Commission for Environmental Cooperation of North America (CEC)

Meeting of the Consultative Group for the North American Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (PRTR) Project

Montreal, Quebec, Canada
20–21 October 2004

Consultations for the *Taking Stock 2003* Report on North American Pollutant Releases and Transfers

Discussion Paper

I Introduction

The Commission for Environmental Cooperation of North America (CEC) is holding a public meeting in Montreal, Quebec, Canada, on 20–21 October 2004, as a forum for exchanging ideas and obtaining stakeholder input for the *Taking Stock 2003* report. The aim of this paper is to introduce a range of issues, with relevant background information, as a basis for the discussions at this meeting.

Taking Stock is an annual report providing information on pollutants in North America, based on data collected through the national pollutant release and transfer registers (PRTRs). These registers are designed to track the quantities of certain chemicals that are released to the air, water and land, and transfers off-site. The CEC recognizes the importance of these PRTRs—such as the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) in the United States, the National Pollutant Release Inventory (NPRI) in Canada and the *Registro de Emisiones y Transferencia de Contaminantes* (RETC) in Mexico—for their potential to enhance the North American environment. Tracking chemicals through PRTRs is essential to:

- increase public and industry understanding of the types and quantities of chemicals released into the environment and transferred off-site as waste;
- encourage industry to prevent pollution, reduce waste generation, decrease releases and transfers and assume responsibility for chemical use; and
- track environmental progress and assist governments in identifying priorities.

The national PRTRs are continually changing and expanding, and each new *Taking Stock* report reflects these developments. Future reports will strive to include as much as possible from the additional data being collected by the national PRTRs.

Significant progress has been made in developing a mandatory and publicly accessible reporting system in Mexico. With the passage of enabling legislation in 2001, work on the supporting regulations continued throughout 2002, 2003 and 2004.The regulations were passed in June 2004; however, reporting for 2003 will remain voluntary. As mandatory Mexican data become available, the CEC will be seeking input on how the Mexican data can be included in *Taking Stock,* along with the national PRTR data from Canada and the United States.

In previous years, comments from participants in the consultative meetings have resulted in significant changes to the format and content of the *Taking Stock* report. The Consultative Group has identified areas of particular interest that have then been explored in greater depth through special feature chapters focusing on, for example, specific industry sectors and chemicals, reporting of pollution prevention activities, and uses of PRTR data by industry and community groups.

The Consultative Group has also provided ideas on ways to improve the organization and presentation of the information, thereby contributing to the CEC's ongoing efforts to better meet users' needs. Such improvements include the *Taking Stock* web site, which allows for customized, user-driven analyses of the data sets used in *Taking Stock*.

The CEC invites and encourages interested parties to contribute to the development of the *Taking Stock 2003* report. The meeting of the Consultative Group, which is a public forum open to all interested parties, is a significant opportunity to discuss options, obtain new ideas and refine the report. The CEC is seeking feedback on a number of ideas, outlined below, and welcomes new ideas.

If you are not able to attend the meeting but would like to provide input, please send your written comments to Vic Shantora at the CEC in advance of the meeting, if possible, or by **22 November 2004**. Following the public meeting and receipt of written comments, the CEC will prepare a Response to Comments document that will summarize the comments received and outline the proposed approach for the development of the *Taking Stock 2003* report.

2 Update on CEC Activities

2.1 Update on the CEC PRTR Program

The CEC PRTR program continues to focus on:

- developing the *Taking Stock* report and web site as a means of fostering information access and use;
- increasing PRTR comparability among countries; and
- providing assistance to Mexico in the development of the RETC.

All three counties have committed to operating a PRTR. In the United States, the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) started in 1988 and is now collecting data on releases and transfers of more than 650 chemicals from over 20,000 facilities for 2003. In Canada, the National Pollutant Release Inventory (NPRI) started in 1993 and now collects data on releases and transfers of over 270 chemicals from almost 5,000 facilities. In Mexico, over 170 facilities reported voluntarily to the *Registro de Emisiones y Transferencia de Contaminantes* (RETC), which is expected to become mandatory for the 2004 reporting year.

Supporting the development of Mexico's PRTR has been a long-standing priority of the CEC's PRTR program. Mexico is currently working to develop the list of chemicals for the new mandatory PRTR system. To support this, the CEC has conducted analyses of the chemicals reported in the United States and Canada in large quantities that are not yet on the Mexican list. The CEC has also

supported NGO involvement in stakeholder consultations and contributed to industry training activities.

2.2 Update on *Taking Stock 2001 and 2002* reports

Some of the key findings of *Taking Stock 2001* released in June 2004 included:

- more than 2.9 million tonnes of chemicals were released and transferred in 2001;
- releases and transfers declined by 10 percent from 1998 to 2001 in North America, with TRI facilities showing generally larger decreases than those reporting to NPRI; and
- the group of some 15,000 facilities that reported smaller amounts of releases and transfers (<100,000 kg/year) generally showed increases in their releases and transfers whereas the group of facilities reporting larger releases and transfers, numbering about 3,600, reported decreases over time.

In addition, *Taking Stock* 2001 included a special feature focusing on recent progress in Mexico implementing the RETC.

The *Taking Stock Online* web site is updated annually and allows customized queries of the matched data sets, time trends and downloading of the report. The site is available at <www.cec.org/takingstock/>.

Taking Stock 2002 is under development, with an expected release in the spring of 2004. Based on discussions at the last Consultative Group meeting, the report will focus on lead, and provide a separate section for analysis of criteria air contaminants.

2.3 Status of Action Plan

Over the past five years, the three governments have collaboratively developed the *Action Plan to Enhance Comparability of Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers in North America* (available at <www.cec.org>). This plan was adopted by the CEC Council through Council Resolution 02-05 in June 2002. The plan describes a number of areas where comparability among the national PRTRs could be improved and outlines proposed actions to address them. Early changes in the PRTRs increased the amount of comparable data. Progress has been made in the following areas: use of industry classification codes (North American Industrial Classification System—NAICS codes), addition of chemicals, lowering of thresholds for some substances such as mercury and lead, fewer reporting exemptions, improved pollution prevention reporting, mandatory reporting, and reporting on dioxins and furans and PCBs. However, more recent changes have reversed that trend. Changes such as lowered reporting thresholds for arsenic, cadmium and chromium for NPRI, but not for TRI, have led to data that cannot be matched for these substances.

Each year the governments review the Action Plan, discuss ideas and propose new actions. Suggestions from stakeholders and the public are welcomed.

2.4 Update on the CEC Air Program

Since 2001, the CEC has been supporting the development of a national criteria air emissions inventory in Mexico that uses a common reporting format and estimation methods comparable to those employed in Canada and the United States. This will be the first-ever national criteria air emissions inventory in Mexico, and is a collaborative effort between the CEC, the *Instituto Nacional de Ecología* (INE), Semarnat, the Western Governors' Association, and the US EPA. The inventory includes the air pollutants, sulfur dioxide (SO_2) nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), ammonia and particulate matter—both 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$) and 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}).

The inventory coverage includes large point sources, small point (area) sources, on-road and off-road mobile sources, and natural sources (e.g., soil dust and vegetation). During 2004, the team has been extending its work from an initial inventory of the six northern Mexico border states to the remainder of Mexico, for a full national inventory. In 2004, the CEC supported the technical work to estimate Mexico's national air emissions at the source-specific level, and also sponsored a series of workshops organized by INE and Semarnat that brought together state officials from each Mexican state to help develop the national inventory. The state meetings also gave Semarnat the opportunity to explain to each state of the new reporting requirements for the RETC.

During 2004, the CEC also began collecting publicly available air emissions information for individual power plants in each North American country. The emissions data are for the year 2002 and cover sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, mercury, and carbon dioxide from plants burning mainly coal, oil and natural gas. The CEC plans to present this information by the end of 2004 in a public report.

2.5 Update on international PRTR activities

Several international organizations have active PRTR programs. The Organisation for the Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has a task force on PRTRs, which assists member countries in fulfilling the OECD recommendation encouraging all OECD countries to implement a PRTR. Several reports are in progress: a compendium of release estimation techniques for off-site transfers, an evaluation framework for release estimation techniques, quality assurance and quality control of PRTR data, and the uses of PRTRs. Canada has taken the lead in developing a data base on release estimation techniques. This database is expected to be available in fall 2004 on the internet at <www.oecd/env/prtr/>.

The OECD PRTR Task Force is developing a new work plan for 2005–2008 considering five possible future directions: products, small and medium-size enterprises, environmental indicators, “cross walk” between the waste-specific and chemical-specific reporting of transfers, and socioeconomic factors linked to PRTR data.

In May 2003, 36 countries and the European Union (not including Canada, Mexico and the United States) signed a global protocol on PRTRs developed under the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters. This legally binding protocol sets minimum requirements for reporting. The PRTR Protocol closed for signatures on 31 December 2003, but remains an “open global protocol” allowing for accession by countries that are not signatories to the entire Convention. Sixteen states are required to ratify the Protocol for it to enter into force. Although currently no country has ratified the Protocol, Europe is planning to extend its current Pollutant Emission Register to a full PRTR by 2006. The first year of reporting under the European PRTR would be 2007. Following this extension, the European Community would start to ratify the Protocol, paving the way for other European states to follow.

At the first meeting of the Working Group on PRTRs under the Protocol, in February 2004, representatives agreed to develop a document to help guide the entry into force and implementation of the protocol, and to develop a list of PRTR capacity building work. The full text of the PRTR protocol is available at <www.unece.org/env/pp/prtr.htm>.

The Inter-Organisation Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) has a PRTR Coordinating Group, see <www.who.int/iomc>

United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) PRTR Training and Capacity Building Program assists countries in the design and implementation of a PRTR. As part of this work, UNITAR has an agreement with Chile and the US EPA to design a PRTR, conduct a pilot project and make a national proposal by 2005. UNITAR is also working with Environment Canada and Ecuador to develop a PRTR. UNITAR has also held a series of national (Costa Rica, Ecuador, Chile, South Africa, Cuba) and regional PRTR meetings. A series of 300 documents about PRTRs has been collected into a summary CD. A virtual classroom has been started to foster exchange on PRTRs. For more information, please see <www.unitar.org/cwm/b/prtr/index.htm>.

3 Update on the National PRTR Programs and the Matched North American Data Set

Each year a "matched" data set is developed for the *Taking Stock* report. This contains the common set of chemicals and industry sectors that reported to both NPRI and TRI and allows data from the national programs to be compared. Information from Mexico's RETC program will be added once comparable data become available under the mandatory system. As the national systems evolve, the scope of the matched data sets used for *Taking Stock* may be increased or decreased, depending upon the nature of the changes to the national PRTRs.

3.1 Changes over the past five years

In the past five years, there have been significant changes in both NPRI and TRI, which in turn have presented opportunities for *Taking Stock*:

- In 1998, new source sectors, such as power plants and hazardous waste management/ solvent recovery facilities, were added to TRI, and became a dominant part of the matched data set.
- In 1999, NPRI added over 70 chemicals, and over 40 of these matched with TRI, thereby greatly increasing the number of chemicals analyzed in *Taking Stock*.
- In 2000, persistent, bioaccumulative toxic chemicals of particular environmental and health concern, such as dioxins, furans and hexachlorobenzene, were reported for the first time.
- For the 2001 reporting year, TRI added lead and lead compounds to the list of PBTs reported under lowered thresholds, and NPRI did so for the 2002 reporting year.
- Also for the 2002 reporting year, NPRI required reporting on criteria air contaminants (nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, particulates and volatile organic compounds). This doubled the number of facilities reporting to NPRI.

Other changes in NPRI include lowered reporting thresholds for several metals, including arsenic, cadmium, and chromium, lower thresholds for incinerators, a new threshold for wastewater treatment plants, reporting required from maintenance and repair of transportation vehicles and fuel storage terminal operations, and revised reporting for pollution prevention.

In 2001, Mexico published a voluntary guideline (NMX-AA-118-SCFI-2001), which specifies the list of chemicals, the reporting format and the reporting procedures for the current RETC program. Subsequently to the passage of enabling legislation in 2001, Mexico has recently passed regulations for a mandatory reporting system for toxics. The current focus is on developing the list of substances for the mandatory reporting system. Several Mexican states have been developing state-level RETC systems. Reporting on toxics to the RETC will

remain voluntary for 2002/2003 but reporting of some criteria air pollutants from certain industrial sectors at the federal level will continue to be mandatory.

3.2 Changes for the 2003 reporting year

There are a number of developments that will make the 2003 *Taking Stock* report the most comprehensive PRTR report to date. The new report will feature:

- the ability to look at trends over nine years (1995–2003),
- the potential to include a description of the data from certain Mexican states and voluntary data from the Mexican RETC, as well as a description of the important steps towards a mandatory system in Mexico,
- the second year of reporting of criteria air contaminants,
- the second year of a match-up between TRI and NPRI under lower reporting thresholds for lead and lead compounds,
- improved match-up in pollution prevention activity reporting,
- four-year trends for persistent bioaccumulative toxics (dioxins/furans, mercury and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons), and
- the opportunity to incorporate some of the lessons learned from the 10-year review of the CEC.

There have been some changes to NPRI and TRI that will affect the scope of the matched data set and the trends that are observed:

Addition of new chemicals in NPRI: For 2003, NPRI has:

- added carbonyl sulfide (CAS 463-58-1) which is also reported to TRI, and so it can be included in the matched data set for *Taking Stock*;
- added total phosphorus, which does not match TRI;
- regrouped chemicals (nonylphenols and ethoxylates, octylphenol and ethoxylates), which do not match TRI data; and
- added 60 volatile organic compounds (VOCs), some of which are also required to be reported to TRI. However, the NPRI reporting threshold is one tonne released and the TRI threshold is approximately 10 tonnes manufactured, processed or otherwised used. Therefore, these VOCs do not match TRI but could be discussed in a separate section.

Addition of new sector in NPRI: Reporting from the oil and gas sector is now required in NPRI in 2003 although exploration and drilling remain exempt. However, this sector is not included in TRI and, therefore, does not form part of the matched data for *Taking Stock*. The data could be discussed, though, in a separate section.

Other changes to NPRI: The other changes in NPRI (improved basis of estimate codes and requirement to report facility business number) do not match TRI.

Change in the number of reporting facilities (NPRI and TRI): The number of facilities reporting to NPRI is dramatically increasing while those reporting to TRI

are decreasing. These changes in the number of facilities have the ability to influence time trends. *Taking Stock 2003*, like previous reports, could analyze the change in the number of reporting facilities and determine the effect that has on the time trends.

There have also been changes in the way that releases and transfer categories are described. Both NPRI and TRI have changed the way data are presented in summary reports. NPRI has narrowed its definition of a release and added a new category of disposal. Starting with the NPRI summary report on 2001 data, NPRI now presents its data in the following categories: releases (on-site release to air, water and spills, leaks and other to land), final disposal (on–site disposal, including landfill, land treatment, underground injection, and off-site disposal, including landfill, land treatment, storage and underground injection), off-site transfers for treatment prior to final disposal (includes physical, chemical, biological treatment, incineration, sewage) and off-site transfers to recycling and energy recovery.

TRI has required finer detailed reporting for off-site land disposal and, in its annual summary, presented the on-site land and underground injection according to regulatory program subdivisions. These subdivisions, referring to US regulations, do not correspond to data categories collected by NPRI, however, so that the matched datasets would continue to be summarized at a higher level.

3.3 Continued effect of 2002 changes

NPRI lowered its thresholds for the metals lead, arsenic, cadmium and hexavalent chromium in 2002. TRI lowered the threshold for lead in 2001, but thresholds for the other metals remain at the higher level. Therefore, the metals arsenic, cadmium and chromium no longer match between NPRI and TRI and so are no longer part of the matched data set. In a manner similar to the PBT chemicals that are reported under different thresholds, these metals could be analyzed separately in the *Taking Stock 2003* report.

The 2003 report will be the second year of NPRI reporting on seven criteria air contaminants (CACs) at various release-based thresholds. While TRI does not include any of these criteria air contaminants, information on CACs is available from other EPA programs. Mexico (on the COA form) does have mandatory reporting for some CACs.

The addition of petroleum terminal operations to NPRI allowed this industry sector to be included in the matched database beginning with the 2002 reporting year.

4 Opportunities for the *Taking Stock 2003* Report

Each year special analyses are undertaken, based on the data in the *Taking Stock* report. The CEC is proposing the following seven topics as a starting point for discussion during the meeting, with a view to identifying those opportunities and potential analyses that are of greatest interest.

The proposals for a special feature analyses for the 2003 *Taking Stock* report include:

1. Focus on the "Back Door"
2. Pollution Prevention Reporting
3. Sector Analysis
4. New Chemical and Health-based Lists
5. Link to DUNS Data
6. Increase Geographic Presentation
7. Your ideas

In previous *Taking Stock* reports, the special feature analyses have been highlighted in the Executive Summary and the press release. We are seeking suggestions on ways to increase communication for the special features, and to emphasize the link to the CEC *Taking Stock* web site.

Opportunity One: Focus on the "Back Door"

Taking Stock 2001 identified a 19% decrease in on-site releases from 1998 to 2001 (driven mainly by large reductions in air releases from larger reporters). At the same time, many facilities are increasing the amount of chemicals sent out the "back door" to landfill off-site (3% increase from 1998 to 2001), to sewage (7% increase from 1998 to 2001), and metals sent for disposal off-site and to sewage (2% increase). In general, there is a shift in how facilities are managing chemicals, from releasing them to the air and water on site to transferring them off site to landfill, treatment and sewage. *Taking Stock 2001* focused on air releases and looked in detail at the sectors, chemicals and facilities showing large air releases. In 2003, it may be time to focus on the "back door" and analyze the chemicals, sectors, facilities and states/provinces transferring chemicals to landfill, treatment and sewage.

This analysis could seek input from industry about the reasons for facilities' changes (increases and decreases) in these management methods, and discuss reasons for the changes. This may provide valuable insights into the drivers of the increase in "back door" waste streams.

The analysis also could look at facilities and sectors that are reporting pollution prevention activities to see if these activities are resulting in a greater rate of decrease in these waste streams than facilities or sectors not such activities. As a result of a change in the TRI reporting form to a finer level of detail, the

projections could be examined to see if the increase in these “back door” waste streams is expected to continue.

In 2002, NPRI also changed the reporting requirements for sewage treatment plants. *Taking Stock* could include a look at the volumes of chemicals being sent to sewage and volumes being released into the air and water from NPRI sewage treatment plants. TRI does not require sewage treatment plants to report, but another database could be used for US information on releases from sewage treatment plants. This sewage tracking analysis may be particularly useful in 2003, as the Great Lakes Water Quality agreement is being reviewed. Both Canada and the United States are committed to certain reduction goals under this Agreement.

Questions for discussion:

Is there interest in this type of analysis?
Are there any particular analyses that would be of interest?
Should the section focus on landfill or sewage or all types of transfers?
Are there any particular chemicals or sectors that may be of interest?

Opportunity Two: Pollution Prevention Reporting

Pollution prevention is a government priority in all three countries. For the first time in 2002, both TRI and NPRI had similar categories of pollution prevention activity reporting. This will allow pollution prevention reporting to be matched between the two countries. Mexico’s RETC also has somewhat similar pollution prevention reporting. The special feature could present the 2002 and 2003 data on pollution prevention activity reporting, analyzing which activities are the most commonly reported, which sectors, facilities and locations report pollution prevention activities.

The feature could also explore if pollution prevention was effective in lowering releases and transfers by examining if facilities that reported pollution prevention activity also reported lower releases and transfers over time. The feature could also compare pollution prevention reporting by facilities reporting smaller releases and transfers to facilities reporting larger releases and transfers. The *Taking Stock 1997* report had a special feature on pollution prevention, and the 2003 report provides an ideal opportunity to see how things have changed since this time.

Questions for discussion:

Is there interest in this type of analysis?
Are there chemicals or sectors that are of particular interest?
Are there any examples of PRTR data driving pollution prevention efforts?
How can PRTRs help companies identify pollution prevention solutions?

Opportunity Three: Sector Analysis

Previous *Taking Stock* reports have focused on two sectors: primary metals and pulp and paper. It may be timely to focus a special feature chapter on another sector. A sector could be selected on the basis of:

- large releases and transfers of carcinogens or California Proposition 65 chemicals or persistent bioaccumulative toxics (PBT) chemicals,
- increases (or decreases) in releases and transfers over time,
- large difference in average releases and transfers between NPRI and TRI,
- large transfers to sewage, treatment or underground injection, or
- differences in reporting on pollution prevention activity.

A sector analysis could describe the sector, chemicals released and transferred, and time trends. It could also discuss programs and regulations to reduce releases and transfers. Differences between TRI and NPRI releases in this sector could be compared. This sector analysis could potentially include Mexican data. Some sectors that may be of interest include the cement manufacturing sector, with large releases of many PBTs, the rubber and plastic sector, with large releases of many carcinogens, or the electronics industry, with greater than average decreases in total releases (32% compared to 16% for all industries).

This analysis could be done cooperatively with an industrial sector, academic researcher and/or NGO.

Questions for discussion:

Is there interest in this type of analysis?
Are there any particular sectors that may be of interest?

Opportunity Four: New Chemical and Health-based Lists

A variety of new chemical and health-based lists could be considered in *Taking Stock 2003*. Currently, *Taking Stock* analyzes PRTR data based on: 1) known or suspected carcinogens, and 2) California Proposition 65 chemicals (those known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm). Previous *Taking Stock* reports have analyzed PRTR data using a list of metals, chemicals targeted for voluntary reduction (such as EPA 33/50 program and Canadian ARET program), and chemicals on regulatory lists such as those considered toxic under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

We could consider new lists of chemicals based either on the characteristics of the chemical, such as toxicity, bioaccumulation or persistence, chemicals associated with programs, or chemicals drawn from different regulatory lists. Chemical lists that could be considered include the chemicals on the High Production Volume lists, the US CERCLA Priority List of Hazardous Chemicals, US hazardous air pollutants list, the European Parliament's REACH list,

European Economic Community Priority Chemicals Lists, Health Canada's Greatest Potential for Exposure list, and the CEPA toxic list. These lists could be reviewed and assessed against the matched NPRI-TRI chemical list. An analysis of the sectors, facilities and jurisdictions based on these new chemical and health lists could be considered.

Questions for discussion:

Is there interest in this type of analysis?
Are analyses of sub-categories of PRTR chemicals useful?
Are there any particular lists that may be of interest?

Opportunity Five: Link to DUNS Data

Canada, Mexico and the United States ask facilities to report their Dunn and Bradstreet business number (DUNS number). This number links to a wealth of financial data about the facility. The type of financial data available includes credit ratings, employee data, business ratios, ownership, payment histories, etc. DUNS data are also available by sector using Standard Industrial Classification codes, making sector analysis possible.

This special feature could explore some of the links between environmental and economic performance. Do facilities that have large releases of carcinogens have strong or weak credit ratings? Are the facilities that are showing decreases in chemical releases also considered economic leaders in their sector? How does the emissions per job ratio vary among sectors and regions? Emissions per job ratio has been used by academic researchers to determine environmental performance, and poor ratios often correlate to poor social and economic conditions.

This could be a bold new direction for *Taking Stock*, starting to examine some of the pressing issues related to environment and economy. This feature could be done cooperatively with an industrial sector, academic researcher and/or NGO. Access to portions of the DUNS database would be needed (either purchased, negotiated or as a contribution from an existing user).

The DUNS data could also be used to calculate the number of facilities below the ten employee threshold in each sector. This would give an idea of the proportion of facilities not captured by NPRI or TRI.

Questions for discussion:

Is there interest in this type of analysis?
Are there any particular analyses that would be of interest?

Opportunity Six: Increased Geographical Presentation

Taking Stock 2003 could devote time and resources to increasing the geographic presentation of the data. Maps and regional analyses can stimulate readers' interest. Types of ideas that could be considered are: watershed- and airshed-based mapping, waterbodies and river basins, and mapping facilities with increases/decrease or large releases of carcinogens etc.

Questions for discussion:

Is there interest in this type of analysis?
Are there any particular watersheds or airsheds that may be of interest?
Are there any good mapping designs that we should consider?

Opportunity Seven: Your ideas

Participants are invited and encouraged to come to the meeting with other ideas for special analyses or areas of interest that could be considered for the *Taking Stock* report or which might form the basis for separate special feature analyses. Your feedback and suggestions on the format of the report and the web site are also welcome.

For additional information or to provide comments, please contact:

Victor Shantora
Head, Pollutants and Health
Commission for Environmental Cooperation of North America
393, rue St-Jacques Ouest, bureau 200
Montreal, Québec H2Y 1N9
Canada
Tel: (514) 350-4300
Fax: (514) 350-4314
E-mail: <vshantora@ccemtl.org>
Web site: <http://www.cec.org>