



RGI
Regulatory
Governance
Initiative

A CRITICAL CONVERSATION ON RAILWAY-SHIPPER RELATIONS

16 October 2014 | Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario

Report on Proceedings



Carleton
UNIVERSITY

School of
Public Policy and
Administration

A CRITICAL CONVERSATION ON RAILWAY-SHIPPER RELATIONS

On 16 October 2014 the RGI hosted a Critical Conversation on the current state of railway-shipper relations in Canada, bringing together representatives from Canadian National (CN) and Canadian Pacific (CP) railways, shippers, transportation associations, former senior officials of the Government of Canada, and academics, to actively explore this complex and challenging topic.

The event was intended to be a start in considering alternatives to rising government regulation of railway-shipper relationships; and in developing alternative mechanisms of governance that could play out closer to the marketplace—with appropriate considerations for economics, efficiency, capacity, and competition.

PREFACE

Railway networks are a vital component of Canada's trade-dependent economy. Many supply chains in Canada would not have grown to prominence without railways providing them with connectivity to global suppliers and markets. And with 21st Century globalization that dependence is rising.

The performance of railways affects virtually every player in the supply chains they serve, not just the railways' direct customers. In recent years the federal government has taken a more active role than it used to in dealing with individual shippers' complaints. Two new pieces of legislation to that effect were passed by Parliament in 2013 and 2014. But no matter how focused a piece of legislation is on a particular constituency, it always affects everyone in an interconnected system like this.

For Canada's network of rail transportation and those who use it, one of the toughest nuts to crack is to ensure reliable and fair service to every player—small and large—without undermining the finite capacity of the system or the stable flow of traffic. The balance is delicate.

Because all shippers have a right to access the system by invoking the railways' common carrier obligations, and because the system's capacity is finite and can partially collapse from congestion if over-accessed, the background paper for this event described the situation as analogous to a "Tragedy of the Commons."

With new business and global trade opportunities on the nation's doorstep, and with regulatory solutions having reached what looks to be about the limit of their potential to sort things out, there seems to be a need for new approaches to avoiding and resolving conflict over the uses and performance of the network.

RGI

The Regulatory Governance Initiative (RGI) at Carleton University builds on the proven track record of Carleton's School of Public Policy and Administration to develop regulatory capacity and competence through research, education, and dialogue. Its scope is regulatory policy, governance, and management. Its approach is holistic and problem-driven. The RGI assembles expertise from the humanities, social and natural sciences as needed.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution – Non-commercial – No Derivatives License.

© 2012 Regulatory Governance Initiative, Carleton University

SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS

1. Dr. Calum Carmichael | Director, School of Public Policy and Administration, Carleton University | *Welcoming Remarks*

Dr. Carmichael welcomed participants and explained that SPPA has provided an academic and applied perspective on public policy for more than 60 years, and is proud of the work of RGI, under whose auspices this Critical Conversation was being held. He stressed the event was inspired by recent rail-related developments, notably federal regulation of rail service, and their potential impact on the performance and efficiency of rail-based supply chains.

He encouraged participants to refer to the discussion paper prepared by John Coleman and Bruce Doern on “Railway-Shipper Relations in a Networked Governance Model” circulated to participants before the event.

2. The Honourable Perrin Beatty | President and CEO, The Canadian Chamber of Commerce | *Canada’s Trade Agenda—how opportunities from new trade agreements will create new challenges for transportation capacity in Canada*

Mr. Beatty said that Canadians are fortunate to enjoy one of the world’s highest standards of living and qualities of life. But despite such economic success, he argued, other countries are catching up and Canadians cannot be complacent and ignore the many current economic challenges. For example, Canada’s transportation network serves a critical role in moving people and commodities across a sprawling landmass but this network has encountered many multimodal issues in recent years, such as congestion, competition from American airports for Canadian travellers, and backlogs at ports and in supply chains.

One of the major issues affecting Canada’s economic potential, in Mr. Beatty’s view, has been recent government actions based upon political and not economic rationales, which have led to poor policy outcomes. He highlighted Bill C-30, the *Fail Rail for Grain Farmers Act*, as a case in which the federal government unfairly penalized railways for events that were outside of their control, such as the harsh winter of 2013-14. Mr. Beatty contended that the federal government should not dictate the amount of one commodity that should be shipped by rail, because this amounts to picking economic winners and losers. He expressed concern on behalf of the membership of The Canadian Chamber of Commerce that the continued politicization of transportation policy could lead to further market distortions and erase previous gains over the past 30 years from sector deregulation.

Mr. Beatty also described the current state of Canada’s international trade strategy. Canada has demonstrated an incremental and slow approach to trade expansion, when it should instead pursue a challenging trade policy, such as setting measurable targets for trade between Canada and Asia. Although NAFTA fundamentally changed the way Canadian businesses operate, changing patterns of global trade have brought about a reorientation from a north-south focus to trade relationships with partners overseas. He cited two recent agreements where Canadian businesses must take advantage of access to new markets in South Korea and the European Union, not to mention the potential for gains from current trade negotiations with India and the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Mr. Beatty stressed that the Canadian economy may not have rebounded as quickly as it did from the 2008 Great Recession were it not for its abundant natural resources and strong infrastructure system that enabled the shipment of commodities quickly to other areas of the world. He portrayed this as a cautionary note about the importance of transportation. He said that Canada needs a natural resources strategy that will make the case for the importance of resources to the economy and will develop a framework to help businesses to get goods to markets in an efficient manner. And he noted that Canada's "infrastructure debt" unwisely compromises the ability of businesses to deliver goods on time, on price, and in a dependable way. According to Mr. Beatty, Canada must ensure it has the infrastructure to enable it to continue as a leader in the global economy.

Looking ahead, he described the current *Canada Transportation Act* Review as an opportunity for transportation reform, and he encouraged participants to come forward and provide recommendations to the Panel in the coming months. He also highlighted the Asia-Pacific Gateway and Corridor Initiative as a model for business and government collaboration. Access to international markets is critical and Canada must have an efficient transportation network to maximize benefits from our supply chains to capitalize on these markets.

3. Nick Mulder | Deputy Minister, Transport Canada (retired) | *Shippers, Rail Transportation, and the "Tragedy of the Commons"*

Mr. Mulder outlined the evolution of federal regulatory reforms in Canada's railway industry. Beginning in the 1970s, the federal government sought to increase competition among railways and shippers by reducing its regulatory reach and encouraging the pursuit of market principles. During the 1980s, reforms were made to historic practices governing the transport of grain; and other, more targeted, railway regulations were introduced as well. By the end of the 1990s, the government had fully privatized CN, further reduced grain regulations, eliminated freight rate subsidies, and enacted simpler branch line abandonment procedures. The past 15 years have seen smaller changes, such as improvements to Final Offer Arbitration and a greater focus on service obligations. As a result of these reforms, Mr. Mulder pointed out the Canadian railway industry has become one of the most efficient in North America, with leading performance indicators in operational performance, safety, and fuel efficiency.

He drew attention to the declining operating ratios of Canada's Class 1 railways, which have decreased to values close to 60 percent, indicating a financially-healthy ratio of revenues to expenditures. But while these low ratios have produced many benefits throughout the rail industry, Mr. Mulder questioned whether such low numbers could be accompanied by negative effects for many rail stakeholders in such things as further branch line abandonment, diminished rail service east of Montréal, and reduced standards of service and possibly also of safety. How low can operating ratios go? he asked.

Mr. Mulder identified and explained four key issues within the rail sector. First, there have been heightened concerns from shippers in recent years over an alleged decline in service levels. The federal government responded with the passage in 2013 of Bill C-52, the *Fair Rail Freight Service Act*. Second, concerns by farmers over the railways' rate of transporting the record crop of grain during the Winter of 2013-14 led to the passage of Bill C-30, the *Fail Rail for Grain Farmers Act*, which in Mr. Mulder's view was a poor response to the issue. Third, high-profile rail accidents including one in Lac Mégantic, brought the federal government to implement new regulations governing safety, as well as new requirements for liability and compensation. And fourth, the

recently-begun statutory review of the *Canada Transportation Act* is a response by government to a wide range of transportation policy issues, which Mr. Mulder described as a useful vehicle for rail stakeholders to identify their concerns and call for changes they think important. Still, he questioned whether the focus of the review should not be on a wider set of transportation issues and challenges and less on the rail sector.

As to whether the railways and its users are in a “Tragedy of the Commons” situation, Mr. Mulder thought they were not, because (a) railways are privately-owned, not publicly; (b) their use is not free; and (c) they have conditions of access that users must meet. The key to improved service, he said, lies in an increased federal focus on needs and service agreements, as well as on investments in equipment and track to ensure all parties meet contractual obligations.

Mr. Mulder stressed that current rail-related challenges should be viewed as supply chain issues, not just rail issues. As a result, all stakeholders have an important role to play and must engage in productive collaboration to ensure economic success. Governments should continue to provide opportunities for railways and shippers to discuss service issues, he said, but should also devote more attention to other transportation issues like the efficiency of gateways and reduction of congestion.

4. Phil Ireland | Vice-President, Service Design and Asset Optimization, Canadian Pacific Railway (retired) | *Network Performance, Capacity, and Stability of Traffic Flow*

Mr. Ireland encouraged participants to consider railway management in the context of multiple supply chain networks. He explained that railways operate at their full potential when following three key design principles: velocity, balance, and network. Velocity refers to the rate at which traffic flows. When maximized on a 24/7/365 basis, railways will provide the fastest possible service and get the maximum throughput from the rail system. Balance refers to running equal-directional flow along rail corridors to prevent congestion and get empty cars quickly back to origin for re-loading. The network principle refers to strategizing and managing the rail system as a unified entity with all of its parts interconnected, with its assets fluidly deployed across its multiple lines of businesses, and across the multiple supply chains they serve.

Mr. Ireland described railway network planning as a complex process that starts with the forecasting of traffic demand and identification of customer needs. The end piece is a resource plan to deliver the railway’s entire book of business for all its customers; and in between are highly-detailed plans and schedules. All of them must be integrated or nothing will work.

He stressed that despite the characteristic efficiency of rail networks they have certain vulnerabilities that need to be dealt with in particular ways:

- small ripples anywhere in a supply chain can lead to huge variations in railway performance. The amplification process is often a result of individual players over-reacting to the ripples. The phenomenon is called the “bullwhip effect”.
- railways are susceptible to random events, often beyond their control; for example the delayed arrival of a vessel can disrupt rail operations at the port and send perturbations all along the rail network and the supply chain that depends on it.

- the primary countermeasure to these inherent vulnerabilities is for all players to work together continuously to minimize the ripples and strive for network balance.
- the maximum possible service to shippers is synonymous with maintaining stability in the flow of traffic on the rail network. The alternative is congestion.

Mr. Ireland concluded by noting that rail networks—the movement of trains and freight cars on the labyrinth of tracks—are extremely complex and need a continuous supply-chain flow to remain stable and efficient. Stakeholders need to keep in mind the “big picture” in order to maximize economic benefits from the railway system. The challenge for stakeholders is to determine the type of railway and shipper governance regimes that will drive the next order of change while maintaining network stability.

5. Bob Slater | Executive Director, Regulatory Governance Initiative, Carleton University | *Dispute avoidance, Critical Conversations, and Introductions to Roundtable Work*

Dr. Slater gave an overview of dispute avoidance and dispute resolution. He argued that many disputes are unavoidable in practice but must nonetheless be resolved whenever possible. In situations where the two parties see the dispute as a difference of their respective *interests*, there is a possibility of a civil resolution (like negotiation or mediation); but if they see the dispute as a disagreement over *principles*, then litigation or arbitration is likely to result. Disputing parties, he said, always need to keep the two situations separate and adhere to the maxim, “Mediate on interests, litigate on principles.”

Dr. Slater stressed that parties in a dispute are generally better off trying to resolve it themselves rather than relying on government-run processes or the courts. The latter are typically cumbersome, expensive, and protracted, and they are adjudicated by people without the knowledge and expertise already vested in the parties.

He pointed out numerous advantages of mediation and negotiation, including speed; the avoidance of costs; the maintenance of privacy, confidentiality, flexibility, and future business relationships; and the greater likelihood of finding creative business solutions. Among the recommended techniques to help avoid and resolve disputes included clarifying the facts, locating common and supportable interests, focusing on solutions, maintaining calm, striving for quality, and bringing expertise and experience to bear.

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS

Dr. Slater described the roundtable process and explained what was being asked of participants: to consider and answer the following two questions:

- 1. *Do we need a new mechanism to improve business relations between railways and shippers in order to capture economic opportunities?***
- 2. *Do we need marketplace or government tools, or a combination?***

The following report of discussions is an amalgam of (a) the main points reported orally by rapporteurs from the tables; (b) discussions at each table as heard by the Critical Conversation's organizers; and (c) ideas contributed by participants after the event.

Most participants agreed that railways have generally performed well within their supply chains, but service needed improving in the "first and last mile". Some shippers said that railways should consider their clients as more than just rail cars, and should take into account their diverse commercial needs.

Participants identified issues they believed were unlikely to be resolved except by new approaches which might be incorporated in a new governance model. Here are their main conclusions:

1. General

There was widespread agreement by participants that a new mechanism or governance model would be preferable to the status quo.

There was virtually unanimous agreement that no one solution will satisfy everyone, and that players not accommodated by current or potential reforms may need a different mechanism or approach.

Many participants noted the *Fair Rail Freight Service Act* is a potentially-useful mechanism to deal with railway-shipper relations, but it lends itself mainly to large- and medium-size shippers and does not provide particularly useful tools for smaller ones.

2. Accountability

Under the *Fair Rail Freight Service Act*, shippers can hold railways financially responsible to a certain extent for contractual breaches; but the process is difficult and expensive; it does not apportion financial liability to all the players who contributed to the breach; and it cannot take into account the full costs and benefits of options being considered by arbitrators, because the process is not part of business dynamics in the marketplace where the economics are automatically "baked into" every decision.

3. Capacity constraints

Some participants found it remarkable that railways consider network "stability" to be essential for providing shippers with good service. The conundrum is explained by the need to avoid congestion. But not everyone agreed that railways are "at capacity" on at least some parts of their network, or that the onset of congestion is an early indicator of a given corridor approaching the upper limit of its throughput capacity. No mechanism exists at the moment to reveal the facts in a form that all parties consider credible.

ANSWERS

1. *Do we need a new mechanism? Yes*

2. *Do we need marketplace or government tools, or both? Probably both*

- *need considerably more emphasis in future on marketplace tools and approaches*
- *need to let Bill C-52 fully settle out before considering further legislation*
- *need to let Bill C-30 expire with no extension, and avoid similar legislation in future*

4. Surge capacity

Many participants spoke about the need for surge capacity in the system, and for a means of enabling (or encouraging) negotiated solutions to the critical questions of how much is optimal, who should carry it, and who should pay for it.¹ These questions are at the heart of many disagreements over service problems.

5. Communications

A major part of the problem between railways and shippers boils down to insufficient communication. Both sides have the same overarching goals of improving their economic performance, and ensuring the financial health of everyone else in the supply chain. But misunderstanding abounds, key information often arrives at the last minute, decisions with far-reaching effects are taken by individual players without sufficiently informing or accommodating others, and inquiries about service and traffic are met too often with no response. One or more ways of enabling or encouraging high-value communications to take place regularly among the players in supply chains could be highly valuable.

Participants said that a mechanism like the Asia-Pacific Gateway Performance Table in Vancouver is good in principle, and can be helpful in practice if attended by senior people from the companies involved, especially if they have scorecards supported by data.

6. Forecasting

Many participants said that shippers of all sizes need to be pro-active and provide forecasts to railways about upcoming traffic and its projected growth, so that railways can absorb more shipper-related information to help them plan the delivery of service. Some shippers said they do that now and find it helps their business.

Current mechanisms seem insufficient to enable or encourage the amount of forecasting needed.² A mechanism seems to be needed that makes data-driven forecasting an integral part of the rail transportation system.

7. Data

Participants said that more and better data was essential for improving accountability, communications, and forecasting. Many said that government is a logical choice for acquiring certain kinds of performance data and generating and disseminating reports, partly because of the efficiency of having a single collection point and partly because of the impartiality government brings to supporting the credibility of the data.

8. Misaligned strategies

Some players in most supply chains have strategies that are not aligned with each other. For instance, ocean carriers optimize to different goals than land-side service providers do. Slow steaming to save

-
1. One participant (a shipper) asked if it is wise for shippers to build their businesses on a just-in-time strategy in the assumption that railways serving them will always have enough surge capacity.
 2. Some shippers interpret the common-carrier provisions in the law as giving them a dispensation for not providing forecasts at all.

fuel is an example. That means there are structural causes of service-difficulties built into the network. There is no mechanism at present to deal with this problem. A data-driven system with key performance indicators (“KPIs”) seems to be needed so that all supply chain players can respond in near real-time to adjust their operations on a fluid basis.

9. Perceptions

There was broad agreement by participants that many current issues are not solely a railway problem, and need to be perceived as a problem affecting every player in the supply chain. Some shippers who perceive things that way report having found it beneficial to take ownership of the performance of every upstream and downstream link rather than considering it a challenge for railways alone to sort out.

Some smaller shippers perceived that railways act high-handedly, for example by refusing to consider even minor changes to one-size-fits-all service level agreements, and by not returning phone calls to help resolve problems.

At least one railway is understood to be working on first-mile / last-mile improvements, but the beneficial results from those initiatives are not yet widely-enough known to overcome many shippers’ perceptions to the contrary.

A new approach seems to be needed that encourages or otherwise ensures that the circumstances giving rise to negative perceptions by shippers are being systematically managed and reduced at a pace that shippers actually notice.

10. System-level behavior

Some participants identified service problems whose solution depends in part on shippers acting in concert. One shipper raised the problem of “mired cars”.³ Railways have said the solution depends in part on many shippers acting in concert (which in some cases would be temporarily against their individual self-interest) but there is no mechanism to encourage such self-restraint to occur.

11. Recent legislation

Virtually all participants thought Bill C-30 was too invasive. Some thought Bill C-52 was as well. Many said that government intervention should be directed instead towards (a) obliging railways to meet regularly and diligently with shippers to hear and take into account their concerns, and (b) exhorting and encouraging railways and shippers, both, to perform better. In particular:

- **Bill C-52, the *Fair Rail Freight Service Act*:** Many participants pointed out that it is virtually untested. They said it should be left to settle-out so everyone can learn how well it works.
- **Bill C-30, the *Fair Rail for Grain Farmers Act*:** Most if not all participants said that by favouring one sector above others this legislation distorts the marketplace; that it has caused non-grain customers to get reduced service; and that it should not be renewed when its term is up.

3. Trains sometimes set off cars in sidings along the route for various unplanned reasons, where they (the cars) may sit for days or weeks because subsequent passing trains are at maximum length. If the cars are carrying a unique cargo, the intended recipient may run out of inventory.

12. Canada Transportation Act

Participants said that most of the basic commercial elements in business-to-business relationships can be negotiated between railways and shippers. The use of remedies provided in legislation should be a last resort.

One participant said that several very good elements in the *Act* are underutilized because they are costly and slow, and because there is an imbalance in financial capacity between the railway and the shipper. Final offer arbitration and level of service complaint mechanisms need to be refined so they will be used more frequently. If done successfully it would generate a collection of jurisprudence and help railways and shippers evaluate probabilities and thereby drive settlement.

13. Best practices

Some terminal operators report having invested in new loading facilities and seeing considerable benefits for themselves as a result. This improved their “first mile”. They urged other shippers to examine their own facilities—were they designed 20 years ago?—and to take full ownership of the entire business of loading. It should not take a government mechanism for this to happen; it is part of how shippers choose to run their business.

Some participants said that local railway managers seem to have too little authority to resolve problems. They recognize the reality of highly-networked operations, but nevertheless called for individual railway managers to have more scope to fix problems for shippers. It should not take a government mechanism for this to happen; it is part of how railways choose to run their business.

One shipper reported meeting with railway people at nearby rail yards to build understanding and rapport. This is best done regularly because of staff rotation in both organizations. It includes riding at least once in a locomotive on a local pickup and delivery run down the line that serves them, in order to learn the impediments and sources of delay faced by train crews on a typical run. What they see is often very enlightening. It should not take a government mechanism for this to happen; railways and shippers have the wherewithal to do this on their own.

14. Options

Many participants said that the railway-shipper dynamic should include more competitive options that allow shippers to choose non-rail alternatives to meet their shipping needs. That would encourage railways to adopt more attentive business relations with shippers.

DISCUSSION OF IDEAS

Dr. Doern thanked participants for their viewpoints on railway-shipper relations. He acknowledged the difficulty of addressing such large policy questions in only a half-day session, and suggested that participants consider returning in the near future for more in-depth Critical Conversation discussions, such as dealing with shipper relations in other modes or examining how railways internally manage stakeholders.

He also highlighted the issue of determining the level of surge capacity that stakeholders should maintain within supply chains. He mentioned that contingency funds enable choices for supply chain members

when faced with difficult economic circumstances, and noted that governments have made use of contingency funds to deal with unexpected budget shortfalls.

Another potential policy question is to determine the right form of government infrastructure funding in light of government fiscal restraint. For example, Dr. Doern explained, many countries consider infrastructure funding as public assets and seek funding relationships with other stakeholders, such as capital markets or private investors.

Dr. Doern concluded by noting that governments must carefully consider the full implications of regulations when contemplating reforms. He highlighted the ongoing *Canada Transportation Act Review* as an example of opportunities available to stakeholders to express their ideas and concerns and ensure they are adequately prepared for future legislation.

CLOSING REMARKS

Dr. Slater thanked attendees for participating in the event and emphasized that it was the first step toward more detailed conversations on railway-shipper relations. He encouraged participants to contact the RGI with any comments or suggestions of topics for future sessions.

Annex I - Agenda

A Critical Conversation on Railway-Shipper Relations

16 October 2014

8:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.

Senate Room, 608 Robertson Hall, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario

- 8:00 a.m. Light Breakfast
- 8:30 a.m. Welcome and introduction to participants, roundtables, and speakers: **Dr. Calum Carmichael**, Director, School of Public Policy and Administration, Carleton University
- 8:40 a.m. *Canada's trade agenda—how opportunities from new trade agreements will create new challenges for transportation capacity in Canada.* Speaker: **Perrin Beatty**, President and CEO, Canadian Chamber of Commerce
- 9:05 a.m. *Shippers, rail transportation, and the “Tragedy of the Commons”.* Speaker: **Nick Mulder**, Deputy Minister, Transport Canada (retired)
- 9:25 a.m. *Railways in multiple supply chains—network performance, capacity, and stability of traffic flow.* Speaker: **Phil Ireland**, Vice-President Service Design and Asset Optimization, CP (retired)
- 9:45 a.m. Break and Refreshments
- 9:55 a.m. Dispute avoidance, Critical Conversations, and Introductions to Roundtable Work (by **Dr. Robert Slater**, Executive Director, RGI, Carleton University)
- 10:10 a.m. Roundtable Discussions:
- *Do we need a new mechanism to improve business relations between railways and shippers in order to capture economic opportunities?*
 - *Do we need marketplace or government tools, or a combination?*
- 11:15 a.m. Roundtable Reports (by panel of rapporteurs, one from each table)
- 11:50 a.m. Questions, comments, discussion of ideas and further work needed (Led by **Dr. Bruce Doern**, Professor Emeritus, Carleton University)
- 12:20 a.m. Summary of ideas presented, and their implications for governance of railway-shipper relations (by **Bruce Doern**)
- 12:40 p.m. Closing Remarks by **Dr. Robert Slater**
- 12:50 p.m. Catered lunch for all participants



Annex 2 | Participants

PARTICIPANT	POSITION & ORGANIZATION
Erika Adams	Research Associate and Event Coordinator, RGI
Bob Ballantyne	President, Freight Management Association of Canada
Perrin Beatty	President and CEO, The Canadian Chamber of Commerce
Joe Butts	Director, North American Logistics, NOVA Chemicals
Calum Carmichael	Director, School of Public Policy & Administration, Carleton University
Philip Cartwright	Director, Transportation, Infrastructure & Communities, Global Public Affairs
James Clements	VP, Strategic Planning and Transportation Services, CP
John Coleman	Senior Fellow, RGI, School of Public Policy & Administration, Carleton University
Amy DiGiovanni	Government Affairs Manager, Chrysler
Rob Bryson	VP, Grain Group, Parrish & Heimbecker
Kristine Burr	Assistant Deputy Minister, Policy, Transport Canada (retired)
Mark Davis	PhD Candidate, School of Public Policy & Administration, Carleton University
Bruce Doern	Professor Emeritus, School of Public Policy & Administration, Carleton University
Andrea Graham	Manager, Business Development, Kinder Morgan
Ian Hamilton	VP, Marketing and Business Development, Hamilton Port Authority
Phil Ireland	VP, Service Design and Asset Optimization, Canadian Pacific Railway (retired); currently Consultant, Jexi Inc.
Michael Kearns	Supply & Logistics Manager, McAsphalt Industries
Mike McDonald	VP, Operations, McAsphalt Industries
Randy Meyer	VP, Corporate Development & Logistics, Altex Energy
Nick Mulder	Deputy Minister, Transport Canada (retired); currently Consultant & Senior Associate, Global Public Affairs
Daniel Olivier	Director, Business Intelligence, Port of Montreal
Jean Patenaude	Assistant General Counsel, CN
Shauntelle Paul	Assistant VP, Car Management and Service Delivery, CN
Carmela Sacco	Associate Vice President, Transportation, Canadian Tire Corporation
Bob Slater	Executive Director, RGI, School of Public Policy & Admin, Carleton University
Patty Toner	Consultant - Transportation, Infrastructure & Communities, Global Public Affairs
Steve Tripp	Head, Worldwide Vehicle Transportation, Chrysler Corporation
Debra Van Holst	Global Business Director, Polyethylene, NOVA Chemicals
Ginny Venslovaitis	Director, Transportation Operations, Hudson's Bay Company
Tom Waskiewicz	Director, Rail Transportation, Ingredient