

Chemistry Industry Association of Canada
National Advisory Panel

May 2, 2013

KPMG Offices, Toronto

HEADLINE MINUTES

1. CIAC Update

Panel holds brief, one-day meeting. Bob Masterson presents update on: discussions with member companies about value of CIAC; 20th Reducing Emissions report; and initial CIAC responses to Panel Challenge Letter. Panel comments on buffer zone issue, praises 20 Years Reducing Emissions report, and emphasizes role of government in promoting Responsible Care. (p. 1)

2. Recognizing Other Approaches to Responsible Care

General sense among Panel members that, to retain and build membership, CIAC should be “a little bit flexible” about the approach to RC, without jeopardizing program’s integrity. There are calls to compare Canadian Responsible Care with U.S. RCMS and RC14000. (p. 4)

3. Reports from Panel Members

Panel members raise issues from own regions: greenhouse gas reductions, emergency response, process safety, Global Reporting Initiative, and plastics issues. (p. 6)

4. Chemtura, Elmira: A Tale of Two CAPs

As a case study, Dwight Este, EH&S manager at plant, reviews history of successive versions of Chemtura Public Advisory Committee (CPAC). Panel member Pat McLean provides additional background on CPAC and its relationship with Chemtura. Panel suggests ways to address a situation in which a company’s community outreach program becomes dysfunctional. (p. 9)

5. R&D Tax Incentives

KPMG Partner Bob Waterworth reviews Government of Canada’s Scientific Research and Experimental Development (SR&ED) program. Panel suggests CIAC invite Bob to present his review to the Technical Management Committee. (p. 12)

6. Agenda Planning for Fall Meeting

Panel members suggest potential agenda topics for fall meeting in Fort Saskatchewan, among them Aboriginal issues, emergency response, air pollution and monitoring, and activities of the Alberta Industrial Heartland Association. (p. 12)

Chemistry Industry Association of Canada
National Advisory Panel
May 2, 2013
KPMG Offices, Toronto

National Advisory Panel:

Anouk Bertner
Nadine Gudz
Cindy Jardine (via telephone)
Brenda Lorenz
Pat McLean
Errol Mendes
Ken Ogilvie
Ron Ormson
Keith Purves (via telephone)
Edwin Tam
Alex von Knobloch
Bruce Walker

CIAC:

Dwight Este (Chemtura)
Bob Masterson
Bob Waterworth (KPMG)

PDA:

Francis Gillis
John Vincett

Regrets:

Richard Janda
Gail Krantzberg
Jane Lister
Robin Orr

Agenda Item 1: CIAC Update

Bob Masterson presented an update on: discussions with member companies about the value of CIAC; the twentieth Reducing Emissions report; and initial responses to the Panel Challenge Letter (Appendix 1).

Bob noted that all 54 member and partner companies participated in the 2013 CIAC survey. Forty-one members ranked Responsible Care as a top value of the Association. The other top values were Advocacy (identified by 24 companies) and Networking (20 companies).

One surprise in 2012 and 2013 has been the dramatic increase in departures and in the number of companies whose participation in Responsible Care is “at risk.” Some common reasons for this development are: fees, a company’s “fit” with CIAC, and administrative demands and commitments that compete with RC. Bob noted that the Association continues to hear from prospective and current members a lot of questions

about how well or little aligned Responsible Care in Canada is with Responsible Care in the United States.

In referring to the economic context in which chemical companies are operating, Bob noted that there has been no investment by the industry in Canada since 2008, but a big investment by Nova Chemicals in Sarnia is underway, and another large investment in Nova Chemical Joffre, AB is expected in June 2013. Such investments will bring change, giving companies more financial flexibility in considering whether to join CIAC. As well, a change in Canada's tax rules – along with the availability of feedstock from the shale gas industry, is attracting companies to consider further investments in Canada.

Regarding the Reducing Emissions Report: 1992 – 2012, Bob noted that there has been a 99.5 percent reduction of CIAC member company discharges to water. “We are not there yet with emissions to air,” he said, “but we will get there.”

Regarding the Panel Challenge Letter to CIAC and its members, Bob cited 12 Association areas of activity in response to Panel challenges (see Appendix 1).

Bob also mentioned the buffer zone issue, noting that CIAC has been trying very hard to get government officials to speak about this to the industry and CIAC membership. CIAC did participate in the formal consultations on a renewed planning framework, and thanked the NAP for also making a submission to the government on this important issue. Bob responded to Panel questions and comments:

- *What are the CIAC membership fees?*
They range from \$15,000 to over \$400,000 per annum, depending on the size of the company.
- *You mentioned advocacy as a top value of CIAC to members. What are the major advocacy issues?*
Freight, rail service, environmental regulations, and feedstock availability are among the advocacy areas. Issues depend on the company and region. Climate change comes up often.
- *What proportion of CIAC members are at risk?*
There are a few members at short or long term risk. We hear messages from some buyers of member companies that they do not see the value proposition of Responsible Care. There is also the issue of free riders. It is a challenge to persuade them to join the program.
- *How many biotechnology companies are members of CIAC?*
We have one such member.
- *I understand you have one energy company among your members.*
Yes, but we have no plans to actively recruit energy companies.

- *In its Reducing Emissions program, is the Association setting specific goals?*
The goal, as in all aspects of Responsible Care, is continuous improvement. We also work through our EPSG (Environmental Steering protection group) to establish priorities, and set collective targets where appropriate.
- *Has CIAC thought of linking up with other industries on corporate social responsibility efforts with respect to the investment community?*
We only have three members (Methanex, Canexus and Chemtrade) that are publicly traded and raise capital in Canada, which limits our ability to get actively engaged in the social investment Community.
- *Is CIAC going to produce a new video on Responsible Care?*
Yes, we are working on new video elements that might be included in member company custom videos. These elements could be used in promoting and explaining Responsible Care.
- *If each member company were to develop its own key messages, which could be captured in video clips for the CIAC website, that would be good.*
- *Putting Responsible Care on the leading edge of voluntary sustainability programs entails risk but draws public attention. So put Responsible Care on the leading edge.*
[This remark was in the context of such cutting edge areas as fracking, nano research and manufacturing, pipelines and oilsands, and childrens' health issues. Suggested questions for the Panel at the next meeting: "Given the limitations of the membership of CIAC, what might be a list of "cutting edge" areas that are within the Association's mandate? Secondly, what kinds of linkages would be appropriate to other "cutting edge" initiatives by others in the value chain?"]

The buffer zone issue:

- *A lot of CIAC proposals are seen as tokenism.*
We don't see it as a role of the Association to get directly involved in buffer zone issues. We expect member companies to have their own policies and procedures. Our role is to make members aware of the obligations in this area.
- *We need to make sure CIAC is playing a serious role at the table.*
- *I highly recommend you consult native people on this issue.*
(John Vincett said that a broader discussion of consultation with native people is planned for the fall meeting. There is some experience of such consultation among member companies that perhaps could be shared. A Panel member remarked that so much around the issue of native consultation is dictated by the federal government. Another member felt it was dictated more by the courts.)

Panel comment on Reducing Emissions Report:

It was remarked that the “20 Years” Reducing Emissions Report is more attractive than past year reports.

A Panel member noted how far the industry has progressed in reducing emissions since the first Reducing Emissions report was published for 1992. He recalled that, in 1992, two member companies had levels of discharges that were in egregious violation of the federal fisheries act. One of those companies changed and is “now doing very well.” John Vincett noted that Daniel Green (a former Panel member) was very influential in how the Association looked at that issue, by producing an analysis of the company’s activities and making a comparison with the Responsible Care ethic, the Board’s attention was effectively focused on the ethic in action or missing in action. One company closed its doors and moved to Louisiana and the other (Kronos, Varennes, QC) addressed the problem, bringing itself into compliance with Responsible Care (and federal and provincial statutes) – and being recognized by Environment Canada for its efforts.

Role of government in promoting Responsible Care:

A member suggested it would be very useful for representatives of CIAC and the NAP to ask for some time to talk to CCME to ask for visible support for Responsible Care. CCME could develop a ministers’ statement that CIAC could use to encourage companies to join RC. This would provide support for CIAC member company CEOs, as they urge other companies to join the Association. Another Panel member thought it would also be useful for the federal minister and each provincial minister of the environment to make a statement supporting Responsible Care.

Agenda Item 2: Recognizing Other Approaches to Responsible Care

Bob noted that CIAC needs more members for a sustainable budget, and that the Association’s approach to Responsible Care is seen as a barrier to increasing the membership. This raises the question: Is it time for CIAC to recognize other approaches to Responsible Care? (See Appendix 2 for details on CIAC’s experience in attempting to recruit a company in Sarnia that ultimately decided to join the American Chemistry Council (ACC) and on experiences of the forest industry in Canada in resolving serious disputes over which certification system to adopt.)

Among the key reasons cited for those declining or resigning membership is CIAC’s lack of recognition of other RC approaches. Is it therefore time to consider a more flexible and adaptable approach that would recognize (subject to conditions) the ACC RCMS plus the RC14000 implementation and certification as equivalent to CIAC RC and verification? (RCMS stands for Responsible Care Management System.)

Bob put this question to the Panel: What kind of association do we want?

- Potentially – A small and declining base of true believers in Responsible Care done our way, and only our way?
- Or
- Possibly – A moderate and growing membership of companies that have pledged commitment to Responsible Care, but whose offshore HQ prefers alternative delivery approaches?

Panel comment:

Panel members expressed interest in seeing RC14000 and Canadian Responsible Care compared. Bob noted that one of the biggest differences between the two is that RC14000 makes no reference to the ethic of Responsible Care. As well, in Bob’s experience with American system auditors, they don’t know quite what to do with community dialogue. Their verification is completely professional; there is no involvement of the community. A member urged CIAC not to allow RC verification to be diluted by other audit processes.

Bob added that the hardest hurdle in Responsible Care is the requirement that each CIAC member develop a worst case scenario. “Companies will leave over that demand,” he said.

A member assumed that the first option of an association based on “true believers” is “just being dramatic.” Bob said no, that option is not just rhetorical. There is a small number of companies that actually want the first option.

A Panel member urged CIAC to explain to companies why Canadian Responsible Care is in their interest. Bob said that the Association does do that, though member companies say it is getting harder and harder to convince their U.S. headquarters of the importance of participating in the Canadian initiative.

It was agreed that the key question facing CIAC is: how do we keep our integrity in terms of Responsible Care without eradicating ourselves. Part of the answer is comparing the U.S. and Canadian systems and seeing what is essential to Canadian Responsible Care and what elements could be compromised, or perhaps more usefully, packaged as an additional activity to qualify for CIAC Responsible Care.

Bob emphasized that CIAC does not want a tiered membership, with one level living up to a higher standard of Responsible Care than the other.

There was a general sense among Panelists that the time has come for CIAC to be a “little bit flexible” about the approach to Responsible Care in order to bring more members into CIAC (without jeopardizing the program’s integrity):

- “The do nothing approach means the association is not going to exist. CIAC has to be open to discussion about the approach to Responsible Care.”
- “Yes, the do nothing approach means the Canadian version of Responsible Care disappears.”

- “It’s like the Canadian auto industry and harmonization with the industry in the U.S. CIAC needs to harmonize without losing its integrity.”
- “We have to be true believers as long as we can sustain it. But we may have to give on some issues.”

Several Panel members called for more emphasis on outreach and recruitment rather than “diluting” Responsible Care.

A Panelist called for CIAC and Panel members to encourage regulators to challenge non-member companies to get involved in Responsible Care. Bob said that CIAC now reaches out to companies that are not in Responsible Care and to companies that are in U.S. based Responsible Care. It explains to the latter what more they need to do to meet CIAC RC.

A Panel member called for Responsible Care companies to apply pressure for sustainability across the value chain. There were also calls for raising the profile of RC, which would raise its value in the minds of non-member companies. “Responsible Care has no presence in the minds of young students,” said a Panel member. Another remarked: “Ninety-five percent of people in Sarnia don’t know what Responsible Care is.” She added that “maybe we have to start from the bottom up”—taking Responsible Care to the people so that they can pressure companies to join the program.

A member asked if there has been any comparison of standards between CIAC members and non-members. Bob indicated that there has been some effort at such comparison. He noted that, as soon as a company leaves Canadian RC, community dialogue falls off.

John Vincett noted that, historically, the fact that Responsible Care originated in Canada made it acceptable to many jurisdictions around the world. A U.S., Japanese, or European invention would not have found such acceptance. There is a certain irony in that the great success of Responsible Care globally has been a result of a clear set of principles that are interpreted by each country according to their culture. In this way, each member country has a stake in the development of its own program. He further noted that in the development of RC14000 in the US, a similar debate took place. The resolution was aided by a “hot dog” analogy, whereby the bun was ISO 14000, and the ends of the hot dog were the extra requirements of RC. A process of negotiation resulted in the inclusion of the hot dog ends in the eventual formatting of RC14000. At the same time, a factor that made this process easier was the professional auditing function in the USA, which did not include public verification.

Agenda Item 3: Reports from Panel Members

Panel members raised issues from their own regions, some of them with national and international implications.

Sustainability and GHG Reductions

Sustainable Waterloo Region is a not-for-profit that advances environmental sustainability of organizations across Waterloo Region through collaboration. They are focused on reducing greenhouse gas emissions through membership in the Regional Carbon Initiative. A Panel member has recently joined SWR and wondered whether CIAC should do the same. Bob said that he cannot speak for CIAC members on this issue, but remarked that Chemtura, CCC Sulco and other regional companies could consider joining that organization. He added that each member company has to provide an inventory of its own emissions and goals. The member was encouraged to contact the two local member companies to see if there was awareness of the initiative and interest in joining it.

Asked if member companies have to report their indirect emissions, Bob said they did not.

Emergency Response

A Panel member recently participated as a public verifier at the Shell site in Corunna near Sarnia. She was impressed by the company, but has proposed a serious review as certain areas in the company's implementation of Responsible Care could be tightened up. During a recent, strong-smelling sulphur compound leak from the Corunna refinery, there was a significant delay before a shelter-in-place alarm went off. Such delays are an ongoing problem in Sarnia.

Bob remarked that companies have to take more responsibility for that kind of communication. It's not a lack of willingness to communicate in emergencies, but there is no clear leadership in decision-making. There's a kind of institutional inertia that has to be fixed.

Another Panelist mentioned a similar problem in Elmira, where a first responder who had come onto the Chemtura site had to go back to the fire station to activate the alarm. This was a major fire where it took 15 minutes for the alarm to go off.

A third Panelist, who as a CAP member for several companies near Montreal was involved in the testing of industrial fire alarms, spoke of one siren not being loud enough and a few minutes' delay in the activation of another siren.

John Vincett suggested the emergency response issue be put on the agenda at the fall NAP meeting in Fort Saskatchewan.

Process safety:

A member noted that the recent collapse of a textile factory in Bangladesh that killed over 1100 workers brings the commercial safety issue to mind. Also mentioned was an accident in November at a plant in Korea where a hydrofluoric acid leak killed two instantly and sent a huge cloud over a community completely unprepared for such an emergency. So process safety is still an issue after all these years.

A member commented that process safety incidents raise the question: is one-off consultation with the community and other stakeholders enough? He noted that, around the world, people are saying that process safety needs ongoing monitoring by the public.

Another member agreed that true participation of stakeholders in discussions about process safety is crucial, especially in the context of aboriginal people.

Global Reporting Initiative and other international programs:

A member talked about “B Corps” that are certified by the non-profit B Lab to meet rigorous standards of social and environmental performance, accountability and transparency. This is a growing community of more than 600 Certified B Corps from 15 countries and 60 industries. The member also talked about GRI. As well, the member noted that there is a new version of LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design), a third party certification program and an internationally accepted benchmark for design, construction and operation of high performance green buildings. She suggested that it is worth exploring how Responsible Care fits into these programs.

Regarding LEED, Bob noted that there is a concern in the U.S. about the de-listing of chemicals for what are seen as environmental issues. He noted that CIAC has attempted to communicate with retailers such as Rona, but “it is hard to get them to talk to us.”

Asked how CIAC responds to such international standard setters as GRI, Bob said that the Association does that through the International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA). Many CIAC members are aware of GRI, he added, but headquarter GRI reports are not made meaningful on the ground in Canada. CIAC members need to look internally, and for other assistance to develop their own sustainability path and ensure their activities also complement the corporate strategies.

A Panel member remarked that, one way or another, companies have to indicate where they see themselves in the context of emerging and international issues. He indicated that a company’s public credibility depends on communicating where it is going in sustainability.

Plastics issues:

A member noted how debris in the ocean, resulting from the tsunami in Japan a couple of years ago, has highlighted the destructive effects of plastics if they are not properly managed. Bob agreed that the incident has helped to focus on the urgency of global industry needing to get its act together on plastics pollution. He remarked that plastics and other companies are active on the issue now and predicted that we will see global cooperation in addressing the problem through their plastics associations.

Alberta GHG proposal:

A Panel member talked about a provincial government proposal that would entail a 40 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. There is strong concern that the expectations in the proposal would threaten the competitiveness of companies.

Agenda Item 4: Chemtura, Elmira: A Tale of Two CAPs

Dwight Este, EH&S manager of the Chemtura plant, reviewed the history of CPAC and its relationship with Chemtura and MOE and the Township of Woolwich.

The Uniroyal Public Advisory Committee (UPAC) formed when the Ontario Ministry of the Environment approached Woolwich Township to form an independent committee to address historical, current and potential future concerns with the operations of the plant in Elmira, Ontario. This committee later became the Crompton/Chemtura Public Advisory Committee (CPAC). In 2001, CPAC became a formal committee of the Township Council.

The election of a new mayor of the township in 2010 resulted in the dissolution of CPAC for about six months. The committee ended up with members that appeared to be handpicked by the mayor, who also chaired the committee for the first six months. Two members quit and one was removed from the committee prior to the first official public meeting. Currently, the CPAC sits with five members and is supported by a Soil, Water and Air Technical (SWAT) working group.

The “former” CPAC evolved into an effective committee that was instrumental in helping set the direction for remediation activities and improved environmental performance at Chemtura. The “current” CPAC came in without a strong understanding of the cleanup challenges facing the plant and community. The current CPAC’s initial dealings with the company and MOE came across as somewhat adversarial.

Chemtura obtained Responsible Care verification in early 2013, after implementing changes to its management system called for by the verification team in July 2011. The team had revisited Chemtura in December 2012 and February 2013. The team signed off on the verification although the opinion was not unanimous and a dissenting opinion was included. In arriving at the conclusion to sign off on the verification, the team reviewed and found to be sufficient:

- The 2013 community outreach and dialogue plan
- The initial implementation of the near neighbour risk communication management system
- Protocols for and results of audits relating to the Accountability Code of Responsible Care
- The Chemtura update presentation at the CPAC meeting of February 28

Two facilitated meetings between Chemtura and two CPAC representatives focused on making the meetings more constructive and productive. The company also met with members of the former CPAC, where dialogue was based on their experience on CPAC and as members of the National Advisory Panel. These initiatives have helped to improve relations between the company and the community. However, in Chemtura's view, the current dialogue process with CPAC will make it difficult for the company to meet community dialogue expectations of the Accountability Code: the requirement of most CPAC meetings to be public; CPAC appearing to be trapped by past history with respect to remediation issues; the entire process feeling like it is being influenced by one member of CPAC's SWAT group.

To move forward, Chemtura has adopted a "management system" approach to community dialogue. The company has identified two specific actions on community dialogue:

- Review relationships with local community groups to determine level of engagement, support and focus with respect to internal resources.
- Evaluate and implement various methods to gain a better understanding from the broader community of what the company can do in terms of communications and responsibility.

Dwight cited recent Chemtura successes in community dialogue:

- Technical meeting on the groundwater remediation proposed action plan, in which the Corporate Remediation Manager delivered commitment to the process
- General update presentation to CPAC in February, which was well received
- Successful meetings with local elected officials: MPP Michael Harris and MP Harold Albrecht.

Panel member Pat McLean, who has sat on CPAC and at one point chaired the Committee, provided additional background on the committee and its relationship with Chemtura. She said that the community gave Chemtura some leeway in addressing pollution, as they felt the company did what was considered best at the time.

From late 1999 through 2001, Pat said, Chemtura went into denial. At that time, CPAC hired a company to do a peer review of Chemtura. With the help of CCPA (now CIAC), the company returned to consult with the community.

At one point, CPAC members were concerned that they would be sued for certain statements they made. Meanwhile, the company went a long time without being verified; in fact, they were not verified until the early 2000s. The company had to be pushed into meeting the expectations of Responsible Care. It was suggested that changes in name and corporate structure in the USA had provided a significant complicating factor. They did not get verified in 2011.

A Panel member asked how CPAC originated. Pat stated that CPAC came into existence because the Ministry of the Environment required the formation of such a committee. It was not a typical CAP.

Panel members raised some questions:

- *Dwight has given us a history of a first and second version of CPAC. Why was the first version disbanded?*
A Panel member familiar with the situation in Elmira said that people quit the first version because of the unprofessional environment in which it operated. Another member added that the township mayor felt he needed to create his own process.
- *Community dialogue is part of Responsible Care. Are there any terms of reference that CIAC sets up for such dialogue?*
Bob Masterson responded that “the short answer is no. If a member company has 30 years of negative relations with the community, the standard of care expected by the Association is going to be higher.”
- *Who sets up the community dialogue? The company?*
Bob indicated that the company sets up the dialogue. CIAC can say the process is not working, but cannot prescribe a solution. The Association can give suggestions, however.

A Panel member commented that the reason Chemtura has made some progress in community dialogue is due to CPAC and CIAC. Bob remarked that the Chemtura and CPAC story is one that begs to be told for the chemical industry in Canada and, indeed, for industry in general. It is the story of the challenge a company can face when it loses the trust of the community.

For the NAP, John Vincett noted, the experience of CPAC and Chemtura is seen as a case study. If a company and its interaction with the community goes a bit rogue, how do we change that to a positive direction?

Panel comment:

Panel members suggested ways to make the company’s consultation with the community more credible:

- “The company needs to do what it says it is going to do and to be transparent going forward. The situation where one individual dominates discussion in meetings comes across as not transparent, regardless as to whether that person is a company leader or a community activist.”
- “Where there is a clash of opinions as to what the facts are, a common technique is to bring in an independent party to show what the actual facts are.” (Another Panel member, who sits on several CAPs, remarked: “The definition of ‘fact’ seems flexible. Somebody’s professional opinion is not necessarily fact.”)
- “You’ve got to look at where the process isn’t working, and CAP and company each have to give up some control.”

Thinking about the importance of CAP independence for credibility, a Panel member asked: Should CPAC work to get MOE out of the process? Another Panelist, who is also

a CPAC member, said, “We want the ministry involved, as they are the only body with authority. We don’t want the municipality involved.”

A member said that MOE should step up with a solution to the pollution problem in Elmira. Dwight said that the ministry has done that by giving a deadline of 2028 for a cleanup. However, noted a Panel member familiar with the situation, they don’t say how the cleanup should be approached.

Summary:

John Vincett offered the opinion, based upon his own consulting work with community engagement, that a successful CAP is like a three-legged stool: it has to have the right people as members, the right process and an effective and transparent company response. Common difficulties that CAPs can experience are with the role of the regulator at the Panel table; getting caught up in political process (usually through a local political agenda); and achieving a level of public discourse that can become counterproductive in the community. These are all difficult problems to solve, speaking both to structure (membership) and process.

Dwight added that the company has to make sure it gets what it needs from the process.

Agenda Item 5: R&D Tax Incentives

KPMG is an associate member of CIAC. KPMG Partner Bob Waterworth reviewed the Government of Canada’s Scientific Research and Experimental Development (SR&ED) program. He talked about the SR&ED tax credit, 2012 and 2013 federal budget changes, the U.S. R&D tax credit, and Ontario tax credits for expenses incurred in the province with eligible research institutes. He also talked about the Ontario Interactive Digital Media Tax Credit and the Apprenticeship Training Tax Credit.

Asked what are the government’s benchmarks for innovation, Bob said that any change to improve a product or technology could qualify.

It was remarked that most of applied R&D in Canada is done in the chemical industry.

It was suggested that CIAC invite Bob to present his SR&ED discussion to the Technical Management Committee so that this information can be shared effectively with member companies.

Agenda Item 6: Agenda Planning for Fall Meeting

The next National Advisory Panel meeting will take place in Fort Saskatchewan (north of Edmonton, Alberta) in October 2013. Panel members will fly to Fort Saskatchewan on

Monday, Oct. 7 and fly back to their homes on Thursday, Oct. 10. The meeting will be hosted by Dow and ME Global.

It was suggested that the Panel consider opportunities to meet with the mayors of Fort Saskatchewan and of Strathcona County and with the Alberta Industrial Heartland Association. There was a call to try to engage provincial government officials in the meeting. A Panel member suggested he might be able to get the deputy minister of the environment to speak to the group.

It was assumed that there will be a Dow/ME Global site tour. Also suggested was a meeting with the CAP(s) in a less structured environment. It was further suggested that the site tour include the town of Fort Saskatchewan, for context.

It was agreed that community events developed for the meeting could go to 9 pm.

It was noted that, in addition to Dow and ME Global, there are a number of CIAC member companies in Alberta, among them Chemtrade, Shell and Canexus.

Panel members put forward potential topics and issues to be discussed:

- Transportation of chemicals
- Pipelines
- Aboriginal issues (There are jurisdictions in Saskatchewan that have done a lot in this area. It was noted that Fort Saskatchewan is in aboriginal territory. What is the industrial impact of industry on that territory? There could be an opportunity to look at some regionally relevant issues to help work on the broader topic of Aboriginal engagement best practices for the chemistry industry.
- Emergency response; social media and CAER
- A number of new environmental projects organized by the Alberta Industrial Heartland Association; among these are efforts by Life in the Heartland, an initiative to provide information to communities on industry, development and operations specifically dealing with cumulative impacts.
- Promotion of Responsible Care by name
- Air pollution and monitoring (Some Panel members may want to see an air monitoring system. Cumulative effects on water and air was also suggested as a topic.)
- Cumulative effects of fracking in Alberta (some push-pull in the discussion—not just a company perspective). Although it was noted that fracking is an upstream

issue and beyond the purview of CIAC companies, other than in a more general sense of responsible behavior in extracting source materials.

- Issues relevant to Fort Saskatchewan and local facilities

A Panel member indicated she would be interested in going to Fort McMurray, even at her own cost. Bob Masterson said that Imperial Oil Limited would be the avenue for arranging such a trip.

Next Meeting

Fort Saskatchewan

October 7 (evening arrival) – 10 (morning departure), 2013