StopWasteEnergy.org

Waste Energy Corp. is trying to open a toxic dump in our city.

Help stop them!

Prepared by Decent Humans



StopWasteEnergy.org

Waste Energy Corp. is trying to open a toxic dump in our city.

Waste Energy Corp. hides behind buzzwords like "AI," "green," "renewable," and "clean energy." In reality, they plan to burn plastic using pyrolysis—a dangerous and thoroughly discredited process.

Plastic pyrolysis releases toxic pollution linked to over 20 types of cancer, birth defects, and other incurable diseases. It contaminates air and water, lowers property values, raises medical costs, and increases emergency risks.

Waste Energy Corp.'s management has a history of failed businesses and speculative or self-benefiting financial arrangements.

They already tried to set up shop at 555 South Cool Spring St. and were told they are NOT WELCOME. Now they are quietly searching for another location in Fayetteville.

The following report brings together our surprising, multifaceted findings about Waste Energy Corp.

The Green Scheme: From Buzzwords to Ashes in a City That Believed It Could

1. Executive Summary

This report is a comprehensive investigation into the company "Waste Energy Corp.", as well as its proposal to construct a pyrolysis facility. We reveal deep and pervasive problems inherent to the project, which make it unviable and likely harmful to the environment, community, economy, and public health.

Key Conclusions:

The project is financially infeasible. The capital expenditure (capex) of a typical pyrolysis plant is around 100 to 250 million USD. Waste Energy Corp. has not disclosed any funding sources or plans to secure such large amounts of capital.

Some members of the Waste Energy Corp. leadership team have a history of failed ventures, legal judgments, stock manipulation, and made false or exaggerated business claims.

The technology is unproven and hazardous. Claims by the company that it will destroy PFAS (perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances), also known as "forever chemicals," achieve zero emissions, and utilize artificial intelligence are questionable.

The facility would emit toxic substances, such as VOCs, PAHs, heavy metals, and microplastics without employing any known and verified technologies for filtration or mitigation.

Waste Energy Corp. has not disclosed any permits, zoning approvals, or environmental studies related to its technology or plans. This places the project at high legal risk and violates standard siting and permitting protocols.

The evidence overwhelmingly demonstrates that Waste Energy Corp.'s proposal is based on false promises, greenwashing, and a wholesale disregard for ethical and operational responsibility. Officials, regulators, and the public should reject this proposal to protect the health, safety, and economic well-being of our community.

2. Financial Impossibility

The proposal by Waste Energy Corp. is not only scientifically unproved, but also financially farfetched. A review of investment requirements, corporate history, and available funding shows that this project cannot succeed without extraordinary external support which is currently lacking.

Building a pyrolysis plant, which also includes some PFAS filters, AI intake sorting, and carboncapture equipment, requires huge investments.

- \$30–\$50 million for a basic facility without PFAS filtration or AI.
- \$75–\$150 million for a fully integrated plant.

Waste Energy Corp. has released no investor reports or disclosures that affirm project funding. Despite the complexity of this project, no institutional investors, government grants, venture capital bankers, or underwriting entities have come forward to support it. This is highly out-of-the-ordinary for infrastructure initiatives such as this one.

History of Business Failures in Pyrolysis Sector

The pyrolysis industry is saturated with failures due to technological defects, regulatory burdens, or market rejections. Examples include:

- Brightmark (Indiana) Failed to produce commercial fuel outputs; subject to community opposition and legal pressure.
- Renewlogy (Salt Lake City) Withdrew after failing emissions targets.
- Vadxx, Agilyx, RES Polyflow All downsized, shifted business models, or shut down.

Waste Energy Corp. claims that it will succeed where better-funded initiatives have failed—without showing how.

Questionable Conduct by Management

Waste Energy's leadership includes those previously investigated or penalized for stock manipulation and speculation. Examples:

- Civil racketeering judgments (e.g., TheDirectory.com case).
- Penny stock promotions with misleading "green" announcements.
- Shell company registrations with no real operations (e.g., at 30 N Gould St, Sheridan, WY).

This pattern continued in the new company. In a March 2025 Form 8-K, the company issued 15 million shares of common stock, at .0075 USD a share, to an entity controlled by CEO Scott Gallagher in settlement of internal debt. This allowed Gallagher to benefit personally without any equivalent benefit being delivered to infrastructure or investment.

This reflects prior patterns, whereby stock movements and executive benefit was prioritized over actual delivery, such as in the cases of Mobile Lads and Nextelligence, which were both tied to the same executive network.

The financial behavior consistently demonstrates promotion-driven enrichment rather than investment in durable infrastructure or long-term outcomes.

Dubious Cost and Revenue Claims

The claims made by Waste Energy Corp. about the resale of pyrolysis oil, gas, and char are highly controversial:

- Pyrolysis oil is often contaminated and fails fuel standards.
- Char is hard to market and must be treated as hazardous waste in many jurisdictions.
- Al controlled sorting requires expensive custom infrastructure, which is not documented by Waste Energy Corp.'s materials.

There is no proof of projected margins, cost recovery timelines, or expected waste intake contracts.

Lack of Transparency or Third-Party Assessments

In contrast to credible projects, Waste Energy Corp. has not published any feasibility studies, thirdparty engineering reports, or financial risk analyses. Environmental compliance cost assessments and emissions mitigation budgets have not been presented. The entire financial strategy appears built on vague claims and unverified technology.

Conclusion: Financial Risks Remain

From extreme capital demands to technological and financial infeasibility, Waste Energy Corp. demonstrates time and time a lack of financial readiness. Combined with a history of promotional behavior, insider transactions, and speculative affiliations, this project's credibility is highly questionable. The risks are steep: a half-built plant, environmental liabilities, and taxpayer burden if public money is ever involved. Financially, this project is neither viable nor responsible.

3. Management and Credibility

Waste Energy Corp. and a network of associated entities, such as EnergyFX, DCRBN, Build Impossible, Business Instinct, TheDirectory.com, and others, are led by individuals who have a history of misleading statements, failed ventures, and questionable affiliations that raise red flags. Exaggerated claims, fictitious credentials, and a lack of transparency render this group unfit to manage a complex and potentially hazardous enterprise.

Questionable Histories of Key Individuals

The leadership team includes figures who faced lawsuits, financial penalties, and industry criticism:

- Scott McBride Co-defendant in a \$345,000 civil racketeering judgment (TheDirectory.com)
- Scott Gallagher CEO of Waste Energy Corp. and co-defendant in the same racketeering case. Scott Gallagher also has an unusually long list of positions at various business ventures:

"Founder of TheDirectory.com, Inc., Scott D. Gallagher is a businessperson who has been the head of 9 different companies and holds the position of Chairman & Chief Executive Officer for Salesrepcentral.com, Inc., Chairman, Chief Executive & Financial Officer at United Consortium Ltd., Chairman, President, Chief Executive Officer & CFO at TheDirectory.com, Inc. and President for MetaWorks Platforms, Inc. In the past Mr. Gallagher was Chairman, President, CEO, CFO & CAO at FTS Group, Inc. and Chairman, President, CEO, Secretary & CAO at FTS Wireless, Inc. (a subsidiary of FTS Group, Inc.), President of About-Face Communications LLC, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer for US BioDefense, Inc. and Chief Executive Officer at Elysium Internet, Inc."

- Cameron Chell Linked to a multitude of speculative ventures, including the KodakCoin project and various inactive or closed firms.
- Steve Beauregard Early crypto entrepreneur with GoCoin, which was criticized for inflated claims and short-lived commercial success.

This group has a track record of speculative promotion, pump-and-dump campaigns, and short-lived ventures designed around hype rather than results.

Shell Addresses and Corporate Fronts

The associated corporations list known shell addresses. For example, EnergyFX lists 30 N Gould St, Sheridan, Wyoming, a location known for hosting thousands of paper companies. No operational facilities exist at these addresses. Entities like EnergyFX and DCRBN maintain static or minimally updated websites that rely on vague promotional language and web design templates, with no visible services or real-world activity. These entities appear to exist solely for brand image or legal abstraction, rather than for industrial development. This shows a focus on appearances over substance, with claims that are unsupported by physical evidence or public record.

Fabricated Experience and Lack of Licensure

Despite claims of "25 years of operational experience," most affiliated companies were incorporated in 2023 or later. No known public records of permitting, licensing, or construction tied to Waste Energy Corp. or its affiliates exist. There are no technical whitepapers, performance data,

or verifiable deployments. Self-reported achievements appear inflated or fictional, potentially in order to mislead investors and regulators alike.

Branding Overlap and Promotional Recycling

Multiple entities repeat the same slogans and buzzwords, such as "green," "AI," "sustainable," "renewable," "clean energy," and "build impossible," across websites, presentations, and promotional materials. These phrases are being used strategically by management to evoke innovation and environmental responsibility without any supporting evidence.

This recycling of language creates an illusion of technological sophistication and real momentum. At the same time, the underlying ventures often appear hollow or completely undeveloped. This type of greenwashing is designed to appeal to the environmentally conscious public, investors, and policymakers.

Misleading Declarations and Greenwashing

Waste Energy Corp. promotes their brand of pyrolysis as:

- Al-controlled
- Cutting edge
- Zero-emission
- PFAS-eliminating

These claims are scientifically dubious and remain unsubstantiated by independent testing, infrastructure deployment, or regulatory review. No evidence or third-party validity has been provided.

Conclusion: Management Can't Be Trusted

The management team of Waste Energy Corp. consists of individuals who have built a facade of innovation on a foundation of empty promises and recycled branding. The documented instances of racketeering, lack of infrastructure, and reliance on self-enrichment over delivery paint a clearly bleak picture—this group cannot be entrusted with environmental stewardship or the safety of the community.

4. Technical Failures and Consequences

Pyrolysis Dangers and Scientific Feasibility Issues

The technology proposed by Waste Energy Corp. — plastic pyrolysis — is scientifically flawed, environmentally dangerous, and not viable at a commercial scale.

Toxic Chemical Emissions

Pyrolysis emits a wide range of hazardous chemicals, many of which are nearly impossible to remove or mitigate. The following table outlines key toxins, their health risks, how people are exposed, and whether they can realistically be filtered or destroyed.

Toxic Chemical	Removal Feasibility	Source of Exposure	Associated Diseases
Dioxins	No known, scalable technology can reliably capture or destroy this compound from pyrolysis emissions.	Inhalation, ingestion (via contaminated food, water, or air)	Lung cancer, Breast cancer, Liver cancer, Pancreatic cancer, Prostate cancer, Hodgkin's lymphoma, Endometriosis, Diabetes mellitus type 2, Hypothyroidism, Immune deficiency disorders
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)	No known, scalable technology can reliably capture or destroy this compound from pyrolysis emissions.	Inhalation, ingestion (via contaminated food and water), dermal absorption	Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, Liver cancer, Thyroid cancer, Multiple myeloma, Parkinson's disease, Hypothyroidism, ALS, Alzheimer's disease
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	Standard technologies (e.g., scrubbers, filters) can reduce emissions if used properly.	Inhalation (airborne emissions from plastic pyrolysis)	Asthma, COPD, Pulmonary fibrosis, Bronchitis, Emphysema, Lung cancer
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)	Removal requires advanced, costly, or rarely implemented systems.	Inhalation, ingestion (via contaminated air, water, food)	Lung cancer, Bladder cancer, Skin cancer (melanoma, squamous cell carcinoma, basal cell carcinoma), Liver cancer, Gastric cancer (stomach cancer),

Toxic Chemicals from Pyrolysis: Health Risks

Toxic Chemical	Removal Feasibility	Source of Exposure	Associated Diseases
			Esophageal cancer, Colorectal cancer
Heavy Metals (e.g., Mercury, Cadmium, Lead)	Removal requires advanced, costly, or rarely implemented systems.	Inhalation (fumes), ingestion (contaminated food, water), dermal absorption	Lead poisoning, Cadmium toxicity, Chronic kidney disease (CKD), Autism spectrum disorder (potential link), Peripheral neuropathy, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, ALS, Kidney cancer
Vinyl Chloride	No known, scalable technology can reliably capture or destroy this compound from pyrolysis emissions.	Inhalation, ingestion (contaminated air or water)	Angiosarcoma of the liver, Hepatocellular carcinoma, Glioblastoma (brain cancer), Small-cell lung carcinoma, Hodgkin's lymphoma, Acute myeloid leukemia (AML)
Acrylonitrile	Standard technologies (e.g., scrubbers, filters) can reduce emissions if used properly.	Inhalation, dermal absorption	Lung adenocarcinoma, Small-cell lung carcinoma, Neurotoxicity syndromes, Guillain-Barré syndrome
Phthalates	Standard technologies (e.g., scrubbers, filters) can reduce emissions if used properly.	Inhalation (plastic fumes), ingestion (contaminated food, water), dermal absorption	Endometriosis, Polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS), Infertility, Testicular dysgenesis syndrome, Obesity, Asthma
Microplastics	Not typically released in air; exposure is via ingestion or dermal routes.	Inhalation, ingestion (contaminated food, water, air)	Interstitial lung disease, Gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD), Crohn's disease, Ulcerative colitis, Infertility, Colon cancer, Gastric cancer, Small intestine cancer

Toxic Chemical	Removal Feasibility	Source of Exposure	Associated Diseases
PFAS (Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances)	No known thermal process fully eliminates PFAS; pyrolysis may convert or release them.	Fluorinated plastics, contaminated packaging, firefighting foam residues	Kidney cancer, Testicular cancer, Ulcerative colitis, Thyroid disease, High cholesterol, Pregnancy-induced hypertension

These emissions not only pose an immediate health threat, but also have long-term consequences for nearby communities. Neighborhoods surrounding similar facilities have experienced declining property values, rising medical expenses, and increased emergency response risks due to fires, equipment failures, and toxic exposure incidents.

PFAS Elimination is Scientifically Unrealistic

Waste Energy Corp. claims it can eliminate PFAS ("forever chemicals") via pyrolysis. In reality, there is no proven pyrolysis method that fully destroys PFAS. These compounds are resilient under heat and may be emitted into the air or released in residue, compounding pollution risks.

Some high-temperature technologies can destroy PFAS — but not pyrolysis.

Method	Temperature	Can It Destroy PFAS?	Why It's Impractical
Pyrolysis (Standard)	400–600°C	No. PFAS remains intact.	PFAS will break down partially but form new toxic compounds.
High-Temp Pyrolysis	700–1,000°C	No. Creates hydrogen fluoride gas & fluorinated pollutants.	Requires expensive gas scrubbing & corrosion-resistant equipment.
Gasification	1,000–1,200°C	Partially effective	Produces synthesis gas (syngas), which may still contain fluorinated compounds.

PFAS Destruction Technologies: Feasibility Comparison

Method	Temperature	Can It Destroy PFAS?	Why It's Impractical
Plasma Arc Treatment	3,000–10,000°C	Yes. PFAS is fully destroyed.	Extremely high cost & energy usage. Used only for specialized hazardous waste.

Plasma arc technology can destroy PFAS, but it is prohibitively expensive and energy-intensive. Gasification performs better than pyrolysis but still cannot ensure complete PFAS destruction. Hightemp pyrolysis creates new toxic pollutants and still leaves PFAS unresolved. Waste Energy Corp. does not claim to use any of these technologies.

Al Cannot Guarantee Purity

The company claims "AI ensures product purity", but:

- Al can assist in feedstock sorting, not chemical refinement.
- There is no known AI that can detect or remove harmful compounds in real-time pyrolysis output.
- This statement is technically misleading and serves as greenwashing.

Unstable and Unproven Technology

Pyrolysis plants have a track record of operational failure due to the complex, inconsistent behavior of mixed plastic waste. Waste composition must be tightly controlled — something Waste Energy Corp. has no demonstrated ability to manage. Many plants struggle with downtime, low efficiency, and unmarketable end-products.

Lack of Emissions Control Technologies

Waste Energy Corp. provides no detail on emissions capture systems (e.g., scrubbers, filters, carbon capture). There is no publicly disclosed plan to mitigate dioxins, VOCs, or particulate matter. In a populated area, this raises significant public health and regulatory concerns.

False Carbon-Negative Claims

Pyrolysis emits CO_2 , methane, and other greenhouse gases. Without carbon capture technology — which Waste Energy Corp. does not appear to possess — this process is not carbon-negative. Environmental lifecycle studies show that pyrolysis has a significant carbon footprint.

Waste Energy Corp. has not published any third-party environmental assessments or engineering reports validating their design. There is no public data on emissions, system performance, or risk

mitigation. Their claims appear based solely on marketing language, with no scientific or regulatory backing.

Failed Projects around the World

Brightmark (IN, USA), Renewlogy (Salt Lake City), and others have faced shutdowns or pullouts after failing to meet environmental or technical targets. In many cases, communities rejected pyrolysis due to toxic emissions and false claims.

Missing Technical Infrastructure and Unrealistic Inputs

Waste Energy Corp. presents no credible plan to address essential physical, chemical, and operational challenges of pyrolysis. Among the most glaring omissions:

- Unrealistic Feedstock Assumptions: Only plastics #2 and #4 (e.g. milk jugs, detergent & shampoo bottles, grocery bags, shrink wrap, clothing, carpet) are compatible with pyrolysis. Most municipal plastic waste (PVC, PET, PS, multilayer) is rejected.
- **No Sorting Infrastructure:** No mention of optical scanners, NIR sensors, or spectroscopy-based sorting systems. Without sorting, emissions and system failures are inevitable.
- **No Byproduct Handling Plan:** Pyrolysis produces char, tar, and contaminated wastewater. Waste Energy Corp. does not specify treatment or disposal systems.
- Lack of Pilot or Lab-Scale Data: The Company offers no evidence of scientific testing or engineering validation.
- Empty AI Claims: There is no detail on sensors, frameworks, or data used for "AI purification."
- False 'All-Plastic' and 'Zero-Waste' Messaging: Even advanced pyrolysis systems must reject large volumes of plastic, undermining these claims.

Conclusion: Technology Is Unsafe

Pyrolysis as proposed by Waste Energy Corp. is scientifically unproven, environmentally unsafe, and has failed repeatedly when attempted by better-funded, better-equipped companies. The technology poses public health risks, and their claims regarding PFAS destruction, AI-driven safety, and carbon neutrality are technically baseless and misleading.

5. Regulatory and Legal Issues

Waste Energy Corp.'s proposed facility faces legal and regulatory hurdles that make the facility challenging to implement. However, none of these hurdles will stop the project without community action.

Environmental Permitting Gaps

Pyrolysis facilities require permits for air emissions, hazardous waste energy handling, and storm water discharge. The company has not disclosed any applications for permits, environmental studies, or third-party audits that would lend the project credibility. Any potential emissions of PFAS, dioxins, and VOC's may trigger EPA or state intervention under the Clean Air Act and RCRA.

Legal Liability and Industry Precedents

Plastic pyrolysis firms across the US have faced lawsuits, community backlash, and cancellations of project plans:

- **Brightmark:** A \$680 million Georgia pyrolysis project was scrapped after the company failed to deliver on the promises it made to the residents of Indiana.
- Alterra Energy: The Ohio plant faces controversy and scrutiny over emissions and poor scalability.
- **Braven Environmental:** Projects have moved forward with state support, but without adequate transparency or long-term testing.
- **RES Polyflow and Vadxx Energy:** Quietly abandoned after the companies did not deliver on their promises.

These cases reveal a pattern: overpromising, underdelivering, and leaving communities to face legal and environmental risks on their own.

Zoning and Transparency

Waste Energy Corp. has not disclosed any zoning approvals or public engagement. Pyrolysis facilities are often restricted near schools, homes, and healthcare centers. The company operates through shell addresses and corporate fronts. This makes oversight difficult and reduces any accountability they have.

Fayetteville's Existing Superfund Sites

Fayetteville already bears the scars of superfund sites. Two local sites, now designated as superfunds, are reminders of what happens when companies disappear and the public is left to fend for itself.

- **Carolina Transformer Company:** It left behind toxic PCB contaminants, with the owners walking away without cleaning it up. The contamination was stopped when the EPA stepped in.
- **Cape Fear Wood Preserving:** It dumped chemicals like creosote and arsenic into unlined ditches, and then abandoned the sites. It is still under federal monitoring decades later.

In both cases, taxpayers—not the polluters—who paid the price. These sites demonstrate the ramifications of failed government oversight combined with corporate neglect. Approving another

facility such as the one proposed by Waste Energy Corp. risks repeating the same environmental injustice but this time under the label of "green innovation".

Conclusion: Regulation Fails to Protect Us

Legal barriers alone won't stop this project. Permits can be rushed, and zoning can be changed quietly. History shows that even hazardous projects can be approved if no one speaks up.

6. Conclusion: The Project is Not Viable

After a thorough investigation into the claims, operations, and leadership of Waste Energy Corp., this report concludes that the proposed pyrolysis facility is not a viable project under any realistic conditions.

The company's leadership has a documented history of legal disputes, financial mismanagement, and misleading public claims. Its technology—plastic pyrolysis—is scientifically unsound, environmentally hazardous, and economically unsustainable. There are no proven capabilities, no secured funding, and no operational track record.

The proposed facility would emit dangerous toxins such as dioxins, VOCs, and PFAS-related byproducts, with no credible plan for control or remediation. The claim of full PFAS destruction via plastic pyrolysis is technically false and unsupported by peer-reviewed data. Public health would be placed at risk.

At the regulatory level, the company lacks required permits, environmental assessments, and transparency. It uses shell entities and virtual offices, while making unverifiable promises of advanced technology and environmental benefits. The project would face zoning opposition, permitting barriers, and legal liability.

Financially, the project is unfeasible. Similar pyrolysis plants across the U.S. have failed despite substantial investment and expertise. Waste Energy Corp. offers no evidence of funding, customer demand, or economically viable outputs. The model is destined for collapse.

In summary, this project is based on false claims, and built on unproven, dangerous technology. It would impose significant health, environmental, and economic risks on the community. We cannot and must not approve or support the development of this facility under any circumstance.

Regulations can fail. Public pressure cannot.

Speak Up Now!

Click the links below to access phone numbers and email contacts. Demand decent living conditions for yourself and your family!

Waste Energy Corp is pushing a hazardous operation that could harm our health, environment, and economy—while misleading investors and the public.

Fayetteville City Council https://www.fayettevillenc.gov/City-Council/City-Council-Members

Cumberland County Commissioners https://www.cumberlandcountync.gov/departments/commissionersgroup/commissioners/commissioners

Fayetteville State University

https://www.uncfsu.edu/academics/colleges-schools-and-departments/lloyd-college-of-healthscience-and-technology/chst-faculty-and-staff

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

https://echo.epa.gov/report-environmental-violations https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/forms/enforcement-contact-us https://www.epa.gov/stationary-engines/epa-regional-contacts

North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (NC DEQ)

https://www.deq.nc.gov/about/divisions/water-resources/dwr-contacts-list

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) https://www.ftc.gov/about-ftc/contact

Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)

https://www.sec.gov/about/contact-sec

Fayetteville-Cumberland County Economic Development (About) https://fcedc.com/about/

Fayetteville-Cumberland County Economic Development (Contact) https://fcedc.com/about/#contactus

For references, visit StopWasteEnergy.org.

Disclaimer

This report is based entirely on publicly available information, including legal filings, corporate registrations, government databases, websites, and media reports. It is intended for informational and educational purposes related to community safety, environmental risk, and corporate transparency.

All efforts have been made to ensure factual accuracy at the time of writing. Any opinions expressed are based on documented patterns, publicly reported behavior, and the absence of verifiable evidence from the entities discussed.

This report does not allege criminal wrongdoing unless such findings have been established by a court of law.

If you believe any factual information is incorrect, please contact us with supporting documentation.