

April 28, 2015

Mark Carter  
Unilever Kilbourn Factory Director  
2816 S. Kilbourn Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60623

Dear Mr. Carter:

In submitting this version of the Community Benefits Agreement related to the expansion of the Unilever Kilbourn site, it is important to clarify these points:

- 1) While many local residents see potential benefits in the proposed facility expansion, it is important to note that it is ultimately Unilever that has the most to gain from the expansion. It is also Unilever that has the most to lose if this expansion does not move forward. This project is not a necessity for the Little Village community.
- 2) It may seem as though residents and Council members have repeatedly raised issues that Unilever representatives feel have already been addressed. It is important to realize that this indicates that the community has not received a sufficient response or seen sufficient change in relation to these issues.
- 3) It is incredibly difficult to be inclusive and to find compromise within any community, and the 26<sup>th</sup> and Kostner Oversight Council has attempted to do this to the best of its ability under the pressure of an incredibly tight timeline.
- 4) Many community stakeholders have high hopes for a Unilever Kilbourn community relations committee that moves us in the direction of increased communication and strengthened relations between Unilever's Kilbourn plant and its neighbors. This committee should not only maintain continued communication between Unilever and the community. It should also create a space for meaningful participation of stakeholders, giving them real bearing on the ways in which the Kilbourn facility impacts their community. There should be room at this table for the two-way sharing of information, and the collaborative development of solutions to concerns as well as new and innovative ideas.
- 5) The community has made its priorities clear. While Unilever has agreed to meet certain priorities, community stakeholders have been told that it is not possible for Unilever to meet other priorities, particularly related to the potential impact of Unilever's operations on the community's health. It is hard to believe that meeting these expectations is not possible for a multinational corporation like Unilever. It seems more likely that it is not in Unilever's financial and/or legal interest to meet them.
- 6) A process of negotiation requires compromise on both sides of the table. Unilever has compromised in relation to its original plan for expansion, particularly in relation to the donation of land for community use. The community has also made a number of compromises, and has modified original requests throughout this process to "meet in the middle." However, this version of Community Benefits Agreement is essentially our last offer. We are not asking Unilever to ensure that the donated land be clean, safe and usable for park and/or school use. Instead, we look forward to continuing to work with Unilever to collaborate around the development of this site, without the express commitment of resources by Unilever. However, we do require that Unilever make a binding and clear commitment to mitigating the impact of truck traffic on our community.

Respectfully,

26<sup>th</sup> and Kostner Oversight Council