



CHEMISTRY INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DE
L'INDUSTRIE DE LA CHIMIE

Chemistry Industry Association of Canada
National Advisory Panel
November 1 – 3, 2017
Saint-Sulpice Hotel, Montreal

HEADLINE MINUTES

1. Introduction

John introduces new Panel member Nadine Blaney, Executive Director of the Fort Air Partnership in Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta. (p.3)

2. Panel Roundup

Panel members talk about issues in their own regions. (p. 4)

3. Perspectives Missing from the Panel Table

Panel members suggest a number of interest areas and types of expertise that should be represented on the Panel. (p. 6)

4. Public Perceptions of the Chemical Industry in Quebec

Yoann Guntzburger, a postdoctoral researcher at CIRANO (Center for Interuniversity Research and Analysis of Organizations) reviews several surveys that include data on public perceptions of the chemistry industry. (p. 8)

5. CIAC Update

Luc Robitaille presents Association update. Panel offers suggestions for Responsible Care Conference in 2019. (p. 9)

6. Climate Change and the Environment

Shannon Watt presents overview of federal and provincial initiatives on climate change, air quality and harmonization of hazardous waste as well as NERM data on member company emissions and emission intensity. Panel suggests a broad coalition to advocate for better government approaches to climate change. (p. 11)

7. CIAC and NAFTA

David Cherniak talks about CIAC's path forward on NAFTA. He answers Panel questions about implications for chemistry industry. (p. 12)



8. Global TV Program about Sarnia

Panel discusses how to address concerns about industry-community relations in the Sarnia area, highlighted by a recent Global News special presentation. Panel decides to write a letter to the CIAC Board about these concerns. (p. 13)

9. Health and Safety (SHARE) and Process Safety Update

Gilles Laurin presents overview of mandates of the SHARE and Process Safety networks. Panel suggests ways to re-engage CIAC members in these networks. (p. 14)

10. Cannabis in the Workplace

Luc Robitaille mentions discussions now going on in CIAC about implications of impending legalization of recreational use of cannabis. (p. 15)

11. Disruptive Forces

Panel cites disruptive forces on horizon that will impact the chemistry industry. (p.16)

Chemistry Industry Association of Canada

National Advisory Panel

November 1 – 3, 2017

Saint-Sulpice Hotel, Montreal

National Advisory Panel:

Michelle Adams

Nadine Blaney

Richard Janda

Brenda Lorenz

Pat McLean

Ken Ogilvie

Ron Ormson

Alex von Knobloch

Regrets:

Nadine Gudz

Jane Lister

Errol Mendes

Visitor:

Debbie Krukowski

(former Panel member)

Cirano:

Yoann Guntzburger

Dinner Guests: McGill Law Students

Mathieu-Rosaire Fraser Arcand

Julien Trambly Gravel

CIAC:

David Cherniak

Gilles Laurin

Luc Robitaille

Sharon Watt

PDA:

Francis Gillis

John Vincett

Agenda Item 1: Introduction

Panel Facilitator John Vincett welcomed everyone to the meeting. He noted several members who have had to resign from the Panel:

- Gail Krantzberg has other obligations and is moving on. We are exploring with her the concept of an outer circle of former Panel members who wish to remain involved with the Panel and could attend meetings when they take place in their own region.
- Andre Morriseau has had to leave the Panel due to some internal community matters. Andre very much regrets having to leave the Panel and will make a significant effort to find an Aboriginal replacement.
- Keith Purves is unable to travel to meetings due to health issues and so has resigned.

John introduced new Panel member Nadine Blaney, who is taking Keith's place. Nadine is Executive Director of the Fort Air Partnership, a not-for-profit organization that monitors air quality within an airshed near Edmonton that includes Alberta's Industrial Heartland. Panel

members met Nadine when the group visited the Fort Saskatchewan Air Monitoring Station during their meeting in that community in October 2013.

Agenda Item 2: Panel Roundup

Panel Members talked about issues in their own regions:

- The aquifer in Elmira won't be cleaned up by 2020. There's so much contamination that it's going to take much longer.
- Sulco has been a poster child for Responsible Care, and they have an understanding of community engagement that could be improved with broader participation.
- Hawk Ridge Homes' application for a residential development in a former apple orchard near the Sulco and Chemtura plants is still there, but not much is happening. Both plants have objected to the project. Community members have made strong representations to the Woolwich Township Council as to why the development should not go ahead. (Another Panel member remarked that the Province of Ontario has failed to develop effective zoning regulations.)
- Waterloo is a centre of high-tech developments in chemicals, despite the perception of chemicals as an old industry. The chemistry industry is not telling its innovation story. Meanwhile, the Government of Ontario is “putting a moratorium” on investment in science.
- In Canada generally, politics have triumphed over pipelines, regardless of the scientific information on safety.
- Electricity costs are a bigger barrier to investment in Ontario than wages.
- There is a heightened sensitivity to chemical issues, which is a serious problem given the lack of basic public education in chemistry and chemicals. CIAC needs to have a discussion about chemical issues and public perceptions, and how the public would respond to a chemical plant fire or a derailment of railcars carrying chemicals. Where do people go for unbiased information about chemical issues? (John Vincett noted that, four or five years ago, the University of Ottawa talked about setting up an independent source of chemical information.)
- The public cannot make distinctions between good and bad uses of chemicals. There is demonization of the industry as a whole.
- A root cause of the problem is that current politicians are scientifically illiterate.
- There has been a moratorium on fracking in Nova Scotia. Even research on fracking is not allowed. There is a complete lack of community understanding of this technology and a

lack of trust in all institutions. The Ecology Action group does not believe what Dalhousie University says. There is a real disconnect in understanding what the risks are.

- There is a massive contamination site near the Northern Pulp mill at Boat Harbour, where a local First Nations community and other residents have long complained about the toxic effluent from the plant. A CBC reporter did a feature about walking on the floor of Boat Harbour, which is springy and wobbles. Nova Scotia Environment imposed—and then for technical reasons retracted—a \$697 fine on Northern Pulp last year for violating air pollution limits. There is very little government oversight of industry in the province.
- The Fort Air Partnership in Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta, is an industrial association that monitors all aspects of facilities in Alberta's Industrial Heartland and their impact on the environment. The Partnership works with all industries and holds open houses for the public. In a recent telephone survey, about 60 percent of residents in the area rated air quality management as good. The Fort Air Partnership is very transparent and shares all data on air quality with the public. All in all, the Partnership is working well.
- The creation of the Fort Air Partnership was grassroots driven. The public did not trust government, so the Partnership was set up as a third-party monitor, but industry really got behind it. In taking steps to ensure good air quality, industry goes above and beyond what is required by government.
- To ensure the public understands the Air Quality Index, the Fort Air Partnership does quite a lot of public education and shares reports with the media. The Partnership operates a live data site, which lists emission exceedances and when they have occurred. If there is a spike in emissions, the company is asked why so the Partnership can report their explanation. Industry and Responsible Care work together. All industry is monitored, whether or not they are part of Responsible Care.
- Last year, the McGill Sustainability Systems Initiative (MSSI) launched solicitation of its experts in the sciences and humanities to propose Grand Challenges for sustainability in the 21st Century. The University is seeking a multi-disciplinary approach to such challenges. One of the three main research themes is Creating Sustainable Materials for the Future. Three goals have been identified:
 1. To develop *de novo* function driven materials and molecules that meet pressing societal needs (benign by design);
 2. To identify, characterize and assess risks associated with emerging materials and molecules—at the level of design and synthesis—with regard to human and ecosystem health (21st-century risk assessment);
 3. To understand and inform government and business policy that promotes responsible—rather than regrettable—stakeholder adoption and catalyzes the commercialization and scaling of sustainable materials while reducing extant risks to acceptable levels (stakeholder driven).
- Quite fascinating in Montreal is an ecosystem of research trying to connect life cycle

analysis with data. They are getting better at collecting and analyzing data on life cycle analysis. They are increasingly able to fill in knowledge gaps through advances in machine learning, built-in tracking of environmental impacts, and inter-university collaboration. All of this fit nicely with the goals and ethics of Responsible Care.

- Responsible Care is producing better impacts on the environment but is being undersold.
- There is going to be more and more pressure on the chemical industry and others to be transparent.
- Sarnia has had the same mayor for 25 years and the city council is fractious, with the result that not much is happening. Sarnia is changing from a dynamic demographic of young workers and families to a retirement community. Chemical Valley is perking along, though some companies are downsizing. Tech companies are bringing in new ideas. Research is focusing on biotechnology rather than manufacturing. So, life in Sarnia is going well, with some blips.
- Yes, Sarnia has a fractious council and Mike Bradley is going to be mayor for life. Public opinion about the mayor is positive right now. Industry in Sarnia is growing right now. The Global TV program, Canada's Toxic Secret, is fairly balanced reporting; it was harder on government than industry. It makes valid points, in spite of the sensationalism.

Asked about the Resident Relocation program in the Alberta Industrial Heartland, the Panel member said it has been fairly successful. John remarked that the Dow plant in Louisiana faced a similar situation, where industry was seen by many residents to be moving too close to their homes. They gave residents three options:

- Stay;
- Move to a new house provided by Dow;
- Have their old house moved to the new location.

John noted that a similar situation occurred in Fort Saskatchewan; industry there created a buy-out fund. This was a creative response; Alberta Industrial Heartland learned from the Louisiana experience.

Agenda Item 3: Perspectives Missing from the Panel Table

Panel members suggested a number of interest areas and types of expertise that should be represented on the Panel.

A member identified three types of panelist, each of which offers a different value: trend forecasters (probably academics); strategists; and observers.

Specific Panel suggestions:

- Tech savvy youth, who would bring a very different experience to the table (though their focus on social media is both a strength and a weakness)

- Plant community members
- Younger Aboriginal leaders with a connection to their community (the importance of Aboriginal representation was emphasized)
- Toxicology experts
- An international perspective
- Calgary oil patch expert
- Chemistry teacher
- Retired media person, e.g. Michael Keating
- An emerging bioeconomist, e.g. a recent grad in this field
- A retired Health Canada epidemiologist, e.g. Dan Krewski
- Someone with a strong understanding of life cycle analysis, e.g. Kevin Brady, who has retired from this field
- Also needed: people who are intelligent but not technically knowledgeable
- Knowledge of analytics, artificial intelligence
- Biotechnology R&D (relates to green chemistry)
- Major downstream customer; e.g. hardware
- Consumer awareness type of group (they keep an eye out for greenwashing)
- Product designers
- First responder
- Health expertise
- Environmental NGO
- Social scientist (with a focus on behaviour)
- Organized labour
- Environmentally responsible investors
- Retired thoughtful politician; e.g. Mike Harcourt
- Former chemical company CEO
- CEO of David Suzuki Foundation

The importance of getting the perspective of young people was noted. It was remarked that they have very different ideas on sustainability. Gilles added that they would come up with ideas we wouldn't even think of. John remarked that student visitors was a good idea.

John Vincett asked about the possibility of think tank representation. A Panel member thought that think tank members would be better as visiting resource people.

A member wondered if government representation on the Panel would be useful. Another member suggested a government visitor from time to time. John remarked that, in his experience, government people have a tendency to use Panel ideas to regulate, so perhaps government visitors would be better. A member said that the experience of government participation in advisory groups in Alberta has been different.

John noted that the Panel currently needs representatives from Sarnia, Quebec and western Canada. It was remarked that the national scope of the Panel has worked well.

Panel Meeting Process:

It was agreed that the Panel as a whole should interact quarterly. At least one of these interactions must be a face-to-face meeting; the other interactions could be webinar conferences. It was pointed out that the longer the lead time in scheduling meetings, the better for Panel members and the more likely that most members will be able to attend.

November/December and June were mentioned as good timeframes for the academics on the Panel.

It was agreed that plant tours were valuable and a tour every other year was suggested. It was noted, however, that a plant tour eats into meeting time. One way to address this issue would be to make the meeting a bit longer. The tour could be offered at the end of the meeting; those who had the extra time could take the tour in.

John put forward a new concept of an outer circle of former Panel members with a continuing interest in chemistry industry issues. Outer circle members could be pulled in to meetings on occasion; for example, when areas in which they have specific expertise or interest are on the agenda. As well, outer circle members could attend meetings if they occur in the region where they live and work. A member remarked that the value of an outer circle would depend on who was brought into it. John heard the Panel saying that membership in the outer circle should be by invitation.

It was noted that outside experts in the area where the meeting is taking place can be brought in at no cost. It was remarked that the visit by Yoann Guntzburger worked particularly well. Probably up to three such visitors per meeting would be workable.

It was observed that Panel visits with local community advisory panels have been valuable, in particular the two-way interaction.

Size of the Panel:

John noted that we have aimed for 16 members on the Panel, which generally means a dozen people will be available for any one meeting. This is a good system that works well.

Responsible Care Branding:

It was observed that Responsible Care is not branded in the community. It was suggested that CAPs should have a Responsible Care talk every year.

Agenda Item 4: Public Perceptions of the Chemistry Industry in Quebec

Yoann Guntzburger, a postdoctoral researcher at CIRANO (Center for Interuniversity Research and Analysis of Organizations) talked about public perceptions of risk (Appendix 1). He reviewed several surveys carried out from 2011 through 2016 that included data on public perceptions of the chemistry industry. He also drew on some elements of his PhD thesis to discuss public perception of risks and ethical risk management.

Among the key survey findings:

- Industrial chemical use: high perceived risk and low perceived benefit
- Low level of trust in government's management of industrial chemical use
- Survey respondents rather opposed to industrial chemical use
- High need for information in risk issues/projects, but 68% of Quebecers do not know where to obtain it.

Among the key findings about public perception of risks and ethical risk management:

- Continuous improvement of risk management and process safety over the past five decades
- Risk related judgments are a mix of cognitive and affective processes
- Risk assessment does not equal risk perception

Plan for action for a better engagement toward communities and social acceptability:

- Recognition and respect of the public and their perceptions
- Humility and honesty in our prediction and control capacity
- Need of paradigm change regarding reputation and accountability
- Iterative process between risk analysis and public perceptions: collaborative risk management for a better social acceptability: if public feels in control they are willing to take risks—connected to trust

Panel Comment:

Several Panel members called for industry to talk about the benefits of chemistry: the more the public sees the benefits of the industry the more likely they are to support it.

The importance of public trust was emphasized. If a relationship of trust has been built, the public are more likely to forgive a spill.

It was remarked that, today, social media has dramatically increased the need for companies to gain social licence: “I'm not breaking any laws doesn't cut it.”

It was suggested that engineering students today have an expanded consciousness about risk management.

The Panel felt that this was a good presentation. Sharing it with CIAC leadership groups was seen as one way to get this thinking to the senior levels of the industry.

It was remarked that “the blue book,” a CIAC publication written a number of years ago on the history of Responsible Care, which includes case studies, captures the ethical thrust of Responsible Care now being echoed in current thinking about building a relationship of trust with the public. It was remarked that this booklet should be mandatory reading for industry leaders. John noted that Panel input was behind the success of the booklet.

Agenda Item 5: CIAC Update

Luc Robitaille, Vice President of Responsible Care, presented a CIAC Update (Appendix 2). Luc covered three topics:

- Review of the Responsible Care Conference held last April in Toronto and discussion of plans for the next conference, including Panel role in the conference
- New RC verification option: Memorandum of Understanding between CIAC and the American Chemistry Council (ACC) involving CIAC recognition of RCMS/RC14001 certification as verification option for members:
 - roll-out planning
 - verification process
 - response from CIAC member companies
 - challenges
- Progress on CIAC membership: accomplishments; challenges; plans

Panel Comment:

Responsible Care Conference 2019

Luc had noted that, given the timing of the conference, there will be an opportunity to recruit speakers as high-profile people running in the federal election. A Panel member noted that there will also be some provincial elections taking place at that time.

It was suggested that there is an opportunity to tie the conference in with global issues. It was further suggested that there will be an opportunity to raise the profile of Canada to draw international and business people to the conference. It was suggested that CIAC members could focus less on technical issues and more on celebrating sustainability successes in this country. Luc noted that the conference will take place back-to-back with a meeting of the International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA), so there will be lots of international people on hand.

The international presence was seen as an opportunity to identify specific areas that individual countries are doing extremely well in. They could be invited to showcase their approach, and Canada could showcase what it does particularly well.

Additional suggestions:

- Highlight revolutionary breakthroughs in technology and sustainability
- Reach out to the general public, e.g. through a breakfast event
- Highlight that the chemistry industry is involved in the circular economy

Luc suggested holding a “Panel on the Panel.” Most other countries do not have such a process.

Regarding the role of the Panel in the conference, John said we will dedicate a teleconference on how Panel members might contribute usefully to this conference and which members should do what.

CIAC-ACC Verification MOU

It was noted that the ACC does not require public reporting of verification outcomes; they aggregate information rather than report on individual plants. Gilles Laurin, Director of Responsible Care, said that CIAC will insist that some kind of public report be part of the CIAC-ACC Memorandum of Understanding

A Panel member remarked that all member companies should be proactively reaching out to the public, even if there is no word change in the MOU.

Strange RFP from Environment Canada

Luc talked about a strange Request for Proposal from Environment Canada to develop “Best Environmental Management Practices Guidelines for the Management and Handling of Chemical Substances.” This RFP has come out at the same time as Ontario and other provincial governments are recognizing Responsible Care as a valid option for meeting many regulatory demands. Luc said that CIAC has agreed to do a gap analysis to point out that Responsible Care is already identifying and minimizing all potential releases from industry operations and doing much more than that to foster sustainability.

Shannon Watt pointed out that wholesale staff changes at Environment Canada, including retirements, means there is little or no corporate memory in the department. “They are in over their heads,” she said.

RC Toolbox

Luc described an element in the RC Toolbox that solicits best practice information from CIAC members. He remarked that such successful practices would probably be cited more often in social areas. A Panel member referred to the Scientific Research and Experimental Development (SR&ED) Program, a federal tax incentive program that encourages Canadian businesses to do R&D in Canada. He said that CIAC could help by running a workshop on the program or sponsoring a KPMG workshop.

Agenda Item 6: Climate Change and Environment

Shannon Watt, Director, Environment and Health Policy, presented an overview of federal and provincial initiatives on climate change, air quality and harmonization of hazardous waste as well as NERM (National Emissions Reduction Masterplan) data on member company emissions and emission intensity (Appendix 3).

Shannon noted that Environment Canada is re-doing six acts related to environment and climate change, commenting that their approach “feels very quick and dirty.” A lot of their changes seem to be ideology driven rather than fact based. For example, they talk about “complementary climate actions;” in fact, they are not complementary and, in some cases, contradictory.”

The increase in greenhouse gas reporting requirements to all three levels of government is not integrated, which adds costs and discourages investment in Canada. That said, CIAC supports

carbon pricing. The Association prefers Alberta's approach (a carbon levy is charged on all fuels) because it allows increases in total emissions as long as intensity goes down.

Shannon responded to Panel questions:

- *What is your take on Ontario's approach to carbon pricing?*
Like the federal government, Ontario hesitates to trust the market. The province's Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change brought in cap and trade but then added regulations. (David Cherniak noted that reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in the chemical industry has not been incremental; rather, the industry has achieved wholesale turnarounds.)
- *Is there any voice at the federal cabinet level articulating the business case for a market-oriented approach to carbon pricing?*
Only one voice in cabinet, that of Jim Carr, Minister of Natural Resources. The only Conservative voice is that of Ed Fast, Official Opposition Critic for Environment and Climate Change.
- *How will the federal government verify industry reports on greenhouse gas emissions?*
They will check into reports when the numbers raise questions.
- *Are the industry's emission reports broken down by region?*
We have a limited facility to break down reports for Alberta and Ontario. We are also able to measure some application effects; for example, insulation.

Panel Comment:

It was remarked that there is a real structural problem with how the federal government is moving on the climate change issue. “You need a bigger coalition than just companies to convince government,” a Panel member said. A second member, noting that Ontario has “hollowed out scientists and technocrats,” agreed that a coalition is probably the best course of action for dealing with the federal and provincial governments. It was suggested that industry would find an ally in the general public as well, once people are informed of the bureaucratic slowdown.

“Put together a multi-industry coalition,” it was suggested. “Then call the media.”

Agenda Item 7: CIAC and NAFTA

David Cherniak, Senior Policy Analyst, reviewed the statistics from 1994 through 2016 on the Canadian chemistry industry's trade with the United States and Mexico; he also talked about CIAC's path forward on the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) (Appendix 4).

David noted that CIAC made a submission on NAFTA to Global Affairs Canada in July 2017, indicating the priorities the Association would like to see in Canada's approach to negotiations: do no harm; go further and improve the Agreement.

CIAC released a statement in March 2017 on the substantial growth in trade with the U.S. and Mexico under NAFTA; the Association wanted to show the Americans how critical Canada is to their success. This information was shared with the public.

In discussions so far, David observed, the American negotiators have not given a lot of thought to defining protectionism. It is not clear at this point where the U.S. Congress sits nor how influential they will be. The White House is running the show; the President is not beholden to either the Democrats or the Republicans. There is some hope on the horizon for a good deal, but the unpredictable personality of Donald Trump makes it very hard to guess what the final outcome will be.

David remarked that trade agreements are a big priority for Canada. “2018 promises to be a very busy year (for the government and the industry),” he said.

David and Shannon responded to Panel questions:

- *Trump is talking about patriating more production to the U.S. Are chemical companies in Canada creating a common front with their U.S. partners?*

David: The chemistry sector is harder for the Americans to patriate. There is not a lot of thought behind the talk of patriation.

Shannon: The American Chemistry Council will, in a worst-case scenario, get its two biggest members to sue the government for loss of profit from thickening the border. Though they doubt it will come to that.

David: Retaliatory tariffs would mean complications at the border. Companies and their lawyers are just starting to look at a worst-case scenario.

- *Wouldn't the threat of retaliatory tariffs discourage the Americans from killing NAFTA?*

David: If NAFTA is killed, tariffs may not be a significant issue for the U.S.

- *How serious is the U.S. trade team now?*

David: On the biggest irritants, nothing concrete is happening right now. On lower level matters, lots of good work is being done.

Shannon: The Senate is the body that ratifies trade deals.

David: The President has a lot of say here. How Congress will react is not certain yet. This is a free trade re-negotiation; it will be a lot different from what NAFTA was originally intended to be. Ultimately, the deal will be handled at the political level. It's possible we will get an OK deal that allows the President to say: We've made America great again.

- *The final result may well have different effects on different CIAC members.*

David: We're working on that issue, still trying to figure it out.

Agenda Item 8: Global TV Program about Sarnia

The Panel discussed how they should address concerns about industry-community relations in the Sarnia area, highlighted by the recent Global News special presentation, *Canada's Toxic Secret: A*

troubling trend of leaks and spills in the Sarnia area. It was remarked that the program was fairly balanced but sensational. Also discussed was a letter to the Panel and to CIAC from former Panel member Kris Lee expressing concerns about the conduct of the Community Awareness and Emergency Response (CAER) process in the area.

A major concern is that Responsible Care companies in the Sarnia area are delegating their CAER responsibilities to the Sarnia-Lambton Environmental Association (SLEA), a cooperative of 20 industrial manufacturers that monitors ambient environmental conditions to assess the impact of its members on the local environment. Both Responsible Care companies and companies not part of Responsible Care are SLEA members. According to industry critics, SLEA is not meeting the Responsible Care commitment to foster Community Awareness. These critics say that CIAC members in the Sarnia area are not meeting the Responsible Care standard of community dialogue, including dialogue with the Aboriginal community located in Chemical Valley.

The Panel also discussed the recent Government of Ontario announcement of a study into the health effects of air pollution on residents of Sarnia and the nearby Aamjiwnaang First Nation. Panel members were pleased to hear about the announcement of the study and CIAC's welcome of this initiative. They noted, however, that the study will take a considerable amount of time, as all epidemiological studies do, and probably will not give the Aamjiwnaang community the answers they are looking for.

Regarding the Aboriginal community, it was noted that a number of their members work in the chemical industry, yet there has been a breakdown of trust. There were suggestions that giving the First Nations community access to the ongoing air monitoring results would help to restore trust. As well, since the First Nations community seems to be unwilling to come to community advisory panel meetings, industry needs to go to them.

After considerable discussion, it was agreed that the Panel should write a letter to the CIAC Board of Directors about the need for the Association to address the lack of the kind of industry-community dialogue in the Sarnia area that would meet the standard of Responsible Care. It was also agreed that the Panel, or at least several members of the Panel, should present and discuss the letter at a Board meeting in May/June 2018. There were a number of suggestions about the letter:

- Evaluate the community dialogue efforts to date, including interactions with the nearby First Nations community. Panel needs to call for community engagement.
- Give the Board a timeline to get back to us.
- Discuss two incidents mentioned in the Global News program that industry did not provide a public response to.
- But it's important not to paint all CIAC companies with a broad brush.
- Industry cannot just rely on government to address concerns about spills.
- This is a real opportunity for CIAC to show leadership.

It was agreed that the letter should talk about a more general concern about the implementation of CAER nationally, although in Sarnia, with Aboriginal issues front and centre, this is a good case study that requires action from CIAC.

Other Issues for Letter:

Asked about additional issues that the Panel would like to see addressed in the letter, members cited:

- Climate change and extreme weather events (Luc noted that CIAC has an official policy on climate change, which is published on its website.)
- Security issues
- Transparency about the relationship between petrochemicals and fracking
- Companies headquartered in the U.S. or Europe not joining CIAC as per the Responsible Care Charter

Conclusion:

It was agreed that the letter should be completed before the end of the year and delivered to CIAC by January 15, 2018, for inclusion in the briefing package that will go out to Board members for their meeting on February 8th. This will give the Board lots of time to consider the letter before the proposed Panel presentation at the Board meeting on May 30th.

Agenda Item 9: Health and Safety (SHARE) and Process Safety Update

Gilles Laurin, Director of Responsible Care, presented an overview of the mandate of the Safety and Health Analysis, Recognition and Exchange (SHARE) network as well as the mandate of the Process Safety network.

Gilles noted that there is a need to re-engage CIAC members in these networks. The Association had replaced face-to-face meetings with other kinds of networking around process safety but plans to go back to face-to-face meetings next year. The Association has collected process safety data and SHARE data but needs to do better analysis of the findings and way to share this information with the public. Gilles noted that CIAC used to have certificates related to SHARE and wondered if the Association should go back to this practice, the network is looking into reviving the annual process.

Panel Suggestions:

- Re-examine worst-case scenarios in terms of flooding. For example, Sarnia has an Intensity, Duration, Frequency (IDF) measure, which was recently updated.
- Find a company that has done a good job in health and safety and share with members.
- Stress testing would be good.

John referenced a worst-case scenario drill (involving Pickering Nuclear Generating Station, first responders and representatives of various government bodies) that will be conducted in December.

Asked if CIAC presented awards to members for excellence in health and safety practices, Gilles noted that there are SHARE certificates but not process safety certificates.

It was remarked that SHARE is a good news story to share with the public.

John asked if CIAC's new standard on process safety refers to the CSA standard. Gilles confirmed that the CIAC statement is fully compliant and most member companies are well above the new CSA directive.

Agenda Item 10: Cannabis in the Workplace

Luc Robitaille noted that, with the anticipation of the sale and use of recreational cannabis scheduled to become legal in Canada by July 1, 2018, the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (CCOHS) has published a White Paper to help workplaces prepare for the potential challenges and impact, such as impairment, that this new legislation may have on workplace safety.

Luc observed that, unlike the case with alcohol, the measurement of cannabis impairment is not clear-cut. For example, there can still be traces of cannabis in the body long after use of the substance, but there is no clear evidence that these traces cause impairment.

David Cherniak remarked that whatever testing for cannabis impairment companies now have will probably just remain.

Asked if CIAC member companies are discussing this issue with organized labour, Luc said that these discussions are just starting.

A Panel member noted that the business law firm McMillan has addressed medical marijuana in the workplace.

It was remarked that this was a case of individual versus collective rights: the latter “justifies zero tolerance.” While it was agreed that workplace safety has to take absolute priority, there was a sense that more work needs to be done to develop a fair test of impairment.

Luc noted that the SHARE group is now looking at the implications of the legalization of recreational cannabis use and will try to come up with recommendations for CIAC members.

Agenda Item 11: Disruptive Forces

The Panel met for dinner at a restaurant and cited disruptive forces on the horizon that will impact the chemistry industry:

- Carbon footprint issues
- Global markets: potential opportunities versus protectionism
- Public demand for transparency before granting companies a social licence
- The push toward a circular economy; demand for products that can be returned to the supply chain
- Terrorism, particularly low-tech acts like vans running into sidewalk crowds; lot of targets in the chemistry industry
- Unpredictability of world politics

- Population growth; ecosystem collapse

A Panel member commented that there could be positive disruptions. We are in the midst of a dramatic revolution, he said. Humans now have the ability to produce all our intelligence everywhere, which will produce a very different economy. There will be new ways to transact goods and services. He also referred to the ecosystem approach to science, talking about the writing of the late Dr. Stan Rowe of the University of Saskatchewan.

Luc Robitaille mentioned climate change and related population migrations. He also mentioned a lack of trust in science in some circles. A Panel member related the trust in science issue to a “proliferation of government decisions that are not fact based.”

Two law students from McGill University were guests at the dinner and added their view on disruptive forces:

Mathieu-Rosaire Fraser Arcand talked about a climate change struggle, greenwashing by corporations, and the challenge of reaching young people. He said that young people are more vulnerable to misinformation due to social media. Regarding the trust in science issue, Mathieu said that during the time of the Harper government, science was under attack.

Julien Tremblay Gravel said that the current generation is scientifically illiterate. At the same time, public expectations of information from industry are much higher.

Gilles Laurin remarked that governments are slow to act on major issues unless a catastrophe happens.