$2.0 million is expected to be recognized in earnings over the next 12 months.

** For the three months ended March 31, 2011 and 2010, the amount of loss recognized in income was all attributable to the ineffective portion of the hedging relationships.

The Company had the following outstanding derivative contracts that were entered into to hedge forecasted transactions:

March 31,

| | | December 31, 2010 |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|
| (in thousands except for mmbtu) | 2011 | |
| Natural gas contracts (mmbtu) | 425,000 | 985,000 |
| Foreign exchange contracts | \$ 35,978 | \$ 20,727 |

Other

The Company has also entered into certain derivatives to minimize its exposure of exchange rate fluctuations on certain foreign currency receivables, payables, and other known and forecasted transactional exposures. The Company has not qualified these contracts for hedge accounting treatment and therefore, the fair value gains and losses on these contracts are recorded in earnings as follows:

Table of Contents

| Derivatives Not Designated as Hedging Instruments Under ASC 815: | Location of (Gain) or Loss Recognized in Income on Derivatives Other expense net | Amount of (Gain) or Loss Recognized in Income on Derivatives Three Months Ended March 31, | |
|---|---|--|-------------|
| | | 2011 | 2010 |
| Foreign Exchange Contracts * | | \$ 318 | \$ 156 |
| Total | | \$ 318 | \$ 156 |

* As of March 31, 2011 and 2010, these foreign exchange contracts were entered into and settled during the respective periods.

Management's policy for managing foreign currency risk is to use derivatives to hedge up to 75% of the forecasted intercompany sales to certain of its subsidiaries. The hedges involving foreign currency derivative instruments do not span a period greater than eighteen months from the contract inception date. Management uses various hedging instruments including, but not limited to foreign currency forward contracts, foreign currency option contracts and foreign currency swaps. Management's policy for managing natural gas exposure is to use derivatives to hedge from zero to 75% of the forecasted natural gas requirements. These cash flow hedges span up to thirty-six months from the contract inception date. Hedge effectiveness is measured on a quarterly basis and any portion of ineffectiveness is recorded directly to the Company's earnings.

8. Contingencies

In conjunction with the February 2004 purchase of substantially all of Waterlink's operating assets and the stock of Waterlink's U.K. subsidiary, environmental studies were performed on Waterlink's Columbus, Ohio property by environmental consulting firms which provided an identification and characterization of the areas of contamination. In addition, these firms identified alternative methods of remediating the property, identified feasible alternatives and prepared cost evaluations of the various alternatives. The Company concluded from the information in the studies that a loss at this property is probable and recorded the liability as a component of current liabilities at March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010. At March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, the balance recorded was \$3.7 million and \$3.9 million, respectively. Liability estimates are based on an evaluation of, among other factors, currently available facts, existing technology, presently enacted laws and regulations, and the remediation experience of other companies. The Company has incurred \$0.2 million of environmental remediation costs for the period ended March 31, 2011 and zero for the period ended March 31, 2010. It is reasonably possible that a change in the estimate of this obligation will occur as remediation preparation and remediation activity commences in the near term. The ultimate remediation costs are dependent upon, among other things, the requirements of any state or federal environmental agencies, the remediation methods employed, the determination of the final scope of work, and the extent and types of contamination which will not be fully determined until experience is gained through remediation and related activities. The Company had commissioned a more definitive environmental assessment to be performed to better understand the extent of contamination and appropriate methodologies for remediation. During the second quarter of 2011, the Company expects to complete and evaluate the assessment. The Company also expects that remediation activities will commence during the latter part of the second quarter.

Table of Contents

On March 8, 2006, the Company and another U.S. producer (the Petitioners) of activated carbon formally requested that the United States Department of Commerce investigate unfair pricing of certain activated carbon imported from the People's Republic of China. The Commerce Department investigated imports of activated carbon from China that is thermally activated using a combination of heat, steam and/or carbon dioxide. Certain types of activated carbon from China, most notably chemically-activated carbon, were not investigated.

On March 2, 2007, the Commerce Department published its final determination (subsequently amended) that all of the subject merchandise from China was being unfairly priced, or dumped, and thus that special additional duties should be imposed to offset the amount of the unfair pricing. The resultant tariff rates ranged from 61.95% ad valorem (i.e., of the entered value of the goods) to 228.11% ad valorem. A formal order imposing these tariffs was published on April 27, 2007. All imports from China remain subject to the order and antidumping tariffs. Importers of subject activated carbon from China are required to make cash deposits of estimated antidumping tariffs at the time the goods are entered into the United States customs territory. Deposits of tariffs are subject to future revision based on retrospective reviews conducted by the Commerce Department.

The Company is both a domestic producer and a large U.S. importer (from its wholly-owned subsidiary Calgon Carbon (Tianjin) Co., Ltd.) of the activated carbon that is subject to this proceeding. As such, the Company's involvement in the Commerce Department's proceedings is both as a domestic producer (a petitioner) and as a foreign exporter (a respondent).

As one of two U.S. producers involved as petitioners in the case, the Company is actively involved in ensuring the Commerce Department obtains the most accurate information from the foreign producers and exporters involved in the review, in order to calculate the most accurate results and margins of dumping for the sales at issue.

As an importer of activated carbon from China and in light of the successful antidumping tariff case, the Company was required to pay deposits of estimated antidumping tariffs at the rate of 84.45% ad valorem to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (Customs) on entries made on or after October 11, 2006 through March 1, 2007. From March 2, 2007 through March 29, 2007 the antidumping rate was 78.89%. From March 30, 2007 through April 8, 2007 the antidumping duty rate was 69.54%. Because of limits on the government's legal authority to impose provisional tariffs prior to issuance of a final determination, entries made between April 9, 2007 and April 18, 2007 were not subject to tariffs. For the period April 19, 2007 through November 9, 2009, deposits have been paid at 69.54%.

The Company's role as an importer that is required to pay tariffs results in a contingent liability related to the final amount of tariffs that it will ultimately have to pay. The Company has made deposits of estimated tariffs in two ways. First, estimated tariffs on entries in the period from October 11, 2006 through April 8, 2007 were covered by a bond. The total amount of tariffs that can be paid on entries in this period is capped as a matter of law, though the Company may receive a refund with interest of any difference due to a reduction in the actual margin of dumping found in the first review. The Company's estimated liability for tariffs during this period of \$0.2 million is reflected

Table of Contents

in accounts payable and accrued liabilities on the Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheet at March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively. Second, the Company has been required to post cash deposits of estimated tariffs owed on entries of subject merchandise since April 19, 2007. The final amount of tariffs owed on these entries may change, and can either increase or decrease depending on the final results of relevant administrative inquiries. This process is further described below.

The amount of estimated antidumping tariffs payable on goods imported into the United States is subject to review and retroactive adjustment based on the actual amount of dumping that is found. To do this, the Commerce Department conducts periodic reviews of sales made to the first unaffiliated U.S. customer, typically over the prior 12 month period. These reviews will be possible for at least five years, and can result in changes to the antidumping tariff rate (either increasing or reducing the rate) applicable to any given foreign exporter. Revision of tariff rates has two effects. First, it will alter the actual amount of tariffs that Customs will seek to collect for the period reviewed, by either increasing or decreasing the amount to reflect the actual amount of dumping that was found. If the actual amount of tariffs owed increases, the government will require payment of the difference plus interest. Conversely, if the tariff rate decreases, any difference is refunded with interest. Second, the revised rate becomes the cash deposit rate applied to future entries, and can either increase or decrease the amount of deposits an importer will be required to pay.

On November 10, 2009, the Commerce Department announced the results of its review of the tariff period beginning October 11, 2006 through March 31, 2008 (period of review (POR) I). Based on the POR I results, the Company's ongoing tariff deposit rate was adjusted from 69.54% to 14.51% (as adjusted by .07% for certain ministerial errors and published in the Federal Register on December 17, 2009) for entries made subsequent to the announcement. In addition, the Company's assessment rate for POR I was determined to have been too high and, accordingly, the Company reduced its recorded liability for unpaid deposits in POR I and recorded a receivable of \$1.6 million reflecting expected refunds for tariff deposits made during POR I as a result of the announced decrease in the POR I tariff assessment rate. Note that the Petitioners have appealed to the U.S. Court of International Trade the Commerce Department's POR I results challenging, among other things, the selection of certain surrogate values and financial information which in-part caused the reduction in the tariff rate. Liquidation of the Company's entries for the POR I review period is judicially enjoined for the duration of the appeal. As such, the Company will not have final settlement of the amounts it may owe or receive as a result of the final POR I tariff rates until the aforementioned appeals are resolved. On February 17, 2011, the Court issued an order denying the Company's appeal and remanding the case back to the Commerce Department with respect to several of the issues raised by the Chinese respondents. The Commerce Department is scheduled to transmit its redetermination to the Court in May 2011. Although the timing for the final resolution of appeals is at the discretion of the Court and is not subject to a specific deadline, it is expected that all issues in the appeals concerning POR I will be finally concluded by the U.S. Court of International Trade by the end of 2011. For POR I, the Company estimates that a hypothetical 10% increase or decrease in the final tariff rate compared to the announced rate on November 10, 2009 would result in an additional payment or refund of approximately \$0.1 million.

Table of Contents

On April 1, 2009, the Commerce Department published a formal notice allowing parties to request a second annual administrative review of the antidumping tariff order covering the period April 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009 (POR II). Requests for review were due no later than April 30, 2009. The Company, in its capacity as a U.S. producer and separately as a Chinese exporter, elected not to participate in this administrative review. By not participating in the review, the Company's tariff deposits made during POR II are final and not subject to further adjustment.

On November 17, 2010, the Commerce Department announced the results of its review of the tariff period beginning April 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009 (period of review (POR) II). Since the Company was not involved in this review our deposit rates did not change from the rate of 14.51% established after a review of POR I. However for the cooperative respondents involved in POR II their new deposit rate is calculated at 31.59% deposit rate but will be collected on a \$0.127 per pound basis.

On April 1, 2010, the Commerce Department published a formal notice allowing parties to request a third annual administrative review of the antidumping tariff order covering the period April 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010 (POR III). Requests for review were due no later than April 30, 2010. The Company, in its capacity as a U.S. producer and separately as a Chinese exporter, elected not to participate in this administrative review. However, Albemarle Corporation has requested that the Commerce Department review the exports of Calgon Carbon (Tianjin) claiming standing as a wholesaler of the domestic like product. This claim by Albemarle to have such standing was challenged by the Company in its capacity as a U.S. producer and separately as a Chinese exporter. The Commerce Department upheld Albemarle's request to review the exports of Calgon Carbon (Tianjin). On April 25, 2011, the Commerce Department released the preliminary results for POR III and Calgon Carbon (Tianjin's) rate was estimated to be approximately 2%. The antidumping rates for POR III remain subject to final determination, which is not expected to be before August 2011 and can be extended until November 2011. Should the Company's tariff rate for POR III be finally determined to be 2%, the Company would be entitled to refunds of tariff deposits of approximately \$1.1 million, plus interest.

On April 1, 2011, the Commerce Department published a formal notice allowing parties to request a fourth annual administrative review of the antidumping tariff order covering the period April 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011 (POR IV). Requests for review were due no later than May 2, 2011. The Company, in its capacity as a U.S. producer and separately as a Chinese exporter, elected not to participate in this administrative review. Again Albemarle Corporation has requested that the Commerce Department review the exports of Calgon Carbon (Tianjin) claiming standing as a wholesaler of the domestic like product. The Commerce Department should finalize selection of mandatory respondents for POR IV by the end of May 2011. For the period April 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011 (POR IV), the Company estimates that a hypothetical 10% increase or decrease in the final tariff rate compared to rates at which deposits were made would not result in a significant payment or refund.

The contingent liability relating to tariffs paid on imports is somewhat mitigated by two factors. First and foremost, the antidumping tariff order's disciplinary effect on the market encourages the elimination of dumping through fair

Table of Contents

pricing. Separately, pursuant to the Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000 (repealed effective Feb. 8, 2006), as an affected domestic producer, the Company is eligible to apply for a distribution of a share of certain tariffs collected on entries of subject merchandise from China from October 11, 2006 to September 30, 2007. In July 2010, 2009 and 2008, the Company applied for such distributions. There were no additional amounts received during the year ended December 31, 2010. In November 2009 and December 2008, the Company received distributions of approximately \$0.8 million and \$0.2 million, respectively, which reflected 59.57% of the total amounts then available. The Company anticipates receiving additional amounts in 2011 and future years related to tariffs paid for the period October 11, 2006 through September 30, 2007, although the exact amount is impossible to determine.

By letter dated January 22, 2007, the Company received from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 4 a report of a hazardous waste facility inspection performed by the EPA and the Kentucky Department of Environmental Protection (KYDEP) as part of a Multi Media Compliance Evaluation of the Company s Big Sandy Plant in Catlettsburg, Kentucky that was conducted on September 20 and 21, 2005. Accompanying the report was a Notice of Violation (NOV) alleging multiple violations of the Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and corresponding EPA and KYDEP hazardous waste regulations.

The alleged violations mainly concern the hazardous waste spent activated carbon regeneration facility. The Company met with the EPA on April 17, 2007 to discuss the inspection report and alleged violations, and submitted written responses in May and June 2007. In August 2007, the EPA notified the Company that it believes there were still significant violations of RCRA that are unresolved by the information in the Company s responses, without specifying the particular violations. During a meeting with the EPA on December 10, 2007, the EPA indicated that the agency would not pursue certain other alleged violations. Based on discussions during the December 10, 2007 meeting, subsequent communications with the EPA, and in connection with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Notice referred to below, the Company has taken actions to address and remediate a number of the unresolved alleged violations. The Company believes, and the EPA has indicated, that the number of unresolved issues as to alleged continuing violations cited in the January 22, 2007 NOV has been reduced substantially. The EPA can take formal enforcement action to require the Company to remediate any or all of the unresolved alleged continuing violations which could require the Company to incur substantial additional costs. The EPA can also take formal enforcement action to impose substantial civil penalties with respect to violations cited in the NOV, including those which have been admitted or resolved.

On July 3, 2008, the EPA verbally informed the Company that there are a number of unresolved RCRA violations at the Big Sandy Plant which may render the facility unacceptable to receive spent carbon for reactivation from sites regulated under CERCLA pursuant to the CERCLA Off-Site Rule. The Company received written notice of the unacceptability determination on July 14, 2008 (the CERCLA Notice). The CERCLA Notice alleged multiple violations of RCRA and four releases of hazardous waste. The alleged violations and releases were cited in the September 2005 multi-media compliance inspections, and were among those cited in the January 2007 NOV described in the preceding paragraph as well. The CERCLA Notice gave the Company until September 1, 2008 to demonstrate to the EPA that the alleged violations and releases are not continuing, or else the Big Sandy Plant

Table of Contents

would not be able to receive spent carbon from CERCLA sites until the EPA determined that the facility is again acceptable to receive such CERCLA wastes. This deadline subsequently was extended several times. The Company met with the EPA in August 2008 regarding the CERCLA Notice and submitted a written response to the CERCLA Notice prior to the meeting. By letter dated February 13, 2009, the EPA informed the Company that based on information submitted by the Company indicating that the Big Sandy Plant has returned to physical compliance for the alleged violations and releases, the EPA had made an affirmative determination of acceptability for receipt of CERCLA wastes at the Big Sandy Plant. The EPA's determination is conditioned upon the Company treating certain residues resulting from the treatment of the carbon reactivation furnace off-gas as hazardous waste and not sending material dredged from the onsite wastewater treatment lagoons offsite other than to a permitted hazardous waste treatment, storage or disposal facility. The Company requested clarification from the EPA regarding these two conditions. The Company has also met with Headquarters of the EPA Solid Waste Division (Headquarters) on March 6, 2009 and presented its classification argument, with the understanding that Headquarters would advise Region 4 of the EPA. By letter dated January 5, 2010, the EPA determined certain residues resulting from the treatment of the carbon reactivation furnace off-gas are RCRA listed hazardous wastes and the material dredged from the onsite wastewater treatment lagoons is a RCRA listed hazardous waste and that they need to be managed in accordance with RCRA regulations. The cost to treat and/or dispose of the material dredged from the lagoons as hazardous waste could be substantial. However, by letter dated January 22, 2010, the Company received a determination from the KYDEP Division of Waste Management that the material is not listed hazardous waste when recycled as had been the Company's practice. The Company believes that pursuant to EPA regulations, KYDEP is the proper authority to make this determination. Thus, the Company believes that there is no basis for the position set forth in the EPA's January 5, 2010 letter and the Company will vigorously defend any complaint on the matter. The Company has had several additional discussions with Region 4 of the EPA. The Company has indicated to the EPA that it is willing to work with the agency toward a solution subject to a comprehensive resolution of all the issues. By letter dated May 12, 2010, from the Department of Justice Environmental and Natural Resources Division (the DOJ), the Company was informed that the DOJ was prepared to take appropriate enforcement action against the Company for the NOV and other violations under the Clean Water Act (CWA). The Company met with the DOJ on July 9, 2010 and agreed to permit more comprehensive testing of the lagoons and to share data and analysis already obtained. On July 19, 2010, the EPA sent the Company a formal information request with respect to such data and analysis which was answered by the Company. In September 2010, representatives of the EPA met with Company personnel for two days at the Big Sandy plant. The visit included an inspection by the EPA and discussion regarding the plan for additional testing of the lagoons and material dredged from the lagoons. The Company, EPA and DOJ have had ongoing meetings and discussions since the September 2010 inspection. The Company has indicated that it is willing to work towards a comprehensive resolution of all the issues. The DOJ and EPA have informally indicated that such a comprehensive resolution may be possible depending upon the results of additional testing to be completed but that the agencies will expect significant civil penalties with respect to the violations cited in the NOV as well as the alleged CWA violations. The Company believes that the size of any civil penalties, if any, should be reduced since all the alleged violations, except those with respect to the characterization of the certain residues resulting from the treatment of the carbon reactivation furnace off-gas and

Table of Contents

the material dredged from the onsite wastewater treatment lagoons, had been resolved in response to the NOV or the CERCLA Notice. The Company believes that there should be no penalties associated with respect to the characterization of the residues resulting from the treatment of the carbon reactivation furnace off-gas and the material dredged from the onsite wastewater treatment lagoons as the Company believes that those materials are not listed hazardous waste as has been determined by the KYDEP. The Company is conducting negotiations with the DOJ and EPA to attempt to settle the issues. The Company cannot predict with any certainty the probable outcome of this matter. In the fourth quarter of 2010, the Company accrued \$2.0 million as its estimate of potential loss related to civil penalties. If process modifications are required, the capital costs could be significant and may exceed \$10.0 million. If the resolution includes remediation, additional significant expenses and/or capital expenditures may be required. If a settlement cannot be reached, the issues will most likely be litigated and the Company will vigorously defend its position.

By letter dated August 18, 2008, the Company was notified by the EPA Suspension and Debarment Division (SDD) that because of the alleged violations described in the CERCLA Notice, the SDD was making an assessment of the Company s present responsibility to conduct business with Federal Executive Agencies. Representatives of the SDD attended the August 2008 EPA meeting. On August 28, 2008, the Company received a letter from the Division requesting additional information from the Company in connection with the SDD s evaluation of the Company s potential business risk to the Federal Government, noting that the Company engages in procurement transactions with or funded by the Federal Government. The Company provided the SDD with all information requested by the letter in September 2008. The SDD can suspend or debar a Company from sales to the Federal Government directly or indirectly through government contractors or with respect to projects funded by the Federal Government. The Company estimates that revenue from sales made directly to the Federal Government or indirectly through government contractors comprised less than 8% of its total revenue for the three month period ended March 31, 2011. The Company is unable to estimate sales made directly or indirectly to customers and or projects that receive federal funding. In October 2008, the SDD indicated that it was still reviewing the matter but that another meeting with the Company was not warranted at that time. The Company believes that there is no basis for suspension or debarment on the basis of the matters asserted by the EPA in the CERCLA Notice or otherwise. The Company has had no further communication with the SDD since October 2008 and believes the likelihood of any action being taken by the SDD is remote.

In June 2007, the Company received a Notice Letter from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) stating that the NYSDEC had determined that the Company is a Potentially Responsible Party (PRP) at the Frontier Chemical Processing Royal Avenue Site in Niagara Falls, New York (the Site). The Notice Letter requests that the Company and other PRP s develop, implement and finance a remedial program for Operable Unit #1 at the Site. Operable Unit #1 consists of overburden soils and overburden and upper bedrock groundwater. The selected remedy is removal of above grade structures and contaminated soil source areas, installation of a cover system, and ground water control and treatment, estimated to cost between approximately \$11 million and \$14 million, which would be shared among the PRP s. The Company has not determined what portion of the costs associated with the remedial program it would be obligated to bear and the Company cannot predict with any certainty the outcome of this matter or range of potential loss. The Company has

Table of Contents

joined a PRP group (the PRP Group) and has executed a Joint Defense Agreement with the group members. In August 2008, the Company and over 100 PRP s entered into a Consent Order with the NYSDEC for additional site investigation directed toward characterization of the Site to better define the scope of the remedial project. The Company contributed monies to the PRP Group to help fund the work required under the Consent Order. The additional site investigation required under the Consent Order was initiated in 2008 and completed in the spring of 2009. A final report of the site investigation was submitted to NYSDEC in October 2009. By letter dated December 31, 2009, NYSDEC disapproved the report. The bases for disapproval include concerns regarding proposed alternate soil cleanup objectives, questions regarding soil treatability studies and questions regarding ground water contamination.

PRP Group representatives met several times with NYSDEC regarding revising the soil cleanup objectives set forth in the Record of Decision to be consistent with recently revised regulations. NYSDEC does not agree that the revised regulation applies to this site but requested additional information to support the PRP Group s position. The PRP Group s consultant did additional cost-benefit analyses and further soil sampling. The results were provided to NYSDEC but they remain unwilling to revise the soil standards. Additionally, NYSDEC indicated that because the site is a former RCRA facility, soil excavated at the site would be deemed hazardous waste and would require offsite disposal. Conestoga Rovers Associates, the PRP Group s consultant, estimates the soil remedy cost would increase from approximately \$3.2 million to \$6.1 million if all excavated soil had to be disposed offsite. Also, PRP Group Representatives met with the Niagara Falls Water Board (NFWB) regarding continued use of the NFWB s sewers and wastewater treatment plant to collect and treat contaminated ground water from the site. This would provide considerable cost savings over having to install a separate ground water collection and treatment system. The Board was receptive to the PRP Group s proposal and work is progressing on a draft permit. In addition, the adjacent landowner has expressed interest in acquiring the site for expansion of its business.

By letter dated July 3, 2007, the Company received an NOV from the KYDEP alleging that the Company has violated the KYDEP s hazardous waste management regulations in connection with the Company s hazardous waste spent activated carbon regeneration facility located at the Big Sandy Plant in Catlettsburg, Kentucky. The NOV alleges that the Company has failed to correct deficiencies identified by the KYDEP in the Company s Part B hazardous waste management facility permit application and related documents and directed the Company to submit a complete and accurate Part B application and related documents and to respond to the KYDEP s comments which were appended to the NOV. The Company submitted a response to the NOV and the KYDEP s comments in December 2007 by providing a complete revised permit application. The KYDEP has not indicated whether or not it will take formal enforcement action, and has not specified a monetary amount of civil penalties it might pursue in any such action, if any. The KYDEP can also deny the Part B operating permit. On October 18, 2007, the Company received an NOV from the EPA related to this permit application and submitted a revised application to both the KYDEP and the EPA within the mandated timeframe. The EPA has not indicated whether or not it will take formal enforcement action, and has not specified a monetary amount of civil penalties it might pursue in any such action. The Company met with the KYDEP on July 27, 2009 concerning the permit, and the KYDEP indicated that it, and Region 4 of the EPA, would like to see specific additional information or clarifications in the permit application. Accordingly, the Company submitted a new application on October 15, 2009. The KYDEP

Table of Contents

indicated that it had no intention to deny the permit as long as the Company worked with the state to resolve issues. The Region 4 of the EPA has not indicated any stance on the permit and can deny the application. At this time the Company cannot predict with any certainty the outcome of this matter or range of loss, if any. In addition to the matters described above, the Company is involved in various other legal proceedings, lawsuits and claims, including employment, product warranty and environmental matters of a nature considered normal to its business. It is the Company's policy to accrue for amounts related to these legal matters when it is probable that a liability has been incurred and the loss amount is reasonably estimable. Management believes that the ultimate liabilities, if any, resulting from such lawsuits and claims will not materially affect the consolidated financial position or liquidity of the Company, but an adverse outcome could be material to the results of operations in a particular period in which a liability is recognized.

9. Goodwill & Other Identifiable Intangible Assets

The Company has elected to perform the annual impairment test of its goodwill on December 31 of each year. For purposes of the test, the Company has identified reporting units, as defined within ASC 350, at a regional level for the Activated Carbon and Service segment and at the technology level for the Equipment segment and has allocated goodwill to these reporting units accordingly. The goodwill associated with the Consumer segment is not material and has not been allocated below the segment level.

The changes in the carrying amounts of goodwill by segment for the three months ended March 31, 2011 are as follows:

| | Activated Carbon & Service Segment | Equipment Segment | Consumer Segment | Total |
|---------------------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Balance as of December 31, 2010 | \$ 20,183 | \$ 6,667 | \$ 60 | \$ 26,910 |
| Foreign exchange | 105 | 49 | | 154 |
| Balance as of March 31, 2011 | \$ 20,288 | \$ 6,716 | \$ 60 | \$ 27,064 |

The following is a summary of the Company's identifiable intangible assets as of March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively.

| | Weighted Average Amortization Period | Gross Carrying Amount | March 31, 2011 | | Net Carrying Amount |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | Foreign Exchange | Accumulated Amortization | |
| Amortized Intangible Assets: | | | | | |
| Patents | 15.4 Years | \$ 1,369 | \$ | \$ (1,147) | \$ 222 |
| Customer Relationships | 16.0 Years | 10,450 | (166) | (7,307) | 2,977 |
| Product Certification | 5.4 Years | 5,327 | | (2,331) | 2,996 |
| Unpatented Technology | 20.0 Years | 2,875 | | (1,889) | 986 |
| Licenses | 20.0 Years | 964 | 133 | (52) | 1,045 |
| Total | 14.0 Years | \$ 20,985 | \$ (33) | \$ (12,726) | \$ 8,226 |

Table of Contents

| | Weighted Average Amortization Period | Gross Carrying Amount | December 31, 2010 | | Net Carrying Amount |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | Foreign Exchange | Accumulated Amortization | |
| Amortized Intangible Assets: | | | | | |
| Patents | 15.4 Years | \$ 1,369 | \$ | \$ (1,128) | \$ 241 |
| Customer Relationships | 16.0 Years | 10,450 | (239) | (7,138) | 3,073 |
| Product Certification | 5.4 Years | 5,327 | | (2,116) | 3,211 |
| Unpatented Technology | 20.0 Years | 2,875 | | (1,848) | 1,027 |
| Licenses | 20.0 Years | 964 | 151 | (52) | 1,063 |
| Total | 14.0 Years | \$ 20,985 | \$ (88) | \$ (12,282) | \$ 8,615 |

For the three months ended March 31, 2011 and 2010, the Company recognized \$0.4 million and \$0.4 million, respectively, of amortization expense related to intangible assets. The Company estimates amortization expense to be recognized during the next five years as follows:

For the year ending December 31:

| | |
|------|---------|
| 2011 | \$1,675 |
| 2012 | 1,485 |
| 2013 | 1,410 |
| 2014 | 1,310 |
| 2015 | 716 |

10. Borrowing Arrangements**Short-Term Debt**

| | March 31, 2011 | December 31, 2010 |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Borrowings under Japanese Credit Facility | \$ | \$ 2,962 |
| Borrowings under Japanese Working Capital Loan | | 18,480 |
| Total | \$ | \$ 21,442 |

Long-Term Debt

| | March 31, 2011 | December 31, 2010 |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Borrowings under Japanese Working Capital Loan | \$ 21,135 | \$ |
| Borrowings under Japanese Term Loan | 5,821 | 6,924 |
| Other | 196 | |
| Less current portion of long-term debt | 2,926 | 3,203 |

Net \$ 24,226 \$ 3,721

Credit Facility

On May 8, 2009, the Company and certain of its domestic subsidiaries entered into a Credit Agreement (the "Credit Agreement") that replaced the Company's prior credit facility. The Credit Agreement provides for an initial \$95.0 million revolving credit facility (the "Revolving Credit Facility") which expires on May 8, 2014. So long as no event of default has occurred and is continuing, the Company from time to time may request one or more increases in the total revolving credit commitment under the Revolving Credit Facility of up to \$30.0 million in the aggregate. No assurance can be given, however, that the total revolving credit commitment will be increased above \$95.0 million. Availability under the Revolving Credit Facility is dependent upon various customary conditions. A quarterly nonrefundable commitment fee is payable by the Company based on the unused availability under the Revolving Credit Facility and is currently equal to 0.25%. Any outstanding borrowings under the Revolving Credit Facility on July 2, 2012, up to \$50.0 million, automatically convert to a term loan maturing on May 8, 2014 (the "Term Loan"), with the total revolving credit commitment under the Revolving Credit Facility being reduced at that

Table of Contents

time by the amount of the Term Loan. Total availability under the Revolving Credit Facility at March 31, 2011 was \$92.8 million, after considering outstanding letters of credit.

The interest rate on amounts owed under the Term Loan and the Revolving Credit Facility will be, at the Company's option, either (i) a fluctuating base rate based on the highest of (A) the prime rate announced from time to time by the lenders, (B) the rate announced by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York on that day as being the weighted average of the rates on overnight federal funds transactions arranged by federal funds brokers on the previous trading day plus 3.00% or (C) a daily LIBOR rate plus 2.75%, or (ii) LIBOR-based borrowings in one to six month increments at the applicable LIBOR rate plus 2.50%. A margin may be added to the applicable interest rate based on the Company's leverage ratio. The interest rate per annum as of March 31, 2011 using option (i) above would have been 3.25% if any borrowings were outstanding.

The Company incurred issuance costs of \$1.0 million which were deferred and are being amortized over the term of the Credit Agreement. As of March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, there are no outstanding borrowings under the Revolving Credit Facility.

Certain of the Company's domestic subsidiaries unconditionally guarantee all indebtedness and obligations related to borrowings under the Credit Agreement. The Company's obligations under the Revolving Credit Facility are secured by a first perfected security interest in certain of the domestic assets of the Company and the subsidiary guarantors, including certain real property, inventory, accounts receivable, equipment and capital stock of certain of the Company's domestic subsidiaries.

The Credit Agreement contains customary affirmative and negative covenants for credit facilities of this type, including limitations on the Company and its subsidiaries with respect to indebtedness, liens, investments, capital expenditures, mergers and acquisitions, dispositions of assets and transactions with affiliates. The Credit Agreement also provides for customary events of default, including failure to pay principal or interest when due, failure to comply with covenants, the fact that any representation or warranty made by the Company is false or misleading in any material respect, certain insolvency or receivership events affecting the Company and its subsidiaries and a change in control of the Company. If an event of default occurs, the lenders will be under no further obligation to make loans or issue letters of credit. Upon the occurrence of certain events of default, all outstanding obligations of the Company automatically become immediately due and payable, and other events of default will allow the lenders to declare all or any portion of the outstanding obligations of the Company to be immediately due and payable. The Credit Agreement also contains a covenant which includes limitations on its ability to declare or pay cash dividends, subject to certain exceptions, such as dividends declared and paid by its subsidiaries and cash dividends paid by the Company in an amount not to exceed 50% of cumulative net after tax earnings following the closing date of the agreement if certain conditions are met. The Company was in compliance with all such covenants as of March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively.

Table of Contents**Belgian Loan and Credit Facility**

On November 30, 2009, the Company entered into a Loan Agreement (the "Belgian Loan") in order to help finance expansion of the Company's Feluy, Belgium facility. The Belgian Loan provides total borrowings up to 6.0 million Euro, which can be drawn on in 120 thousand Euro bond installments at 25% of the total amount invested in the expansion. The maturity date is seven years from the date of the first draw down which has yet to occur. The Belgian Loan is guaranteed by a mortgage mandate on the Feluy site and is subject to customary reporting requirements, though no financial covenants exist and the Company had no outstanding borrowings under the Belgian Loan as of March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively.

The Company also maintains a Belgian credit facility totaling 1.5 million Euro which is secured by cash collateral of 750 thousand Euro. The cash collateral is shown as restricted cash within the Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheet as of March 31, 2011. There are no financial covenants, and the Company had no outstanding borrowings under the Belgian credit facility as of March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively. Bank guarantees of 1.4 million Euros were issued as of March 31, 2011.

United Kingdom Credit Facility

The Company maintains a United Kingdom credit facility for the issuance of various letters of credit and guarantees totaling 0.6 million British Pounds Sterling. This credit facility is secured with a U.S. bank guarantee. Bank guarantees of 0.4 million British Pounds Sterling were issued as of March 31, 2011.

Japanese Loans and Credit Facility

On March 31, 2010, CCJ entered into a Revolving Credit Facility Agreement (the "Japanese Credit Facility") totaling 2.0 billion Japanese Yen for working capital requirements of CCJ. This loan matured and was paid in full as of March 31, 2011.

CCJ also entered into two other borrowing arrangements as part of the common share repurchase on March 31, 2010, a Term Loan Agreement (the "Japanese Term Loan"), and a Working Capital Loan Agreement (the "Japanese Working Capital Loan"). Calgon Carbon Corporation is jointly and severally liable as the guarantor of CCJ's obligations and the Company permitted CCJ to grant a security interest and continuing lien in certain of its assets, including inventory and accounts receivable, to secure its obligations under both loan agreements. The Japanese Term Loan provided for a principal amount of 722.0 million Japanese Yen, or \$7.7 million at inception. This loan matures on March 31, 2013, bears interest at 1.975% per annum, and is payable in monthly installments of 20.0 million Japanese Yen beginning on April 30, 2010, with a final payment of 22.0 million Japanese Yen. Accordingly, 240.0 million Japanese Yen or \$2.9 million is recorded as current and 242.0 million Japanese Yen or \$2.9 million is recorded as long-term debt within the Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheet included in Item 1 at March 31, 2011. The Japanese Working Capital Loan provided for borrowings up to 1.5 billion Japanese Yen. This loan originally matured on March 31, 2011, and was renewed, with an increase in borrowing capacity up to 2.0 billion Japanese Yen, until April 4, 2012, and bears interest based on a daily short-term prime rate fixed on the day a borrowing takes place, which was 1.475% per annum at March 31, 2011. Borrowings and repayments under the Japanese Working Capital Loan have generally occurred on a bi-weekly basis in order to ensure adequate liquidity while minimizing outstanding borrowings. The borrowings and repayments are presented on a gross basis within the Company's Condensed Consolidated Statement of Cash Flows presented within Item 1. Total borrowings outstanding under the Japanese Working Capital Loan were 1.8 billion Japanese Yen or \$21.1 million at March 31, 2011, and are shown as long-term debt within the Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheet presented in Item 1.

Table of Contents**Fair Value of Debt**

At March 31, 2011, the Company had approximately \$27.0 million of borrowings under various Japanese credit agreements described above and \$0.2 million of other borrowings. The recorded amounts are based on prime rates, and accordingly, the carrying value of these obligations approximate their fair value.

Maturities of Long-Term Debt

The Company is obligated to make principal payments on debt outstanding at March 31, 2011 of \$2.2 million in 2011, \$24.1 million in 2012, \$0.8 million in 2013, \$28 thousand annually from 2014 through 2017, and \$5 thousand in 2018.

11. Pensions**U.S. Plans:**

For U.S. plans, the following table provides the components of net periodic pension costs of the plans for the periods ended March 31, 2011 and 2010:

| | Three Months Ended March | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| | 2011 | 2010 |
| Pension Benefits | | |
| Service cost | \$ 218 | \$ 223 |
| Interest cost | 1,216 | 1,241 |
| Expected return on plan assets | (1,613) | (1,284) |
| Amortization of prior service cost | 7 | 29 |
| Net actuarial loss amortization | 398 | 400 |
| Net periodic pension cost | \$ 226 | \$ 609 |

The expected long-term rate of return on plan assets is 8.00% in 2011.

Employer Contributions

In its 2010 financial statements, the Company disclosed that it expected to contribute \$2.0 million to its U.S. pension plans in 2011. As of March 31, 2011, the Company has contributed \$1.0 million. The Company expects to contribute the remaining \$1.0 million over the remainder of the year.

Table of Contents**European Plans:**

For European plans, the following table provides the components of net periodic pension costs of the plans for the periods ended March 31, 2011 and 2010:

| Pension Benefits | Three Months Ended March | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|
| | 2011 | 2010 |
| Service cost | \$ 38 | \$ 136 |
| Interest cost | 498 | 484 |
| Expected return on plan assets | (372) | (343) |
| Amortization of net transition amount | | 3 |
| Net actuarial loss amortization | 18 | 37 |
| Foreign currency exchange | 3 | (9) |
| Net periodic pension cost | \$ 185 | \$ 308 |

The expected long-term rate of return on plan assets ranges from 5.20% to 6.40% in 2011.

Employer Contributions

In its 2010 financial statements, the Company disclosed that it expected to contribute \$1.6 million to its European pension plans in 2011. As of March 31, 2011, the Company contributed \$0.4 million. The Company expects to contribute the remaining \$1.2 million over the remainder of the year.

Defined Contribution Plans:

The Company also sponsors a defined contribution plan for certain U.S. employees that permits employee contributions of up to 50% of eligible compensation in accordance with Internal Revenue Service guidance. Under this defined contribution plan, the Company makes a fixed contribution of 3% of eligible employee compensation on a quarterly basis and matches contributions made by each participant in an amount equal to 50% of the employee contribution up to a maximum of 1% of employee compensation. In addition, each of these employees is eligible for an additional discretionary Company contribution of up to 4% of employee compensation based upon annual Company performance at the discretion of the Company's Board of Directors. Employer matching contributions for non-represented employees vest immediately. Employer fixed and discretionary contributions vest after two years of service. For each bargaining unit employee at the Catlettsburg, Kentucky facility, the Company contributes a maximum of \$25.00 per month to the plan. As of June 8, 2010, under this facility's new collective bargaining agreement, current employees have the option of remaining in the defined benefit plan or converting to an enhanced defined contribution plan. The election to convert will freeze the defined benefit calculation as of such date and employees who elect to freeze their defined benefit will be eligible to receive a Company contribution to the enhanced defined contribution plan of \$1.15 per actual hour worked as well as for other related hours paid but not worked. The Company will then make additional lump sum contributions to employees that have converted of \$5,000 per year on the next three anniversary dates of the voluntary conversion to the enhanced defined contribution plan. As a result, employees that have converted will be excluded from the aforementioned \$25.00 match. For bargaining unit employees hired after June 8, 2010, and for employees voluntarily converting to the enhanced defined contribution plan, the Company contributes \$1.15 per actual hour worked, as well as for other related hours

Table of Contents

paid but not worked, for eligible employees. For bargaining unit employees at the Columbus, Ohio facility, the Company makes contributions to the USW 401(k) Plan of \$1.15 per actual hour worked for eligible employees. For bargaining unit employees at the Neville Island, Pennsylvania facility, the Company, effective January 1, 2009, began making contributions of \$1.40 per actual hour worked to the defined contribution pension plan (Thrift/Savings Plan) for eligible employees when their defined benefit pension plan was frozen. Employer matching contributions for bargaining unit employees vest immediately. Total expenses related to the defined contribution plans were \$0.5 million and \$0.4 million for the periods ended March 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively.

12. Basic and Diluted Net Income Per Common Share

Computation of basic and diluted net income per common share from operations is performed as follows:

| | Three Months Ended March | |
|---|--------------------------|------------|
| | 2011 | 2010 |
| <i>(Dollars in thousands, except per share amounts)</i> | | |
| Income from operations available to common shareholders | \$ 8,477 | \$ 9,476 |
| Weighted Average Shares Outstanding | | |
| Basic | 56,124,101 | 55,708,492 |
| Effect of Dilutive Securities | 768,641 | 1,016,585 |
| Diluted | 56,892,742 | 56,725,077 |
| Net income | | |
| Basic | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.17 |
| Diluted | \$ 0.15 | \$ 0.17 |

For the three months ended March 31, 2011 and 2010, there were 132,436 and 145,358 of stock options that were excluded from the dilutive calculations as the effect would have been antidilutive.

13. Income Taxes**Unrecognized Income Tax Benefits**

As of March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, the Company's gross unrecognized income tax benefits were \$11.8 million and \$11.2 million, respectively. If recognized, \$5.3 million and \$4.9 million of the gross unrecognized tax benefits would affect the effective tax rate at March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively. At this time, the Company believes that it is reasonably possible that approximately \$3.9 million of the estimated unrecognized tax benefits as of March 31, 2011, related primarily to transfer pricing, will be recognized within the next twelve months based on the expiration of statutory periods of which \$0.7 million will impact the Company's effective tax rate.

Table of Contents

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

This discussion should be read in connection with the information contained in the Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements and Notes to the Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 1.

Results of Operations

Consolidated net sales increased by \$21.5 million or 20.8% for the quarter ended March 31, 2011 versus the quarter ended March 31, 2010. Calgon Carbon Japan's (CCJ) sales, which were not reported on a consolidated basis for the quarter ended March 31, 2010, accounted for approximately 83% of the increase. The total positive impact of foreign currency translation on consolidated net sales for the quarter ended March 31, 2011 was \$0.9 million versus the comparable 2010 period.

Net sales for the quarter ended March 31, 2011 for the Activated Carbon and Service segment increased \$22.4 million or 24.8% versus the similar 2010 period. Approximately \$17.9 million of the increase relates to sales from CCJ, as mentioned above. Sales from the Company's traditional business also contributed to the increase due to higher sales in four of the Company's six markets: industrial process \$2.4 million, municipal \$2.4 million, environmental water treatment \$1.0 million, and specialty carbon \$0.9 million. Partially offsetting these increases was lower demand in the environmental air treatment and food markets of \$1.1 million and \$1.0 million, respectively. The decline in demand for the environmental air treatment market was primarily as a result of a change in mercury removal requirements in one Canadian province; the temporary shutdown of certain customers' coal-fired electric generating units for maintenance; and one customer's decision to temporarily shift some production from coal-fired to hydroelectric generating facilities. Net sales for the Equipment segment decreased \$1.0 million or 10.3% in the first quarter 2011 versus the comparable 2010 period. The decrease was primarily due to lower revenue from carbon adsorption systems and ion exchange systems of \$1.1 million and \$0.3 million, respectively. Partially offsetting this decrease was an increase in revenue recognized for UV systems of \$0.4 million. Net sales for the quarter ended March 31, 2011 for the Consumer segment were comparable for the quarter ended March 31, 2011 versus the quarter ended March 31, 2010. Net sales less cost of products sold, as a percentage of net sales, was 33.3% for the quarter ended March 31, 2011 compared to 36.1% for the similar 2010 period, a 2.8 percentage point decrease. The decrease was all in the Activated Carbon and Service segment which was primarily related to sales from CCJ whose margins were lower than the overall Company average. The Equipment and Consumer segments for the quarter ended March 31, 2011 were comparable to the quarter ended March 31, 2010. The Company's cost of products sold excludes depreciation; therefore it may not be comparable to that of other companies.

Table of Contents

The depreciation and amortization increase of \$0.5 million during the quarter ended March 31, 2011 versus the quarter ended March 31, 2010 was primarily due to increased depreciation related to capital improvements at the Company's Feluy, Belgium facility of \$0.3 million and \$0.2 million as a result of the addition of CCJ.

Selling, general and administrative expenses increased \$2.6 million for the quarter ended March 31, 2011 versus the comparable 2010 quarter which included \$2.5 million related to the addition of CCJ.

Research and development expenses for the quarter ended March 31, 2011 increased \$0.3 million versus the similar 2010 period which relates primarily to the addition of CCJ.

Interest income and expense were comparable for the quarter ended March 31, 2011 versus March 31, 2010.

As a result of the acquisitions of Zwicky, Hyde, and an additional interest in its Japanese joint venture which are more fully described within Note 1 to the Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 1, the Company recorded a gain of \$2.7 million during the quarter ended March 31, 2010 which was retrospectively adjusted by \$0.5 million from the originally reported 2010 results.

Other expense net was comparable for the quarter ended March 31, 2011 versus March 31, 2010.

The Company recorded an income tax provision of \$4.7 million and \$5.5 million for the three month periods ended March 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively. The decrease in tax expense primarily relates to the decrease in income from operations before income tax and equity in income from equity investments.

The effective tax rate for the quarter ended March 31, 2011 was 35.8% compared to 37.1% for the quarter ended March 31, 2010. The quarter ended March 31, 2011 tax rate was slightly higher than the statutory Federal income tax rate mainly due to state taxes which were partially offset by net favorable permanent deductions.

During the preparation of its effective tax rate, the Company uses an annualized estimate of pre-tax earnings.

Throughout the year this annualized estimate may change based on actual results and annual earnings estimate revisions in various tax jurisdictions. Because the Company's permanent tax benefits are relatively constant, changes in the annualized estimate may have a significant impact on the effective tax rate in future periods.

Equity in income from equity investments for the quarter ended March 31, 2010 was \$0.1 million and related to the former joint venture of Calgon Mitsubishi Chemical Corporation (CMCC).

Table of Contents

Financial Condition

Working Capital and Liquidity

Cash flows provided by operating activities were \$7.6 million for the period ended March 31, 2011 compared to \$17.1 million for the comparable 2010 period. The \$9.5 million decrease is primarily due to unfavorable working capital changes principally related to accounts payable, accrued liabilities, and accrued interest. This unfavorability was in part due to a \$4.3 million payment made related to the settlement of a lawsuit that had been accrued for as of December 31, 2010.

The Company utilized cash for the purchase of businesses, net of cash acquired, of \$2.1 million related to the acquisitions made during the period ended March 31, 2010 (Refer to Note 1 to the Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 1).

Common stock dividends were not paid during the quarters ended March 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively.

Credit Facility

On May 8, 2009, the Company and certain of its domestic subsidiaries entered into a Credit Agreement (the "Credit Agreement") that replaced the Company's prior credit facility. The Credit Agreement provides for an initial \$95.0 million revolving credit facility (the "Revolving Credit Facility") which expires on May 8, 2014. So long as no event of default has occurred and is continuing, the Company from time to time may request one or more increases in the total revolving credit commitment under the Revolving Credit Facility of up to \$30.0 million in the aggregate. No assurance can be given, however, that the total revolving credit commitment will be increased above \$95.0 million. Availability under the Revolving Credit Facility is dependent upon various customary conditions. A quarterly nonrefundable commitment fee is payable by the Company based on the unused availability under the Revolving Credit Facility and is currently equal to 0.25%. Any outstanding borrowings under the Revolving Credit Facility on July 2, 2012, up to \$50.0 million, automatically convert to a term loan maturing on May 8, 2014 (the "Term Loan"), with the total revolving credit commitment under the Revolving Credit Facility being reduced at that time by the amount of the Term Loan. Total availability under the Revolving Credit Facility at March 31, 2011 was \$92.8 million, after considering outstanding letters of credit.

The interest rate on amounts owed under the Term Loan and the Revolving Credit Facility will be, at the Company's option, either (i) a fluctuating base rate based on the highest of (A) the prime rate announced from time to time by the lenders, (B) the rate announced by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York on that day as being the weighted average of the rates on overnight federal funds transactions arranged by federal funds brokers on the previous trading day plus 3.00% or (C) a daily LIBOR rate plus 2.75%, or (ii) LIBOR-based borrowings in one to six month increments at the applicable LIBOR rate plus 2.50%. A margin may be added to the applicable interest rate based on the Company's leverage ratio. The interest rate per annum as of March 31, 2011 using option (i) above would have been 3.25% if any borrowings were outstanding.

Table of Contents

The Company incurred issuance costs of \$1.0 million which were deferred and are being amortized over the term of the Credit Agreement. As of March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, there are no outstanding borrowings under the Revolving Credit Facility.

Certain of the Company's domestic subsidiaries unconditionally guarantee all indebtedness and obligations related to borrowings under the Credit Agreement. The Company's obligations under the Revolving Credit Facility are secured by a first perfected security interest in certain of the domestic assets of the Company and the subsidiary guarantors, including certain real property, inventory, accounts receivable, equipment and capital stock of certain of the Company's domestic subsidiaries.

The Credit Agreement contains customary affirmative and negative covenants for credit facilities of this type, including limitations on the Company and its subsidiaries with respect to indebtedness, liens, investments, capital expenditures, mergers and acquisitions, dispositions of assets and transactions with affiliates. The Credit Agreement also provides for customary events of default, including failure to pay principal or interest when due, failure to comply with covenants, the fact that any representation or warranty made by the Company is false or misleading in any material respect, certain insolvency or receivership events affecting the Company and its subsidiaries and a change in control of the Company. If an event of default occurs, the lenders will be under no further obligation to make loans or issue letters of credit. Upon the occurrence of certain events of default, all outstanding obligations of the Company automatically become immediately due and payable, and other events of default will allow the lenders to declare all or any portion of the outstanding obligations of the Company to be immediately due and payable. The Credit Agreement also contains a covenant which includes limitations on its ability to declare or pay cash dividends, subject to certain exceptions, such as dividends declared and paid by its subsidiaries and cash dividends paid by the Company in an amount not to exceed 50% of cumulative net after tax earnings following the closing date of the agreement if certain conditions are met. The Company was in compliance with all such covenants as of March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively.

Japanese Loans and Credit Facility

On March 31, 2010, CCJ entered into a Revolving Credit Facility Agreement (the "Japanese Credit Facility") totaling 2.0 billion Japanese Yen for working capital requirements of CCJ. This loan matured and was paid in full as of March 31, 2011.

CCJ also entered into two other borrowing arrangements as part of the common share repurchase on March 31, 2010, a Term Loan Agreement (the "Japanese Term Loan"), and a Working Capital Loan Agreement (the "Japanese Working Capital Loan"). Calgon Carbon Corporation is jointly and severally liable as the guarantor of CCJ's obligations and the Company permitted CCJ to grant a security interest and continuing lien in certain of its assets, including inventory and accounts receivable, to secure its obligations under both loan agreements. The Japanese Term Loan provided for a principal amount of 722.0 million Japanese Yen, or \$7.7 million at inception. This loan matures on March 31, 2013, bears interest at 1.975% per annum, and is payable in monthly installments of 20.0 million Japanese Yen beginning on April 30, 2010, with a final payment of 22.0 million Japanese Yen. Accordingly, 240.0 million Japanese Yen or \$2.9 million is recorded as current and 242.0 million Japanese Yen or \$2.9 million is recorded as long-term debt within the Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheet included in Item 1 at

Table of Contents

March 31, 2011. The Japanese Working Capital Loan provided for borrowings up to 1.5 billion Japanese Yen. This loan originally matured on March 31, 2011, and was renewed, with an increase in borrowing capacity up to 2.0 billion Japanese Yen, until April 4, 2012 and bears interest based on a daily short-term prime rate fixed on the day a borrowing takes place, which was 1.475% per annum at March 31, 2011. Borrowings and repayments under the Japanese Working Capital Loan have generally occurred on a bi-weekly basis in order to ensure adequate liquidity while minimizing outstanding borrowings. The borrowings and repayments are presented on a gross basis within the Company's Condensed Consolidated Statement of Cash Flows presented within Item 1. Total borrowings outstanding under the Japanese Working Capital Loan were 1.8 billion Japanese Yen or \$21.1 million at March 31, 2011, and are shown as long-term debt within the Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheet presented in Item 1.

Contractual Obligations

The Company is obligated to make future payments under various contracts such as debt agreements, lease agreements, and unconditional purchase obligations. As of March 31, 2011, there have been no material changes in the payment terms of debt agreements, lease agreements and unconditional purchase obligations since December 31, 2010, except for the renewal of the Company's Japanese Working Capital Loan which matured on March 31, 2011 (Refer to Note 10 to the Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 1) and was renewed until April 4, 2012. The Company is obligated to make principal payments on debt outstanding at March 31, 2011 of \$2.2 million in 2011, \$24.1 million in 2012, \$0.8 million in 2013, \$28 thousand annually from 2014 through 2017, and \$5 thousand in 2018.

The Company currently expects that cash from operating activities plus cash balances and available external financing will be sufficient to meet its cash requirements for the next twelve months. The cash needs of each of the Company's reporting segments are principally covered by the segment's operating cash flow on a stand alone basis. Any additional needs will be funded by cash on hand or borrowings under the Company's Revolving Credit Facility, Japanese Working Capital Loan, or other credit facilities. Specifically, the Equipment and Consumer segments historically have not required extensive capital expenditures; therefore, the Company believes that cash on hand and borrowings will adequately support each of the segments cash needs.

Capital Expenditures and Investments

Capital expenditures for property, plant and equipment totaled \$12.7 million for the three months ended March 31, 2011 compared to expenditures of \$8.9 million for the same period in 2010. The expenditures for the period ended March 31, 2011 consisted primarily of improvements to the Company's manufacturing facilities and information technology systems of \$10.4 million and \$1.0 million, respectively. The comparable 2010 period consisted primarily of improvements to the Company's manufacturing facilities of \$5.1 million and \$1.1 million for customer capital. Capital expenditures for 2011 are projected to be approximately \$85.0 million. The aforementioned expenditures are expected to be funded by operating cash flows, cash on hand, and borrowings.

Regulatory Matters

U.S. By letter dated January 22, 2007, the Company received from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 4 a report of a hazardous waste facility inspection performed by the EPA and the Kentucky Department of Environmental Protection (KYDEP) as part of a Multi Media Compliance Evaluation of the Company's Big Sandy Plant in Catlettsburg, Kentucky that was conducted on September 20 and 21, 2005. Accompanying the report was a Notice of Violation (NOV) alleging multiple violations of the Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and corresponding EPA and KYDEP hazardous waste regulations. The

Table of Contents

alleged violations mainly concern the hazardous waste spent activated carbon regeneration facility. The Company met with the EPA on April 17, 2007 to discuss the inspection report and alleged violations, and submitted written responses in May and June 2007. In August 2007, the EPA notified the Company that it believes there were still significant violations of RCRA that are unresolved by the information in the Company's responses, without specifying the particular violations. During a meeting with the EPA on December 10, 2007, the EPA indicated that the agency would not pursue certain other alleged violations. Based on discussions during the December 10, 2007 meeting, subsequent communications with the EPA, and in connection with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Notice referred to below, the Company has taken actions to address and remediate a number of the unresolved alleged violations. The Company believes, and the EPA has indicated, that the number of unresolved issues as to alleged continuing violations cited in the January 22, 2007 NOV has been reduced substantially. The EPA can take formal enforcement action to require the Company to remediate any or all of the unresolved alleged continuing violations which could require the Company to incur substantial additional costs. The EPA can also take formal enforcement action to impose substantial civil penalties with respect to violations cited in the NOV, including those which have been admitted or resolved.

On July 3, 2008, the EPA verbally informed the Company that there are a number of unresolved RCRA violations at the Big Sandy Plant which may render the facility unacceptable to receive spent carbon for reactivation from sites regulated under CERCLA pursuant to the CERCLA Off-Site Rule. The Company received written notice of the unacceptability determination on July 14, 2008 (the CERCLA Notice). The CERCLA Notice alleged multiple violations of RCRA and four releases of hazardous waste. The alleged violations and releases were cited in the September 2005 multi-media compliance inspections, and were among those cited in the January 2007 NOV described in the preceding paragraph as well. The CERCLA Notice gave the Company until September 1, 2008 to demonstrate to the EPA that the alleged violations and releases are not continuing, or else the Big Sandy Plant would not be able to receive spent carbon from CERCLA sites until the EPA determined that the facility is again acceptable to receive such CERCLA wastes. This deadline subsequently was extended several times. The Company met with the EPA in August 2008 regarding the CERCLA Notice and submitted a written response to the CERCLA Notice prior to the meeting. By letter dated February 13, 2009, the EPA informed the Company that based on information submitted by the Company indicating that the Big Sandy Plant has returned to physical compliance for the alleged violations and releases, the EPA had made an affirmative determination of acceptability for receipt of CERCLA wastes at the Big Sandy Plant. The EPA's determination is conditioned upon the Company treating certain residues resulting from the treatment of the carbon reactivation furnace off-gas as hazardous waste and not sending material dredged from the onsite wastewater treatment lagoons offsite other than to a permitted hazardous waste treatment, storage or disposal facility. The Company has requested clarification from the EPA regarding these two conditions. The Company has also met with Headquarters of the EPA Solid Waste Division (Headquarters) on March 6, 2009 and presented its classification argument, with the understanding that Headquarters would advise Region 4 of the EPA. By letter dated January 5, 2010, the EPA determined certain residues resulting from the treatment of the carbon reactivation furnace off-gas are RCRA listed hazardous wastes and the material dredged from the onsite wastewater treatment lagoons is a RCRA listed hazardous waste and that they need to be managed in accordance with RCRA regulations. The cost to treat and/or dispose of the material dredged from the lagoons as hazardous waste could be substantial. However, by letter dated January 22, 2010, the

Table of Contents

Company received a determination from the KYDEP Division of Waste Management that the material is not listed hazardous waste when recycled as had been the Company's practice. The Company believes that pursuant to EPA regulations, KYDEP is the proper authority to make this determination. Thus, the Company believes that there is no basis for the position set forth in the EPA's January 5, 2010 letter and the Company will vigorously defend any complaint on the matter. The Company has had several additional discussions with Region 4 of the EPA. The Company has indicated to the EPA that it is willing to work with the agency toward a solution subject to a comprehensive resolution of all the issues. By letter dated May 12, 2010, from the Department of Justice Environmental and Natural Resources Division (the DOJ), the Company was informed that the DOJ was prepared to take appropriate enforcement action against the Company for the NOV and other violations under the Clean Water Act (CWA). The Company met with the DOJ on July 9, 2010 and agreed to permit more comprehensive testing of the lagoons and to share data and analysis already obtained. On July 19, 2010, the EPA sent the Company a formal information request with respect to such data and analysis which was answered by the Company. In September 2010, representatives of the EPA met with Company personnel for two days at the Big Sandy plant. The visit included an inspection by the EPA and discussion regarding the plan for additional testing of the lagoons and material dredged from the lagoons.

The Company, EPA and DOJ have had ongoing meetings and discussions since the September 2010 inspection. The Company has indicated that it is willing to work towards a comprehensive resolution of all the issues. The DOJ and EPA have informally indicated that such a comprehensive resolution may be possible depending upon the results of additional testing to be completed but that the agencies will expect significant civil penalties with respect to the violations cited in the NOV as well as the alleged CWA violations. The Company believes that the size of any civil penalties, if any, should be reduced since all the alleged violations, except those with respect to the

Table of Contents

characterization of the certain residues resulting from the treatment of the carbon reactivation furnace off-gas and the material dredged from the onsite wastewater treatment lagoons, had been resolved in response to the NOV or the CERCLA Notice. The Company believes that there should be no penalties associated with respect to the characterization of the residues resulting from the treatment of the carbon reactivation furnace off-gas and the material dredged from the onsite wastewater treatment lagoons as the Company believes that those materials are not listed hazardous waste as has been determined by the KYDEP. The Company is conducting negotiations with the DOJ and EPA to attempt to settle the issues. The Company cannot predict with any certainty the probable outcome of this matter. The Company has accrued \$2.0 million as its estimate of potential loss related to civil penalties. If process modifications are required, the capital costs could be significant and may exceed \$10.0 million. If the resolution includes remediation, significant expenses and/or capital expenditures may be required. If a settlement cannot be reached, the issues will most likely be litigated and the Company will vigorously defend its position.

By letter dated August 18, 2008, the Company was notified by the EPA Suspension and Debarment Division (SDD) that because of the alleged violations described in the CERCLA Notice, the SDD was making an assessment of the Company's present responsibility to conduct business with Federal Executive Agencies. Representatives of the SDD attended the August 2008 EPA meeting. On August 28, 2008, the Company received a letter from the Division requesting additional information from the Company in connection with the SDD's evaluation of the Company's potential business risk to the Federal Government, noting that the Company engages in procurement transactions with or funded by the Federal Government. The Company provided the SDD with all information requested by the letter in September 2008. The SDD can suspend or debar a Company from sales to the Federal Government directly or indirectly through government contractors or with respect to projects funded by the Federal Government. The Company estimates that revenue from sales made directly to the Federal Government or indirectly through government contractors comprised less than 8% of its total revenue for the three month period ended March 31, 2011. The Company is unable to estimate sales made directly or indirectly to customers and or projects that receive federal funding. In October 2008, the SDD indicated that it was still reviewing the matter but that another meeting with the Company was not warranted at that time. The Company believes that there is no basis for suspension or debarment on the basis of the matters asserted by the EPA in the CERCLA Notice or otherwise. The Company has had no further communication with the SDD since October 2008 and believes the likelihood of any action being taken by the SDD is remote.

In June 2007, the Company received a Notice Letter from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) stating that the NYSDEC had determined that the Company is a Potentially Responsible Party (PRP) at the Frontier Chemical Processing Royal Avenue Site in Niagara Falls, New York (the Site). The Notice Letter requests that the Company and other PRP's develop, implement and finance a remedial program for Operable Unit #1 at the Site. Operable Unit #1 consists of overburden soils and overburden and upper bedrock groundwater. The selected remedy is removal of above grade structures and contaminated soil source areas, installation of a cover system, and ground water control and treatment, estimated to cost between approximately \$11 million and \$14 million, which would be shared among the PRP's. The Company has not determined what portion of the costs associated with the remedial program it would be obligated to bear and the Company cannot predict with any certainty the outcome of this matter or range of potential loss. The Company has joined a PRP group (the PRP Group) and has executed a Joint Defense Agreement with the group members. In August 2008, the Company and over 100 PRP's entered into a Consent Order with the NYSDEC for additional site investigation directed toward characterization of the Site to better define the scope of the remedial project. The Company contributed monies to the PRP Group to help fund the work required under the Consent Order. The additional site investigation required under the Consent Order was initiated in 2008 and completed in the spring of 2009. A final report of the site investigation was submitted to NYSDEC in October 2009. By letter dated December 31, 2009, NYSDEC disapproved the report. The bases for disapproval include concerns regarding proposed alternate soil cleanup objectives, questions regarding soil treatability studies and questions regarding ground water contamination. PRP Group representatives met several times with NYSDEC regarding revising the soil cleanup objectives set forth in the Record of Decision to be consistent with recently revised regulations. NYSDEC does not agree that the revised regulation applies to this site but requested additional information to support the PRP Group's position. The PRP Group's consultant did additional cost-benefit

analyses and further soil sampling. The results were provided to NYSDEC but they remain unwilling to revise the soil standards. Additionally, NYSDEC indicated that because the site is a former RCRA facility, soil excavated at the site would be deemed hazardous waste and would require offsite disposal. Conestoga Rovers Associates, the PRP Group's consultant, estimates the soil remedy cost would increase from approximately \$3.2 million to \$6.1 million if all excavated soil had to be disposed offsite. Also, PRP Group representatives met with the Niagara Falls Water Board (NFWB) regarding continued use of the NFWB's sewers and wastewater treatment plant to collect and treat contaminated ground water

Table of Contents

from the site. This would provide considerable cost savings over having to install a separate ground water collection and treatment system. The Board was receptive to the PRP Group's proposal and work is progressing on a draft permit. In addition, the adjacent landowner has expressed interest in acquiring the site for expansion of its business.

By letter dated July 3, 2007, the Company received an NOV from the KYDEP alleging that the Company has violated the KYDEP's hazardous waste management regulations in connection with the Company's hazardous waste spent activated carbon regeneration facility located at the Big Sandy Plant in Catlettsburg, Kentucky. The NOV alleges that the Company has failed to correct deficiencies identified by the KYDEP in the Company's Part B hazardous waste management facility permit application and related documents and directed the Company to submit a complete and accurate Part B application and related documents and to respond to the KYDEP's comments which were appended to the NOV. The Company submitted a response to the NOV and the KYDEP's comments in December 2007 by providing a complete revised permit application. The KYDEP has not indicated whether or not it will take formal enforcement action, and has not specified a monetary amount of civil penalties it might pursue in any such action, if any. The KYDEP can also deny the Part B operating permit. On October 18, 2007, the Company received an NOV from the EPA related to this permit application and submitted a revised application to both the KYDEP and the EPA within the mandated timeframe. The EPA has not indicated whether or not it will take formal enforcement action, and has not specified a monetary amount of civil penalties it might pursue in any such action. The Company met with the KYDEP on July 27, 2009 concerning the permit, and the KYDEP indicated that it, and Region 4 of the EPA, would like to see specific additional information or clarifications in the permit application. Accordingly, the Company submitted a new application on October 15, 2009. The KYDEP indicated that it had no intention to deny the permit as long as the Company worked with the state to resolve issues. Region 4 of the EPA has not indicated any stance on the permit and can deny the application. At this time the Company cannot predict with any certainty the outcome of this matter or range of loss, if any.

In conjunction with the February 2004 purchase of substantially all of Waterlink's operating assets and the stock of Waterlink's U.K. subsidiary, environmental studies were performed on Waterlink's Columbus, Ohio property by environmental consulting firms which provided an identification and characterization of the areas of contamination. In addition, these firms identified alternative methods of remediating the property, identified feasible alternatives and prepared cost evaluations of the various alternatives. The Company concluded from the information in the studies that a loss at this property is probable and recorded the liability as a component of current liabilities at March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010. At March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, the balance recorded was \$3.7 million and \$3.9 million, respectively. Liability estimates are based on an evaluation of, among other factors, currently available facts, existing technology, presently enacted laws and regulations, and the remediation experience of other companies. The Company has incurred \$0.2 million of environmental remediation costs for the period ended March 31, 2011 and zero for the period ended March 31, 2010. It is reasonably possible that a change in the estimate of this obligation will occur as remediation preparation and remediation activity commences in the near term. The ultimate remediation costs are dependent upon, among other things, the requirements of any state or federal environmental agencies, the remediation methods employed, the determination of the final scope of work, and the extent and types of contamination which will not be fully determined until experience is gained through remediation and related activities. The Company had commissioned a more definitive environmental assessment to

Table of Contents

be performed to better understand the extent of contamination and appropriate methodologies for remediation. During the second quarter of 2011, the Company expects to complete and evaluate the assessment. The Company also expects that remediation activities will commence during the latter part of the second quarter.

Europe and Asia. The Company is also subject to various environmental health and safety laws and regulations at its facilities in Belgium, Germany, the United Kingdom, China, and Japan. These laws and regulations address substantially the same issues as those applicable to the Company in the United States. The Company believes it is presently in substantial compliance with these laws and regulations.

Other

On March 8, 2006, the Company and another U.S. producer (the Petitioners) of activated carbon formally requested that the United States Department of Commerce investigate unfair pricing of certain activated carbon imported from the People's Republic of China. The Commerce Department investigated imports of activated carbon from China that is thermally activated using a combination of heat, steam and/or carbon dioxide. Certain types of activated carbon from China, most notably chemically-activated carbon, were not investigated.

On March 2, 2007, the Commerce Department published its final determination (subsequently amended) that all of the subject merchandise from China was being unfairly priced, or dumped, and thus that special additional duties should be imposed to offset the amount of the unfair pricing. The resultant tariff rates ranged from 61.95% ad valorem (i.e., of the entered value of the goods) to 228.11% ad valorem. A formal order imposing these tariffs was published on April 27, 2007. All imports from China remain subject to the order and antidumping tariffs. Importers of subject activated carbon from China are required to make cash deposits of estimated antidumping tariffs at the time the goods are entered into the United States customs territory. Deposits of tariffs are subject to future revision based on retrospective reviews conducted by the Commerce Department.

The Company is both a domestic producer and a large U.S. importer (from its wholly-owned subsidiary Calgon Carbon (Tianjin) Co., Ltd.) of the activated carbon that is subject to this proceeding. As such, the Company's involvement in the Commerce Department's proceedings is both as a domestic producer (a petitioner) and as a foreign exporter (a respondent).

As one of two U.S. producers involved as petitioners in the case, the Company is actively involved in ensuring the Commerce Department obtains the most accurate information from the foreign producers and exporters involved in the review, in order to calculate the most accurate results and margins of dumping for the sales at issue.

As an importer of activated carbon from China and in light of the successful antidumping tariff case, the Company was required to pay deposits of estimated antidumping tariffs at the rate of 84.45% ad valorem to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (Customs) on entries made on or after October 11, 2006 through March 1, 2007. From March 2, 2007 through March 29, 2007 the antidumping rate was 78.89%. From March 30, 2007 through April 8, 2007 the antidumping duty rate was 69.54%. Because of limits on the government's legal authority to impose provisional tariffs prior to issuance of a final determination, entries made between April 9, 2007 and April 18, 2007 were not subject to tariffs. For the period April 19, 2007 through November 9, 2009, deposits have been paid at 69.54%.

Table of Contents

The Company's role as an importer that is required to pay tariffs results in a contingent liability related to the final amount of tariffs that it will ultimately have to pay. The Company has made deposits of estimated tariffs in two ways. First, estimated tariffs on entries in the period from October 11, 2006 through April 8, 2007 were covered by a bond. The total amount of tariffs that can be paid on entries in this period is capped as a matter of law, though the Company may receive a refund with interest of any difference due to a reduction in the actual margin of dumping found in the first review. The Company's estimated liability for tariffs during this period of \$0.2 million is reflected in accounts payable and accrued liabilities on the Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheet at March 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively. Second, the Company has been required to post cash deposits of estimated tariffs owed on entries of subject merchandise since April 19, 2007. The final amount of tariffs owed on these entries may change, and can either increase or decrease depending on the final results of relevant administrative inquiries. This process is further described below.

The amount of estimated antidumping tariffs payable on goods imported into the United States is subject to review and retroactive adjustment based on the actual amount of dumping that is found. To do this, the Commerce Department conducts periodic reviews of sales made to the first unaffiliated U.S. customer, typically over the prior 12 month period. These reviews will be possible for at least five years, and can result in changes to the antidumping tariff rate (either increasing or reducing the rate) applicable to any given foreign exporter. Revision of tariff rates has two effects. First, it will alter the actual amount of tariffs that Customs will seek to collect for the period reviewed, by either increasing or decreasing the amount to reflect the actual amount of dumping that was found. If the actual amount of tariffs owed increases, the government will require payment of the difference plus interest. Conversely, if the tariff rate decreases, any difference is refunded with interest. Second, the revised rate becomes the cash deposit rate applied to future entries, and can either increase or decrease the amount of deposits an importer will be required to pay.

On November 10, 2009, the Commerce Department announced the results of its review of the tariff period beginning October 11, 2006 through March 31, 2008 (period of review (POR) I). Based on the POR I results, the Company's ongoing tariff deposit rate was adjusted from 69.54% to 14.51% (as adjusted by .07% for certain ministerial errors and published in the Federal Register on December 17, 2009) for entries made subsequent to the announcement. In addition, the Company's assessment rate for POR I was determined to have been too high and, accordingly, the Company reduced its recorded liability for unpaid deposits in POR I and recorded a receivable of \$1.6 million reflecting expected refunds for tariff deposits made during POR I as a result of the announced decrease in the POR I tariff assessment rate. Note that the Petitioners have appealed to the U.S. Court of International Trade the Commerce Department's POR I results challenging, among other things, the selection of certain surrogate values and financial information which in-part caused the reduction in the tariff rate. Liquidation of the Company's entries for the POR I review period is judicially enjoined for the duration of the appeal. As such, the Company will not have final settlement of the amounts it may owe or receive as a result of the final POR I tariff rates until the aforementioned appeals are resolved. On February 17, 2011, the Court issued an order denying the Company's appeal and remanding the case back to the Commerce Department with respect to several of the issues raised by the

Table of Contents

Chinese respondents. The Commerce Department is scheduled to transmit its redetermination to the Court in May 2011. Although the timing for the final resolution of appeals is at the discretion of the Court and is not subject to a specific deadline, it is expected that all issues in the appeals concerning POR I will be finally concluded by the U.S. Court of International Trade by the end of 2011. For POR I, the Company estimates that a hypothetical 10% increase or decrease in the final tariff rate compared to the announced rate on November 10, 2009 would result in an additional payment or refund of approximately \$0.1 million.

On April 1, 2009, the Commerce Department published a formal notice allowing parties to request a second annual administrative review of the antidumping tariff order covering the period April 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009 (POR II). Requests for review were due no later than April 30, 2009. The Company, in its capacity as a U.S. producer and separately as a Chinese exporter, elected not to participate in this administrative review. By not participating in the review, the Company's tariff deposits made during POR II are final and not subject to further adjustment.

On November 17, 2010, the Commerce Department announced the results of its review of the tariff period beginning April 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009 (period of review (POR) II). Since the Company was not involved in this review our deposit rates did not change from the rate of 14.51% established after a review of POR I. However for the cooperative respondents involved in POR II their new deposit rate is calculated at 31.59% deposit rate but will be collected on a \$0.127 per pound basis.

On April 1, 2010, the Commerce Department published a formal notice allowing parties to request a third annual administrative review of the antidumping tariff order covering the period April 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010 (POR III). Requests for review were due no later than April 30, 2010. The Company, in its capacity as a U.S. producer and separately as a Chinese exporter, elected not to participate in this administrative review. However, Albemarle Corporation has requested that the Commerce Department review the exports of Calgon Carbon (Tianjin) claiming standing as a wholesaler of the domestic like product. This claim by Albemarle to have such standing was challenged by the Company in its capacity as a U.S. producer and separately as a Chinese exporter. The Commerce Department upheld Albemarle's request to review the exports of Calgon Carbon (Tianjin). During the POR III period, the Company continued to make tariff deposits at the 14.51% rate. On April 25, 2011, the Commerce Department released the preliminary results for POR III and Calgon Carbon (Tianjin's) rate was estimated to be approximately 2%. The antidumping rates for POR III remain subject to final determination, which is not expected to be before August 2011 and can be extended until November 2011. Should the Company's tariff rate for POR III be finally determined to be 2%, the Company would be entitled to refunds of tariff deposits of approximately \$1.1 million, plus interest.

On April 1, 2011, the Commerce Department published a formal notice allowing parties to request a fourth annual administrative review of the antidumping tariff order covering the period April 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011 (POR IV). Requests for review were due no later than May 2, 2011. The Company, in its capacity as a U.S. producer and separately as a Chinese exporter, elected not to participate in this administrative review. Again

Table of Contents

Albemarle Corporation has requested that the Commerce Department review the exports of Calgon Carbon (Tianjin) claiming standing as a wholesaler of the domestic like product. The Commerce Department should finalize selection of mandatory respondents for POR IV by the end of May 2011. For the period April 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011 (POR IV), the Company estimates that a hypothetical 10% increase or decrease in the final tariff rate compared to rates at which deposits were made would not result in a significant payment or refund.

The contingent liability relating to tariffs paid on imports is somewhat mitigated by two factors. First and foremost, the antidumping tariff order's disciplinary effect on the market encourages the elimination of dumping through fair pricing. Separately, pursuant to the Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000 (repealed effective Feb. 8, 2006), as an affected domestic producer, the Company is eligible to apply for a distribution of a share of certain tariffs collected on entries of subject merchandise from China from October 11, 2006 to September 30, 2007. In July 2010, 2009 and 2008, the Company applied for such distributions. There were no additional amounts received during the year ended December 31, 2010. In November 2009 and December 2008, the Company received distributions of approximately \$0.8 million and \$0.2 million, respectively, which reflected 59.57% of the total amounts then available. The Company anticipates receiving additional amounts in 2011 and future years related to tariffs paid for the period October 11, 2006 through September 30, 2007, although the exact amount is impossible to determine.

Outlook

Activated Carbon and Service

The Company believes activated carbon and service sales volume for 2011 will continue to increase over 2010. Sales volume growth in 2011 is expected to come from several sources including the ongoing impacts of enacted and proposed environmental regulation; a full year of sales from the Calgon Carbon Japan subsidiary in which the Company acquired the remaining interest in as of March 31, 2011; additional reactivation capacity which the Company is in the process of expanding in all three of its regions; and, other factors discussed below.

Most of the markets that the Company serves continued to strengthen in the first quarter of 2011. Of special note was the potable water market which continued to benefit from an increase in commercial demand, as well as a U.S. Federal mandate for the prevention/removal of disinfection by-products from drinking water. The Company believes that growth in this market will continue as companies continue to comply with these environmental regulations. Sales to the industrial process market in the U.S. also continued to strengthen in the first quarter of 2011. The Company experienced a temporary decline in sales in the environmental air market as a result of a change in mercury removal requirements in one Canadian province; the temporary shutdown of certain customers' coal-fired electric generating units for maintenance; and one customer's decision to temporarily shift some production from coal-fired to hydroelectric generating facilities. However, the Company believes that sales in 2011 will remain steady due to state regulations requiring removal of mercury from coal-fired power plant flue gas.

While the tariff on imported Chinese thermally activated carbon to the U.S. was lowered significantly in November 2009, current trends do not indicate signs of pricing pressure, and the Company expects that this will remain the

Table of Contents

case in 2011. During the first quarter of 2011, the price of Chinese coal-based activated carbon and coconut carbon increased significantly. The Company instituted global price increases effective November 1, 2010 and has started to see some of the impact on its financial results in the first quarter of 2011. Because of existing contracts, outstanding bids and other factors, it typically takes twelve months for the full effect of the price increase to be realized.

During 2010, the Company made significant research and development expenditures for second generation products aimed at significantly reducing the amount of Powder Activated Carbon (PAC) required for mercury removal as compared to competitive products. PAC is recognized today by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as the leading abatement technology for mercury removal from coal-fired power plant flue gas. The Company's sales of PAC for mercury removal grew 81% in 2010 compared to the previous year. The current U.S. driver of sales to owners of coal-fired power plants is state regulations as we await final action by the EPA. The EPA does have regulations in effect for cement manufacturers and we are also awaiting EPA regulations for industrial boilers and gold mining. The Company believes that mercury removal could become the largest U.S. market for activated carbon and has made great strides in establishing itself as a market leader. In March 2011, the EPA issued proposed mercury emission standards for coal-fired power plants that are expected to be finalized by November 2011. The Company currently estimates that annual, total demand for mercury removal in North America could be as high as 220 million pounds in 2011 and 2012; and, 500 to 750 million pounds by 2015.

The need for municipal drinking water utilities to comply with the Environmental Protection Agency's Stage 2 Disinfection By-Product (DBP) Rule is expected to be yet another growth driver for the Company. DBP's are compounds that form when natural decaying organic chemicals present in drinking water sources are disinfected with chemicals. Granular activated carbon (GAC) is recognized by the EPA as a best available control technology (BACT) for the reduction of DBP's. The EPA promulgated the Stage 2 DBP Rule in 2006, and requires water utilities to come into compliance with the rule in a phased manner between 2012 and 2015. The Company currently estimates that this regulation may increase the annual demand for GAC by municipal water utilities in the United States by as much as 100 million pounds by 2015. The Company's reactivation facilities in California and Ohio received certification from NSF (National Science Foundation) International during 2010. This certification verifies that the reactivated carbon is safe for reuse in municipal water treatment applications. In 2010, custom reactivated carbon accounted for 13% of the Company's municipal water revenue.

Driven by these market forces, the Company currently plans to make significant capital expenditures in 2011 which are currently projected to be approximately \$85 million. The Company is investing in a reactivation capacity expansion of the Feluy, Belgium site as well as new reactivation facilities in China and in the northeast United States. In total, these sites will eventually increase the Company's service business capacity by 59 million pounds annually. Currently, the Belgium expansion is expected to be on-line in the second quarter of 2011 while the China service facility is currently scheduled to commence operation during the fourth quarter of 2011. The site in the northeast United States is not currently scheduled to begin operating until the first half of 2012. In the fourth quarter of 2010, the Company re-started its Datong, China plant. This plant, which produces virgin carbon, has an annual capacity of approximately 22 million pounds.

Table of Contents

In addition to these initiatives, the Company plans to continue increasing its presence throughout the world. On March 31, 2011, the Company acquired full ownership of its former joint venture in Japan (Refer to Note 1 to the Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 1). This acquisition will increase the Company's capabilities in the world's second largest geographical market by country for activated carbon. In Europe, the Company acquired Zwicky Denmark and Sweden, long-term distributors of the Company's activated carbon products and provider of services associated with the reactivation of activated carbon, in January 2010 (Refer to Note 1 to the Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 1). This acquisition is consistent with the Company's strategic initiatives to accelerate growth in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden and to expand its service capabilities in Europe outside of the geographic markets it has traditionally served. In 2011, the Company will look to begin expanding its operations in both Mexico and South America.

On March 11, 2011, a magnitude 8.9 earthquake and subsequent tsunami struck Japan. At this time it appears that there has been no damage to the Company's infrastructure in Japan, and no employees have been injured. The Company will continue to monitor how the earthquake might affect the general economic and market conditions in Japan as the recovery moves forward.

Equipment

The Company's equipment business is somewhat cyclical in nature and depends on both current regulations as well as the general health of the overall economy. The Company believes that U.S demand for its ultraviolet light (UV) systems is expected to hold as the Company moves closer to the deadline of 2012 for affected municipalities to treat for *Cryptosporidium* in drinking water. The Company estimates the total global market for this application to be \$250 million through 2015. Backlog for the Equipment segment as of March 31, 2011 was \$33.4 million and includes the award of a major contract which is described below.

In 2010, the Company acquired Hyde Marine, Inc., a manufacturer of systems that utilize UV technology to treat marine ballast water (Refer to Note 1 to the Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 1). In 2004, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) adopted the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (BWMC) which addresses the transportation of potentially harmful organisms through ballast water. The regulations requiring ballast water treatment will become effective when 30 countries representing 35% of the world's shipping tonnage ratify the BWMC. With the recent ratification by Iran, the BWMC has been signed by 28 countries representing approximately 25% of the world's current gross tonnage. The BWMC is expected to be phased in over a ten-year period and require more than 60,000 vessels to install ballast water treatment systems. The total ballast water treatment market is expected to exceed \$15 billion. The U.S. Coast Guard is now working with the U.S. EPA to prepare its own regulations which are expected to be similar to the IMO convention and could be announced in the third quarter of 2011.

Hyde Marine's Hyde Guardian® system (Guardian), which employs filtration and ultraviolet light technology to filter and disinfect ballast water, offers cost, safety, and technological advantages. Guardian has received Type Approval from Lloyd's Register on behalf of the U.K. Maritime and Coast Guard Agency. Type Approval confirms compliance with the BWMC. This strategic acquisition has provided the Company immediate entry into a global,

Table of Contents

legislative-driven market with major long-term growth potential. Since its acquisition, Hyde Marine has obtained orders for more than 80 systems. One contract awarded during the third quarter of 2010, was for ballast water treatment systems totaling \$19.8 million that will have a positive impact on revenue and income in 2011. During the first four months of 2011, Hyde Marine has been responding to an average of eight or more proposals per week.

Consumer

The Company believes that the slowing economy contributed to decreased demand for its Consumer products. As a result of a 2010 legal settlement, the Company is exiting the PreZerve® product line. The Company expects that 2011 sales for its carbon cloth will be at a higher level as compared to 2010.

Environmental Compliance

As set forth under Item 2 Regulatory Matters and Note 8 to the Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 1, the Company is involved in negotiations with the EPA and DOJ with respect to the resolution of various alleged environmental violations. If the negotiations result in an agreement by the Company to undertake process modifications and/or remediation at the Company's Catlettsburg, Kentucky facility, significant costs and/or capital expenditures, perhaps in excess of \$10.0 million, may be required. While the Company believes it will have adequate liquidity to pay such costs and expenditures, doing so may adversely affect the Company's pursuit of its strategic growth plans.

Critical Accounting Policies

There were no material changes to the Company's critical accounting policies from those disclosed in the Company's Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2010.

Item 3. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk

There were no material changes in the Company's exposure to market risk from December 31, 2010.

Item 4. Controls and Procedures

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures:

The Company has evaluated the effectiveness of the design and operation of its disclosure controls and procedures as of March 31, 2011. These disclosure controls and procedures are the controls and other procedures that were designed to provide reasonable assurance that information required to be disclosed in reports that are filed with or submitted to the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission is: (1) accumulated and communicated to management, including the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosures and (2) recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in applicable law and regulations. Based on this evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer concluded that, as of March 31, 2011, the Company's disclosure controls and procedures were effective at the reasonable assurance level.

Table of Contents**Changes in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting:**

There have not been any changes in the Company's internal controls over financial reporting that occurred during the fiscal quarter covered by this quarterly report, which have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, the Company's internal control over financial reporting.

PART II OTHER INFORMATION**Item 1. Legal Proceedings**

See Note 8 to the unaudited interim Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements included in Part I, Item 1 contained herein.

Item 1a. Risk Factors

There were no material changes in the Company's risk factors from the risks disclosed in the Company's Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2010.

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

| Period | (a) Total Number of Shares Purchased | (b) Average Price Paid Per Share | (c) Total Number of Shares Purchased as Part of Publicly Announced Repurchase Plans or Programs | (d) Maximum Number (or Approximate Dollar Value) of Shares that May Yet be Purchased Under the Plans or Programs |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| January 1 - January 31, 2011 | 113 | \$ 15.30 | | |
| February 1 - February 28, | 12,089 | \$ 14.36 | | |
| March 1 - March 31, 2011 | 17,306 | \$ 14.26 | | |

(a) This column includes purchases under Calgon Carbon's Equity Incentive Plan which represented withholding taxes due from employees relating to the restricted share awards issued on January 2, 2011; February 8, 2011; February 28, 2011; and March 4, 2011. Future purchases under this plan will be dependent upon employee elections and forfeitures.

Item 6. Exhibits

| Exhibit No. | Description | Method of filing |
|--------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 10.1 | Employment Agreement by and between Calgon Carbon Corporation and Stevan R. Schott made February 14, 2011 and effective January 1, 2011 | (a) |
| 10.2 | Contract Amendment Document dated March 31, 2011 by and among The Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi UJF, Ltd., Calgon Carbon Japan KK and Calgon Carbon Corporation | (b) |
| 31.1 | Rule 13a-14(a) Certification of Chief Executive Officer | Filed herewith |
| 31.2 | Rule 13a-14(a) Certification of Chief Financial Officer | Filed herewith |
| 32.1 | Certification of Chief Executive Officer pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. | Filed herewith |

Table of Contents

| Exhibit No. | Description | Method of filing |
|-------------|---|------------------|
| 32.2 | Certification of Chief Financial Officer pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. | Filed herewith |

(a) Incorporated herein by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to the Company's report on Form 8-K filed February 15, 2011

(b) Incorporated herein by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to the Company's report on Form 8-K filed April 4, 2011

Table of Contents

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements 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.

CALGON CARBON CORPORATION
(REGISTRANT)

Date: May 6, 2011

/s/ Stevan R. Schott
Stevan R. Schott
Senior Vice President, Chief Financial
Officer

47

Table of Contents

EXHIBIT INDEX

| Exhibit No. | Description | Method of filing |
|-------------|--|------------------|
| 10.1 | Employment Agreement by and between Calgon Carbon Corporation and Stevan R. Schott made February 14, 2011 and effective January 1, 2011 | (a) |
| 10.2 | Contract Amendment Document dated March 31, 2011 by and among The Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi UJF, Ltd., Calgon Carbon Japan KK and Calgon Carbon Corporation | (b) |
| 31.1 | Rule 13a-14(a) Certification of Chief Executive Officer | Filed herewith |
| 31.2 | Rule 13a-14(a) Certification of Chief Financial Officer | Filed herewith |
| 32.1 | Certification of Chief Executive Officer pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. | Filed herewith |
| 32.2 | Certification of Chief Financial Officer pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. | Filed herewith |
| 101.INS | XBRL Instance Document | |
| 101.SCH | XBRL Taxonomy Extension Schema Document | |
| 101.CAL | XBRL Taxonomy Extension Calculation Linkbase Document | |
| 101.LAB | XBRL Taxonomy Extension Label Linkbase Document | |
| 101.PRE | XBRL Taxonomy Extension Presentation Linkbase Document | |

(a) Incorporated herein by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to the Company's report on Form 8-K filed February 15, 2011

(b) Incorporated herein by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to the Company's report on Form 8-K filed April 4, 2011