



# **SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC SAFETY**

**Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 4 – May 21, 2013**



**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

**Twenty-Seventh Legislature**

## **SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC SAFETY**

Mr. Darryl Hickie, Chair  
Prince Albert Carlton

Ms. Danielle Chartier, Deputy Chair  
Saskatoon Riversdale

Mr. Herb Cox  
The Battlefords

Mr. Roger Parent  
Saskatoon Meewasin

Mr. Warren Steinley  
Regina Walsh Acres

Mr. Doyle Vermette  
Cumberland

Ms. Nadine Wilson  
Saskatchewan Rivers

[The committee met at 08:59.]

**The Chair:** — Good morning, everybody. I want to welcome you to the meeting of the Special Committee on Traffic Safety. I'm Darryl Hickie, the Chair of the committee. I want to introduce the other members of the committee at this time. I've got Herb Cox, Roger Parent, Warren Steinley, Nadine Wilson, Danielle Chartier is my Deputy Chair, and Doyle Vermette.

Today is the first day of the committee's public hearings on traffic safety. In March of this year, the committee was issued the following order of reference for the Legislative Assembly:

That a Special Committee on Traffic Safety be appointed in accordance with rule 150(1) of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan* to conduct an inquiry on matters related to:

Improving traffic safety and reducing fatalities by examining the dominant factors that cause traffic collisions in the province. [These are] impaired driving, distracted driving, excessive speed, intersection safety, and wildlife collisions as well as [looking at] education and public awareness issues related to traffic safety; and,

That the said committee shall hold public hearings to receive representations from interested individuals and groups and report its recommendations to the Assembly by August 30th, 2013.

Over the last two months, the committee planned the inquiry process, deciding on time and locations of meetings. The committee agreed that the stakeholders and the public should focus upon the five dominant factors that cause traffic collisions: impaired driving, distracted driving, excessive speed, intersection safety, and wildlife collisions.

The committee has scheduled a total of eight meetings across the province. We begin our public hearings in Regina in room 8 of the Legislative Assembly building today and tomorrow, May 21st and 22nd. The committee convenes in Estevan on Tuesday, May 28th at the Days Inn. On June 3rd and 4th, the committee holds public meetings in Saskatoon at the Travelodge Hotel, on June 5th in Prince Albert at the Quality Inn, and meets in Pelican Narrows at the Office Hall on June 10th and in La Ronge at the La Ronge inn and suites on June 11th.

Within the next four weeks, the committee will be hearing from SGI [Saskatchewan Government Insurance] and other stakeholders, including the general public. The committee will continue to accept written submissions of recommendations until June the 6th that the committee will use in consideration when making its final recommendations.

After these meetings, the committee will table a report with the Legislative Assembly which will then be made available to the public. This report, along with the testimony and written submissions provided to the committee in the upcoming weeks, will be available for the public as well.

All the committee's public documents and other information pertaining to this inquiry are posted at the Legislative Assembly

website at [www.legassembly.sk.ca](http://www.legassembly.sk.ca). You can click on this link to the Special Committee on Traffic Safety. The hearings will be televised across the province and will be live streamed on the Internet. Check the website for information regarding locations, cable companies, and channels. Past proceedings of the committee will be archived and available on the website as well.

This is for the media and public decorum. I would like to advise the media and general public of decorum to be followed while the committee meets. The public and media are invited to attend the public proceedings, based on seating availability. Photography, videotaping, or recording is not permitted while the committee is meeting. The media may access the audio proceedings from the audio box provided. Any media interviews shall be held outside the committee room and footage of the committee may be taken before or after the committee meeting.

Witness process. Before we hear from our first witness, I would like to advise witnesses of the process for presentations. I will be asking all witnesses to introduce themselves and anyone else that may be presenting with them as well. Please state your name and, if applicable, your position within the organization represented. If you have a written submission, please advise that you would like to have it tabled. Once this occurs, your submission will be available to the public. Electronic copies of tabled submissions will be available on the Legislative Assembly website.

I will then ask you to proceed with your presentation. Once your presentation is completed, the committee members may have questions for you. I will direct the questioning and recognize each member that is to speak. Members are not permitted to engage witnesses in any debate, and witnesses are not permitted to ask questions to the committee members.

Our agenda allows for a prescribed time period for each presentation which will include both the presentation and questions and answers afterwards. I would also like to remind witnesses that any written submissions presented to the committee will become public documents and will be posted to the Legislative Assembly website for public viewing.

Having said all that, today we have SGI. And I've asked SGI to present on the five factors along with any other relevant information they have. I would understand this is going to be three hours long so, I think, depending upon the volume of the first two presentations, especially the driving while impaired and the distracted driving, we'll probably take a break at some point to stretch our legs and kind of refresh our minds.

But before we proceed, I have another procedure I have to follow here as well. We have to table the following documents: TSC 2/27(21) through to TSC 26/27(3).

Okay. Welcome. So we will now turn over to the presenters.

**Presenter: Saskatchewan Government Insurance**

**Mr. Cartmell:** — Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name's Andrew Cartmell. I'm president and CEO [chief

executive officer] of Saskatchewan Government Insurance. On my right, I have Earl Cameron, vice-president for the Auto Fund. And on my left, I have Dr. Kwei Quaye, assistant vice-president for traffic safety services for SGI.

Just before we begin, we do have handouts of our presentation. Would the committee like copies of those?

I would like to start by thanking the committee for its time and your commitment to traffic safety. Traffic safety is a major concern in Saskatchewan. With 180 deaths, 2012 was one of the deadliest on our roads in the past two decades.

Per capita, more people die on Saskatchewan roads than anywhere else in Canada. Perhaps even scarier is that traffic fatalities are trending down in most of the country, yet they're trending up here. From the chart you can see Saskatchewan's line is the top line. At best it's flat. It's perhaps even trending slightly upwards. Our sister provinces in the West are clearly trending downward, as is the Canadian-wide average.

Interestingly in the 1980s and 1990s, injury and fatality rates dropped dramatically across Canada. Kwei will show this later. This chart you have in front of you just shows the last basically five years. So while there have been dramatic improvements in traffic safety across Canada, several decades ago, more lately particularly in Saskatchewan, it's flattened out and in fact may even be slightly trending upwards.

The next slide shows the same thing but for injuries per 100,000 of population. Saskatchewan has the second highest traffic injury rate in Canada. Only the Yukon Territory is higher. A strong Saskatchewan economy and a growing population are resulting in more drivers and vehicles on Saskatchewan roads, which will increase the number of collisions in Saskatchewan and likely will increase the number of injuries per 100,000 population.

It's time that we worked together to improve the safety on our roads, reduce collisions, prevent injuries, and save lives. While SGI is responsible for most road safety legislation, regulations, programs, and policy, I think it's a problem that's bigger than SGI. It's a problem that needs a concerted effort from the various stakeholders and the general public.

SGI recommends a comprehensive traffic safety strategy that brings together the various stakeholders such as SGI, the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Highways and Infrastructure, Ministry of the Environment, policing services, and municipalities to combat road safety issues and reduce the number of lives lost and people injured on Saskatchewan roads.

SGI's presentation will follow these 10 steps. Kwei will walk you through our approach to traffic safety, which uses the safe systems framework and an overview of collisions in the province. He'll then get into some of the key factors contributing to the cause and/or severity of traffic collisions in the province, specifically impaired driving, distracted driving, excessive speed, intersection safety, seat belt use, and wildlife.

We'll pause for questions and discussion after each section. Kwei will then discuss some of the current traffic safety initiatives and some possible solutions going forward.

Questions and discussions are welcome as we walk through the current initiatives and possible solutions. And with that, I'll hand it over to Kwei to take you through the bulk of the presentation.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Thank you very much, Andrew. As Andrew indicated, our approach to looking at traffic safety is based on something called the safe systems framework. To address traffic safety issues, we believe that there are four important prerequisites that are necessary for successful traffic safety programming, and these are strong legislation, adequate and visible enforcement, timely and targeted education, and good engineering. I would like to emphasize that it is important to note that we cannot advertise our way to traffic safety. We cannot just rely on the enforcement alone to be successful with traffic safety. What we need are all these four elements working together and in concert to allow us to be successful.

Essentially the safe systems framework recognizes that humans make mistakes and as such, traffic safety measures must go beyond just looking at the driver or the road user as the one to blame. Historically our focus at SGI has been on strong legislation, timely and targeted education, as these components relate more to our line of business. However, in most of the investments that we have made, and we'll see some of these later, we try as much as possible to bring in engineering measures. We try as much as possible to invest in law enforcement because we believe that, without these elements, the success of our programs are heavily, heavily compromised.

The safe systems approach essentially allows the other elements that we've noted here — engineering, enforcement, and education — to help assist the driver, to help create the more forgiving environment in the event that the driver makes a mistake, and essentially to help make the roads as safe as we could make it.

And I'll go on to expand a bit on some of the elements that Andrew noted in his introductory remarks. In 1969 there were 223 fatalities on Saskatchewan roads. In 1974, which you see is the peak year for fatalities, there were 306 fatalities on Saskatchewan roads. As Andrew mentioned, in 2012 we recorded 180 fatalities on Saskatchewan roads.

We know that the population has changed somewhat in Saskatchewan. In 1969, according to our records, there were about 958,000 people here in Saskatchewan. Last year, 2012, we had 1,080,000 people here in Saskatchewan. We've also seen shifts in the number of drivers in Saskatchewan. In 1969 there were 495,000 drivers in Saskatchewan, in 2012 about 740,000 drivers here in Saskatchewan.

The number of vehicles on our roads has also gone up. While as we'll see on this graph, per 1,000 population, a decline over time with respect to the number of fatalities here in Saskatchewan, in recent years you will note that it stagnated. And if you observe carefully, we unfortunately observe an increasing trend in the number of fatalities here on our roads.

The decline that we see here can be attributed to many things: huge improvements in road engineering, huge improvements in vehicle engineering, huge improvements in medical care, huge improvements in understanding traffic safety. Changes in

legislation such as seat belt laws, drinking and driving laws have all contributed to this trend. What we see though is that it seems as if we've stagnated. And if we keep doing what we're doing today, we will see this increasing trend, and unfortunately we will see lots and lots of loss of life.

The picture with respect to injury is the same. The explanations are identical or similar. Injuries in 1969, there were 6,614 injuries due to traffic collisions here in Saskatchewan. It peaked around 1975 when we had about 10,299 injuries on our roads. Last year in Saskatchewan we had 6,996, almost the same levels as we had in 1969. We also acknowledge again that the number of vehicles on our roads have gone up. The decline that we see is encouraging, but when you place this in the perspective of what's happening in other jurisdictions in Canada, like Andrew indicated, you notice that Saskatchewan is over the top when it comes to number of injuries per 100,000 population in Canada.

Huge challenges remain, as I indicated: 180 fatalities in 2012, almost one every two days. Almost 7,000 injuries in 2012, again almost 20 a day. These have implications. They have implications in terms of claims costs. It has implications in terms of lost productivity. It has implications in terms of pain and suffering, and it has implications in terms of quality of life.

A little bit more with respect to fatal collisions. This gives you an indication of where these fatal collisions and fatalities are taking place. The vast majority of the fatal collisions, about 80 per cent of the fatal collisions and roughly 40 per cent of the . . . [inaudible] . . . collisions that we see on our roads, occur outside major cities. And these are mainly within RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police] jurisdictions. And we indicate within RCMP jurisdictions intentionally because, as you see later on, that is an area that we would like to see a lot more emphasis put on.

[09:15]

On average, the collisions in the RCMP jurisdictions result in about 3,200 injuries and 142 fatalities each year. And although the numbers for 2012 are still being completed because some injury reports and fatal reports keep coming in, we've had about 3,217 injuries, and 165 fatalities have been reported in these areas.

Based on these statistics, and we've looked at the injury statistics very carefully, we at SGI came to the conclusion that some of the principal causes of these crashes are impaired driving, distracted driving, excessive speeding, lack of seat belt use. We see a lot of wildlife type crashes happening in this province, and these are all contributing to these inordinate number of collisions.

When we talk impaired driving, distracted driving, and speed, just those three factors alone, either alone or together, they contribute to about 67 per cent of the fatalities that we see on our roads and 51 per cent of the injuries that we see on our roads. So these areas become areas that we believe deserve a lot of emphasis. Seat belt use do not necessarily result in crashes, but they produce a huge mitigation in terms of the consequence of crashes.

Wildlife collisions, we'll see they all do not particularly contribute to lots of fatal collisions or injury crashes, but they are one of the predominant contributors to property damage with the crashes, which caused over 40 million each year here in Saskatchewan. We'll see a lot more detail on some of these as we go through the slides.

We'll take each of these important areas in turn and try to delve as much as possible to get some understanding as to what is driving these types of crashes, and we'll start with impaired driving. Impaired driving is the major contributing factor in fatal crashes in Saskatchewan. It's been for a long time. Between 2000 and 2012, on average we've had 41 per cent of the fatalities in this province has been the result of impaired driving. Twelve per cent of the injuries on Saskatchewan roads have been the result of impaired driving or have been alcohol related.

As you can see from the chart on the screen, when you look at across Canada — and this data is from a MADD [Mothers Against Drunk Driving] Canada report, mothers against drinking and driving report that compared the statistics across Canada with respect to fatalities per 100,000 population — you can see that Saskatchewan does not fare very well. We have had this status for a while, and it is important, we believe, that things change so that we can reduce these numbers.

Alcohol-related crashes are generally more severe as compared to other crashes. I'm saying that because, like I said before, it is usually in combination with speed. And on average, 37 per cent of alcohol-related crashes result in injury or death as compared to 10 per cent for all other crashes.

This slide provides some information on alcohol-related crashes for 2011 and 2012. And what we want to do is to paint the picture with respect to the number of collisions that actually take place. And you'll notice we have injury collisions, fatal collisions, and we have injuries and fatalities. In terms of terminology, the injuries just mean the number of injury casualties that result from the injury collision. So you will see that there were 381 injury collisions, but there were 634 injuries in 2011, which means that there were multiple injuries in each collision.

The same goes with fatalities. The important thing that . . . Some thoughts that I'd like to bring across with respect to these crashes, that on average that 74 per cent of the victims in these crashes are male; 66 per cent of the victims in these crashes were drivers and operators. That indicates that about 34 per cent of the victims were passengers or other, or pedestrians. So the victims of impaired driving crashes are not necessarily limited to the drivers of the vehicle because their actions tend to hurt or injure other people. Twenty-four per cent of the victims were passengers in vehicles, and 10 per cent of the victims were pedestrians.

In terms of the types of vehicles involved, 45 per cent were vans and trucks; 33 per cent, automobiles; 4.6 per cent off-road vehicles; and 3.4 per cent were motorcyclists.

Approximately 95 per cent of the impaired driving fatal collisions and 56 per cent of impaired driving injury collisions occur outside of urban centres. By outside urban centres, we're

talking about the provincial highways, rural roads, and First Nations roads.

Although we have these statistics with respect to the overconcentration of these crashes on roads outside urban areas, it is important to note that they could be feeder communities. You have a city like Prince Albert which will be, could be a feeder community to highways around it or rural roads around it, or even Regina or Saskatoon, where people might originate with respect to where they start to drink. The fatalities might occur on these main roads, but the origin of some of these drinking usually come from these feeder communities. So it's important to, you know, keep that in perspective.

This graph shows the incidence of fatalities, drinking and driving fatalities, with respect to age, this 2012 alcohol-related collision data by age. You can see from the graphic, you know, without even doing a little math that there is a significant concentration of these types of collisions among the younger age group, drivers 20 and below. In fact drivers who are 18 to 20 years of age account for only 5 per cent of the drivers in Saskatchewan, but when we look at the involvement in fatal, alcohol-related collisions, they represent about 18 per cent of those collisions that we see. You'll recall earlier on I did indicate that 66 per cent of the fatalities are drivers or operators.

Some interesting things that, interesting numbers that we have with respect to blood alcohol concentration of these drivers who were involved in fatalities are important to note. About 82 per cent of the drivers who are involved in fatalities had a blood alcohol content above the legal limit of .08. Sixty-two per cent of the drivers who have been drinking and were involved in fatal crashes had a blood alcohol content of above 0.16. That is twice the legal limit. We have 6 per cent in the .04 to .08 range and 12 per cent less than the .04.

The average BAC, blood alcohol content, when we pull the data on drivers involved in fatal collisions, the average BAC of drivers who have been drinking was 0.19 for Saskatchewan drivers. This is more than twice the legal limit, about 2.5 times the legal limit. There's a lot of heavy drinking and driving going on and this is reflected in the fatalities that we see.

The next couple of slides show Criminal Code convictions in Saskatchewan for impaired driving and drivers over .08. Impaired driving is a charge that's laid when the officer does not necessarily have the driver blow into an instrument, but have reason to believe that the driver is impaired and lays a Criminal Code charge because of that. Over .08 is reflective of the situation where the driver blows into an approved instrument and blows over the legal limit of .08. These statistics are statistics that reflect cases where a conviction arises as a result of a drinking and driving incident.

You will see from the graph that in 2012 there were over 2,500 convictions for impaired driving .08 and above. There were 530 convictions for impaired driving here in Saskatchewan. It seems to be trending down. There are many reasons for that. The reason could be there's less impaired driving, which we are skeptical that's the case. The other reason is because law enforcement resources are not enough or they're not catching enough people as a result of that. We at SGI, you will see later on that we invest a lot of resources to assist law enforcement to

be out there to be able to identify these drivers, and this is in spite of our efforts to get law enforcement out there to catch as many drinking drivers as possible.

This slide shows 24-hour roadside suspensions. And 24-hour roadside suspensions can be issued by law enforcement for drivers who blow above the legal limit and also for drivers who blow between .04 and .08. The blue line or blue chart — blue bar, sorry — indicates the number of suspensions related to .04, .08. And those, the red bars show those related to over .08 or refusal.

It is important to note we are encouraged to see because we've been encouraging law enforcement to try as much as possible to veer away from relying on only the 24-hour suspension charges and to, as much as possible, lay a Criminal Code charge or bring the offender to the police station to let him blow into an instrument. And this is reflected in some of the numbers that we see here on the graph.

This chart shows 24-hour roadside standard field sobriety test for drugs- and alcohol-related convictions. And what I think the point we want to drive across with this particular graph is that, apart from the fact that we have a serious alcohol-related problem, on top of that is a drug-related problem, a drug-related problem that seems to be growing, as a matter of fact.

Some work done by CCMTA, the Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators, in 2010 indicated that for drivers who were fatally injured in Saskatchewan, about 50 per cent of those drivers when tested had signs of some licit or illicit drug present. The report does not indicate that the presence of those drugs necessarily contributed to those crashes, but I think the mere presence of this is an indication that we do have a drug-related problem as well on top of the issues to do with alcohol.

In 2009 the federal government held a review of the Criminal Code of Canada with respect to what could be done to improve impaired driving — improve the Criminal Code, make changes to the Criminal Code — to improve impaired driving in Canada. And in one of the submissions made to the committee that held these hearings, it was indicated that the chances of being caught for impaired driving ranged from 1 in 2,000 trips to 1 in 500 trips. If we bring this to bear here to our picture in Saskatchewan, you notice that anyone who's caught as a first offender for drinking and driving is not really, truly a first offender if these numbers, you know, hold true here in Saskatchewan, but could possibly have been driving maybe about 2,000 times impaired before they even come across a police officer.

When we look at impaired driving, fatal drivers in fatal collisions, again coming back to the 66 per cent that I spoke about earlier on, and look at the prior convictions for Criminal Code offences for these drivers, these are some stats that we found: 73 per cent of those drivers who died as a result of an impaired driving event had never come across a police officer. They had no prior Criminal Code conviction — 73 per cent. Eighteen per cent had come across a police officer once, just one conviction, and 9 per cent two or more times. If we look at those drivers again with respect to alcohol-related injury crashes, 59 per cent had never come across a police officer, 29

per cent just once, and 12 per cent two or more.

[09:30]

The point we'd like to bring across with this and with regard to this 1 in 2,000 and 1 in 500 is that those who die as a result of alcohol-related crashes or kill people as a result of alcohol-related crashes are not necessarily people who have been stopped by the police even once. A majority of them have not been stopped by the police even once.

This graph illustrates repeat impaired driving convictions in Saskatchewan. And like you can see from the graph, this is for data from 2008 to 2012. Those who have had only one conviction over that period, those are 15,170. Two convictions drops dramatically to only 1,238; and as it goes to third and more, it just tapers out. So this again is reflective of the probability that somebody's going to be caught for impaired driving. Most people might be caught only once, and using the 1 in 2,000 and 1 in 500, they are not necessarily first-time offenders, but that is the time, the only time because of the law of probability, that they got caught.

This ends our presentation on the numbers with respect to impaired driving. And I think I'll pause here in case there are any questions for us.

**The Chair:** — Yes, thank you very much. If we can take a pause after each one of these presentations, it makes it a lot easier. Because the data is interesting, but of course there's lots of questions that come out of that. So I'll entertain questions from any of the members now. Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — I think the one thing that's interesting to me is that .08 and police resources, having spoken to police officers about some of their challenges, I know you've said SGI's been encouraging police to, instead of the 24-hour suspension, encouraging officers to bring people down to the station to blow.

But having spoken to police officers, some of their frustration is around resources, being pulled . . . It's a three- or four-hour process. And you've got busy nights and obviously that's a question of resources then, I think. Are you hearing from the police services that that's some of the challenges? So it's time consuming to pull an officer out of the field, but it's also incredibly frustrating because impaired driving charges are beatable if you have the financial resources for legal fees. So are you hearing from police services those concerns?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes, we surely are hearing from police officers in the service with respect to those concerns. Some of the things that we've done was to invest in overtime hours. We call it Operation Overdrive, which has been going on since early 2000, you know. 2001 I think, we started a program where we actually pay for officers' overtime hours so that they can be out there to supplement the regular hours when they, you know, they try to enforce impaired driving.

With respect to the onerous process involving processing a Criminal Code conviction, we've heard numerous times from them. We have in fact been in discussions with our counterparts at a national level and the federal Minister of Justice in Canada,

to look at ways and means in which this can be made better.

In the meantime, some of the ideas that we've discussed with them are the possibility of making administrative laws a bit stronger for police to be able to, at the roadside, be able to, you know, when they lay a charge or even issue a roadside suspension, the suspension is severe enough that it can in fact lead to deterrence of that behaviour.

So we are approaching this on multiple fronts. And I think that some of the solutions that we'll present today is reflective of those types of discussions and our intention to move in that direction.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you. Just a follow-up. In terms of what you're speaking to your federal counterparts or the federal government, what kinds of things are you in discussion about?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Essentially at the federal level, the discussion has been with respect to other ways and means to make the processing time for an impaired driving conviction shorter, other ways and means. It's something that they've been grappling with for years. I wouldn't say there's a solution yet. There's been lots of tinkering, with respect to the Criminal Code, to consolidate the types of charges and convictions that come out of an impaired driving event to make it simpler for police. But at the same time it is still time consuming.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. Thank you for that. I'll defer.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Parent.

**Mr. Parent:** — I had a question about page 8, a couple of questions there. The one you have undefined, one at impaired fatal collisions at 61 per cent, what do they mean by undefined?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Eight? That's the graph?

**Mr. Parent:** — Page 8 chart, the top half of that page. This one here. What do you mean by undefined?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Undefined. We rely on these locations based on information that we get from the police with respect to where the crash took place, so when we have a report and the location that the police gave. So if they don't give us a location for where the crash took place, we do not have a code for it in our database. So it could be anywhere, but we don't have information. So that's why it's labelled here as undefined.

**Mr. Parent:** — I was just wondering because that's an awful high amount, 61 per cent. The other question I have . . .

**Mr. Quaye:** — 61 per cent? No, that's major highways. Maybe the colours could be off. No, 61 per cent is major highways. Undefined is the top bar, the slim top bar. Sorry. Sorry about that. Our colours are a bit mixed up.

**Mr. Parent:** — The other thing is, I didn't understand, or I didn't catch it: you said between the ages of 18 and 20?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes.

**Mr. Parent:** — What percentage of the drivers are that age?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Five per cent.

**Mr. Parent:** — Five per cent. And 18 per cent are in fatal collisions?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes, 18. Eighteen are involved in alcohol-related fatal collisions.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay. Then I had another question. On the Criminal Code convictions, impaired driving and over .08, versus 24-hour roadside, 2011 you have 2,824 over .08. Is that also part of the 3,981 in 2011 on 24-hour roadside? Or are they 6,800?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Not necessarily. I would say it is . . . They are related, but not necessarily. Because there are people who are charged for impaired driving in, let's say in 2010. And they fight it and fight it and fight it. So their suspension will occur in 2010, but their conviction might not occur until about 2011 because they have a good lawyer who delays and delays and delays.

**Mr. Parent:** — What I'm saying is those two charts, like it shows two different numbers for 2011: one where they get suspended and one where they were charged for .08. Like, 2011 has 2,824 and then you've got, in 24-hour roadside, you've got 3,981. So is there 6,800, over 6,800 that were stopped and were either given a 24-hour suspension or were given a .08 Criminal Code conviction? And then some got lost of course, and some didn't. Some had good lawyers, as you say.

**Mr. Quaye:** — The 24-hour suspensions, let me . . . When you're stopped for a Criminal Code conviction, for instance, you're stopped by the police. You blow into the roadside device and it indicates that you are over .08. They take you to the station and you blow into another instrument, and there they lay the charge if it shows that you are above .08. But in addition to laying the charge they can, they will issue a 24-hour suspension, right. Not all those charges are successful, so this will be reflective . . .

**Mr. Parent:** — That's not what I'm talking about.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Okay.

**Mr. Parent:** — On the Criminal Code convictions you have 2,824 that were impaired driving or .08 — all right? — in 2011. Then you go to the next slide, 24-hour roadside suspension. And in 2011 you had 3,981 who had the suspension. So you're saying there was 2,824 plus 39 for 6,800 that had been . . . or is that 2,800 part of that 3,900?

**Mr. Quaye:** — It's part of it. It's part of it. But because the conviction arises out of the charge, this . . .

**Mr. Parent:** — Yes, I'm not worried about conviction. I'm just asking how many were stopped and either given a 24-hour suspension or were charged. Or are they the same thing?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I'll try and explain that. It's in addition to the charge. There was, I see the number here, 3,981 24-hour suspensions laid in addition to those charges of the 2,824.

**Mr. Parent:** — That's what I want to know. So that means that it was over 6,800 who had been checked, so to speak.

**Mr. Cameron:** — No, some of those would be the same. Because what Kwei was saying, I go to the police station. I blow a .08. They charge me. They also give me a 24-hour suspension. That shows up there.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay. That's what I . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — If I don't blow over .08, they'd probably still give me a 24-hour suspension so that shows up over there. That's why the difference in numbers.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Cox.

**Mr. Cox:** — Just on that same graph, just for clarification, what is the difference between impaired driving and over .08? You've got the blue and the gold there. Are they both not the same?

**Mr. Quaye:** — No, .08 you actually blow into an instrument and there's a reading. Impaired driving, the officer has reason to believe that you're driving, you're impaired whilst you're driving. He doesn't necessarily get you to blow into an instrument, but he can still charge you under the Criminal Code. So those are the differences. So you can be charged for impaired driving or you can be charged for above .08.

**Mr. Cox:** — Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Steinley.

**Mr. Steinley:** — I do have one quick question regarding the fatalities. You said there's 180 fatalities in Saskatchewan in 2012, and then if you go to the graph on page 6 at the top where it says fatal collisions by location, it only shows 150 fatalities. I'm wondering where the other 30 fatalities were in the province.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Which page was that?

**Mr. Steinley:** — Page 6, the top graph where it says fatal collisions by location. One hundred and thirty-seven and 13 only add up to 150. So I'm wondering where the other 30 are, that you said there's 180 fatalities in 2012.

**Mr. Quaye:** — The first one is alcohol related. Notice that?

**Mr. Steinley:** — No, it's before impaired driving. It's page 6 at the top. It has nothing to do with . . .

**A Member:** — I think that's referring to the collisions, and how many. So you could multiple . . . [inaudible].

**A Member:** — It's collisions and fatalities.

**A Member:** — [Inaudible] . . . the number of deaths.

**Mr. Steinley:** — That's perfect. Okay . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes. This is vehicles, yes. Okay.



**Mr. Quaye:** — One is fatalities and one is fatal . . .

**A Member:** — Collisions.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. Yes.

**A Member:** — There could be more than one person killed.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes.

**Mr. Steinley:** — Perfect, thank you.

**The Chair:** — I have some questions. I guess to clarify for the people on the committee, when an officer — because I used to do this — when an officer pulls you over, there's two charges that can be laid as a result of an impaired. It's over .08 based on the instrument reading, plus there's also care and control of the vehicle. So that's the differentiating. There's actually two charges that fall under that. Now sometimes you do not get the .08 charge over because a lawyer will fight the actual reading and the judge will still find you to be in care and control of the vehicle. So you can still be impaired because you're driving while impaired. So that's the difference.

So at the time you actually pull a person over, you take them to the station. You do have the instrument. You blow. The officer issues a 24-hour suspension. This is a question I guess I'd like to have answered by the SGI members, if you could pay attention. Thanks.

So an officer brings a person into the station, issues a 24-hour suspension immediately upon finishing the test results. Then the officer issues what's called a seven-day temporary licence which allows the person to get their affairs in order, is the definition or the direction we were given in the law enforcement community. Then after . . . The same time that's going on, there's an appearance notice made to appear in court, which usually is within the first three or four weeks if it's possible, where a person will lay a guilty or a not guilty plea.

Can I ask — and I have multiple questions here so I hope the committee bears with me — can I ask who decided and what was the parameters or the discretion used to figure out why you get a seven-day temporary licence permit?

[09:45]

**Mr. Cameron:** — I'm sorry. I don't know where that came from. It was some time ago.

**The Chair:** — Can't answer the question? Okay.

**Mr. Cameron:** — No, but we can do a . . . We can undertake to find out why that . . .

**The Chair:** — I appreciate that, because it's just one of those things that's been . . . It was an issue in the law enforcement community, and what Ms. Chartier talked about after talking to the law enforcement community plus having been a member, we couldn't understand why that was put in place. It doesn't seem . . . You've been charged. You're given a 24-hour suspension. Why would you have a seven-day temporary licence?

So the next question is this. Has SGI looked at, given what's happening across the country and from statistics and research, has SGI considered taking the 24-hour suspension off the table and having an administrative sanction such as a 72-hour suspension instead of 24 hours? Has that been considered?

**Mr. Cameron:** — When we get to our recommendations, we're going to look at some of those things.

**The Chair:** — Okay.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Trying to make it tougher for impaired drivers so they can't get back on the road as soon.

**The Chair:** — Okay, that's good. Can I also ask another question? You've done really good work on the Overdrives and the STEP [selective traffic enforcement program] enforcement for overtime. I think the committee members recognize that there's going to be some need to have enforcement initiatives as a result of this report that could take a number of years before we actually get a complement of new police officers on the streets actually doing these jobs. In some cases it could take a full year before we have the officers out.

Would SGI be prepared to take a recommendation, accept a recommendation to pay for overtime on weekends because we typically see an increased impaired driving rate on Friday, Saturday nights? Would SGI be prepared to pay for additional overtime costs for not just urban but RCMP officers as well to look at interim actions to take place and then have the policing section of the Ministry of Justice analyze that as well? Would you be willing to take that recommendation and do that?

**Mr. Quaye:** — I think, with respect to the magnitude of the problem and the amount of resources needed, we believe that will be a band-aid kind of solution. I'm saying that because we have overtired ourselves for here in Saskatchewan . . . [inaudible] . . . enforcement for a long, long time. We have put in significant amount of resources in terms of overtime into RCMP jurisdictions, and the numbers that we see, like we've indicated before, we've seen a plateauing of these numbers.

I think something more significant is needed than overtime hours on top of what we have. What we've seen with the police resources that we have now is, because of the amount of manpower or officer power that's available right now, there's so much limitation in terms of how many additional hours they can actually add to that to be present on the roads. So that could sort of help the problem a bit, but I don't think the impact is going to be very significant.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. No, I agree. This is just an idea I had over the weekend, looking at some of the data that because whatever the committee recommends, it's going to take a long time to even get one new officer on the street, whether it's urban or RCMP. So just wondering is that . . . You know, SGI should be prepared for a recommendation that we do in fact look at some interim and other additional Overdrive measures.

And Fresno, California has a great program where they actually have a very dedicated law enforcement division that works just nights and they work . . . They do what's called bar watch. I think that's something that could be done immediately to help

as a band-aid, yes but as a measure going forward. So I think . . . Earl, do you want to answer that question?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes, I just wanted to comment a bit on it. I agree with you completely, Mr. Chair. The targeted approach is much better than the broad approach, and whether it's certain hours, certain days. But Overdrive, Kwei is exactly right. You can't keep working overtime and exhausting your resources. And you're going to see some of the numbers that show up, and same with when we discuss the RID [report impaired drivers] program, why some of those things just . . . You just don't have enough resources. We have to be more effective and more targeted.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Ms. Chartier, I think you had a question.

**Ms. Chartier:** — A couple, actually. With respect to . . . Well now we're talking about Overdrive. Just for everybody here, can you describe a little bit more in detail what exactly Overdrive is and how it works.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Enforcement Overdrive, we started in collaboration with the Regina Police Service in I think the year 2001. It involves SGI providing resources, funding, to the police agency. The police agency commits to hold a number of blitzes, impaired driving blitzes, over the course of the year. We agree on a timetable, and they make their officers and their vehicles and their resources available to go out, say, for a certain number of hours over the course of the year. And it is principally targeted at catching impaired drivers.

The program has evolved over the years. It used to be the case we jointly decided on the locations for these blitzes, and it could be outside a bar or on a major road. We'd plot it out on a map where most of the collisions or charges are taking place, and they go out and they hold a blitz. There are two types: they can have one that is on a major street like Albert Street during, close to rush hour, and that is principally for awareness, making people aware that they're out there. Or they could target a location where, a drinking establishment per se, where drinking and driving might originate.

Right now they've indicated, the police have indicated to us that it's more efficient for them to form small groups of officers that rove around the city and try to move from location to location rather than being at fixed locations.

So that's principally what Overdrive . . . We provide money; they provide the enforcement; and it's targeted at drinking drivers.

**Ms. Chartier:** — So it relies on then police services having officers come forward, saying they're willing to work the overtime then. So it's not a voluntary program, but it requires a police service that has officers who are willing to work overtime. Is that correct?

**Mr. Quaye:** — That is correct. Fortunately for us, all the police agencies in Saskatchewan have been very, very collaborative with us, helpful, very interested in this. And we have all the police agencies in Saskatchewan participating in Enforcement Overdrive right now.

**Ms. Chartier:** — How much does SGI spend on Overdrive?

**Mr. Quaye:** — In 2012, we spent about \$483,000 on Enforcement Overdrive.

**Ms. Chartier:** — So are you paying for the top-up overtime hours? Are you paying . . . You're paying for extra officers for those extra hours their full salary, or is the individual police service paying for X amount, and then SGI's . . .

**Mr. Quaye:** — No we foot the whole amount. Like the overtime hours required to provide our service is footed by SGI.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. Thank you for explaining Overdrive a little bit better.

A second question: I'm wondering, in your recommendations, will you talk a little bit more about illicit drugs? I know you've just briefly touched on it here, but obviously it is a problem; you look at literature elsewhere. Will you be talking a little bit further about drugs?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes, there is one specific recommendation that is targeted at drugs. Right now with respect to drugs, SGI works with the police to help them train officers in something called a standard field sobriety testing procedure and drug recognition on the roads. So we provide funding to allow them to be able to train as many officers as possible.

The whole issue of drugs and impairment is still evolving. It's not like alcohol where there's been years and years of development, and there is a per se amount of .08 where we know somebody can be charged criminally. With drugs, there are many different types of drugs, and there's no real instrument that has been created that can measure how much drugs you have in your system and what level of impairment that caused, that can create.

So the Criminal Code has established a procedure using drug recognition experts where you go through a series of tests, standard field sobriety tests. And if they suspect there's a drug present, the individual is taken to the police station and they follow a whole bunch of steps to be able to do it.

What we're doing and what we are limited to doing right now is to provide funding so that the police can get the necessary training to be able to do that, but it still remains a challenge. However in our recommendation, we think the consequences for somebody who's stopped and caught by the police and suspected of drug impairment is still too lenient, and there is an opportunity to create more deterrence by making it more strict than it is right now.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Can I ask . . . You said what we're limited to doing right now is just providing those resources for training. So what is limiting you? Is it legislation? Is it technology? I understand some jurisdictions have actually moved quite far on technology. Like in Australia they're using testing, random testing frequently for drugs. But so I'm wondering what are the barriers or what is limiting SGI and the government for all intents and purposes.

**Mr. Quaye:** — We're limited by what's in the Criminal Code

of Canada.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay.

**Mr. Quaye:** — We're limited by the processes that have been established. We're limited by the fact that I indicated earlier on: there is no instrument that has been developed that can quickly test somebody for a drug. It is a trial and error and expertise type of process right now where the officer says, I suspect this individual will have some marijuana in his system. And he has to go through the process of eliminating and checking for marijuana. So I would say it is even more onerous than processing an impaired driver who's impaired by alcohol. Unfortunately that's the state of the technology so far, and we are working within those limits.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. So obviously the Criminal Code is federal jurisdiction, but is there anything that you will be . . . You will be addressing this here then in your recommendations, things that could improve or allow police officers better opportunity to catch people who are driving while impaired with other substances.

**Mr. Quaye:** — We will continue to provide funding for them to get the training, to get the necessary training. And one of the recommendations we have is that if somebody is stopped and fails the standard field sobriety test for drug-related reasons, right now the consequence is a 24-hour suspension. We are asking for that consequence to be much longer than a 24-hour suspension. We are asking for the consequence to be extended to a 30-day suspension, particularly for the younger drivers.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you very much for that.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Vermette had a question.

**Mr. Vermette:** — I guess you referred to, and I guess you'll probably get into your presentation, but you talked about I guess for safety, and we talk about cars, improving the safety of them. You know, you looked at it. In your opening comments you referred to that, and at some point I think that's important. You also referred to engineers looking at roads and the way roads are made, improved for fatalities, and I think that's kind of the stuff. So you made some opening comments on that, and I'll wait to see it. I'm curious on that.

But one area where you did talk about, I just look at page 11. You talk about your repeat impaired driver convictions. You look at the numbers, and I'm curious. First conviction, and that's page 11, if you look at it, it's 15,170 first-time impaired driving. Then your second conviction, if you look at your number of convictions going down right to no. 7, you have one person. Is there any indication as to why you go 15,000 to one, two? Is it that less chance of those individuals getting caught a second time? I guess I'm just curious on the numbers, if there's anything to explain that.

**Mr. Quaye:** — As I indicated earlier on, your chances of being caught lie between 1 in 2,000 trips, 1 in 500 trips. And this is reflected in these numbers. You have a very . . . And that's, you know, is reflective of the amount of enforcement out there in terms of our ability to catch people. And therefore for most people, they will be caught once. These 15,170 people who

were convicted only once for impaired driving are not first-time offenders. They've been driving many, many, many times. You can multiply that by 2,000 trips or even more. They were caught once by the law of chance. So then you have a second-time offender, who's a really second-time offender. To be caught the second time means you've been . . . actually been out there drinking and driving.

So the point I wanted to get across is that, you know, we have these with respect to the distribution of convictions in terms of number of times people have been convicted. But the picture, and you will recall when I indicated that, for people who died as a result of drivers, who died as a result of impaired driving, a significant number of them had never even been caught even once by the police for a drinking and driving event. All right. If the world were an ideal place, somebody who, you know, drives and kills someone as they were out drinking and driving but been driving many times, he or she will show up in these convictions. But most of them don't show up even in this chart that I show you here. They're never caught. All right.

So it's a fairly complex situation that we have. And I think the important point that we want to drive across with this is that every time we have the opportunity and the police identify somebody for an impaired driving event, we must take advantage of that and create as much deterrence as much as possible so that that person never, ever contemplates drinking and driving again. Every opportunity that we get, you multiply that by 2,000 means the person has been out there 2,000 times. We take advantage of that and have rules and regulations and laws that ensure that message is sent to these drivers so that they don't engage in drinking and driving again.

[10:00]

**Mr. Vermette:** — Thank you. No, that explains it. No. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Chartier had another question.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Just in follow-up to Mr. Vermette's question here with respect to random testing. So obviously in Australia they've got that down to a fine art — the random blood alcohol testing — and have seen some really good results from that. But would that involve a Criminal Code change to be able to conduct to the level that they do in Australia the random roadside testing?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes it will, and it is not a subject that is new to us. Federally with our counterparts across the country and even the federal government, we've been engaged in these discussions for many, many, many years. It's something that mothers against drinking and driving has been pushing for over many, many, many years. But there are Charter issues with respect to that, and I think the decision to do random testing lies outside of, you know, the provincial realm. I think it's a federal government issue.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Parent.

**Mr. Parent:** — I've got a few questions. Danielle was asking

you about federal or provincial criminal codes and you were saying that it's the federal criminal codes that are the problem for you. Like you were saying that . . .

**Mr. Quaye:** — I was saying . . . She was asking about drug-related driving earlier on, and I indicated to her that we are working within the limits that have been created by the Criminal Code of Canada. By we, I mean law enforcement. They can only operate within the rules that have been established, the Criminal Code, how you process somebody who is suspected of drug-impaired driving. And it's a fairly laborious process right now, what has been established. She wanted to know if something can be done to speed it up, and I'm saying the only way we can get that sped up is to have or lobby for changes to be made to the Criminal Code. That's the only way we can do that.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay. With that though I don't understand why the other provinces . . . Or are the other provinces having less than we're having in this province? Because you had one chart where ours is really high in the impaired part of charges. Saskatchewan's extremely high versus some of the other provinces. Are there any reasons why the other provinces are lower than this province?

**Mr. Quaye:** — You mean looking at the fatalities.

**Mr. Parent:** — Right.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Fatalities. Yes. Look at British Columbia and Alberta and Manitoba. I think they have over the years made quite significant changes to their drinking and driving legislation, those within the scope of the provincial government.

Lately the most two recent examples were in British Columbia and Alberta, where they brought in very, very strong administrative type sanctions to help make a difference on drinking and driving on their roads. Similar laws have been brought in by a province like Ontario. I think it was in 2009 Ontario introduced something along those lines.

The big push we made here with respect to impaired driving was in 1996, when we made changes to the lengths of suspension. We brought in vehicle impoundment, screening, and so on and so forth. And ever since then we've been tinkering just a little bit with drinking and driving laws here.

I think we have opportunities to make changes to what we have right now so that our law enforcement colleagues can be enabled to do their job better with the resources that they have. I think in a place like Alberta and British Columbia, they've invested heavily, heavily in law enforcement resources, so your chance of being caught is much higher than it is in British Columbia . . . than it is here in Saskatchewan.

So the reason why we've seen those charts, those bars on the graph, is not accidental; it's structural. There are things they have in their jurisdictions that we don't have here. And if we continue to have what we have, we will be placed in that last position for a long time.

**Mr. Parent:** — We do have one thing that I've often wondered. If a person gets in an accident and he's DUI [driving under the

influence], and say he does \$50,000 damage to a couple of vehicles, of course he has no insurance. But I've seen in one particular case not that long ago where the individual was allowed to pay only \$100 a month for the \$50,000 of damage that was done. Isn't that kind of, you know . . . And then he's actually got his licence back after his year or six-month suspension or whatever it was. And all he had to do, he had to go through various testing, and he had to go to various alcohol rehab or whatever. And he's no different.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I can speak to that a little bit. Yes we do have many impaired drivers who pay us back over time. We try and get all of our money back. We're not always successful. We try and work out, in some cases, monthly payments or lump sums. And some of them, yes seem quite low and they will pay \$100 for the rest of their life. Some of them pay more than that. We recover approximately, I think it's a little over 20-some million dollars a year from people who don't have insurance. And that includes . . . Some of them are drunk drivers. So it is fairly dramatic.

**Mr. Parent:** — Yes. That kind of answers that. The other thing . . . I don't know if there's been any work done on it and, Mr. Hickie, you probably know that, is because they now are, especially in the cities, they're having in-vehicle cameras, ways of utilizing the cameras . . . And I've seen them do it. Like they'll go into parking lots where there's a bar. And I mean most of the other establishments are already closed, and they'll drive down and forth and they'll look at the vehicles and then hopefully maybe run into that vehicle later on when the person was driving drunk.

But has there been any research done on using the cameras from the police cars, as they're going, to record the licence plate numbers which would be on a — like I mean they all sit there with their little laptops or whatever they carry in the vehicle — that it would be alerts on all the different plates? And then when they see a vehicle, and they're behind that vehicle, that it would actually resonate back into their computer to say, that guy was at that bar; we should check him. Something to that effect, I just . . .

**The Chair:** — I'll answer that actually. Mr. Parent, you make a good point. Police officers do use various techniques and tactics to identify possible potential impaired drivers at establishments. However, the basis for pulling over an impaired driver is really founded on a driving action. We don't have . . . And I talked about Fresno, California, which was interesting at the traffic safety conference we went to with Ms. Chartier and Mr. Cameron in Edmonton. They actually have a process where they target . . . It's called bar watch where they actually have officers inside bars. Then they radio or cellphone, text their partners outside in the parking lot. It's a method of covert/over operations.

However though, in Saskatchewan and in Canada, to get behind a vehicle, to actually turn the vehicle on, puts you in care and control. Then you have the opportunity to stop that person. Officers typically want to see driving actions. And the courts have in fact deemed that driving action is required first although we are allowed by statute to actually check for licence, registration, and impaired driving, which goes to the random vehicle testing as well, random vehicle stops. But by law,

driving action is a preamble basis for the actual stopping and then you build grounds from there to go forward approaching a vehicle — signs and observations, things you sense.

So it's part of a tactic. It's not one of those things where it's . . . It goes to Ms. Chartier's point. Officers are very busy and unless you have dedicated officers hunting those individuals down after . . . Many times there's hundreds and hundreds of calls in the queue, they call it, so it's hard to . . . You may see that vehicle and even though that vehicle may be on a premise, nothing says that you weren't drinking and you were driving because your wife had consumed more. So to stop that vehicle and no driving action is a bit of an abuse of power and it could also degrade the system of building grounds, reasonable grounds to actually do the impaired charge. So that's a basic law enforcement definition or answer for that.

For the committee members, I'd like to say that Justice will be providing us with a very detailed submission. They, however, will not be presenting to the committee. And to some of the points that Ms. Chartier's brought up and yourself. Mr. Parent, and SGI members have indicated, Justice is going to have a pretty detailed submission that we'll have in our hands prior to June 6th which will help to answer some of these questions, and especially the legalities about the whole drug testing, the search and seizure, Charter of Rights arguments against it.

So any more questions from members? Mr. Steinley.

**Mr. Steinley:** — Talking about initiatives moving forward, I think you talk about this later on in your submission, but now it seems time to ask, what is the RID program, the report impaired driver program? I was just wondering the success it's had over, since it's been, the initiative's been developed and if that's been, had any improvements on drinking and driving in Saskatchewan and if the expansion of it to P.A. [Prince Albert], I think is coming up soon, and if that's had a positive effect on taking some drunk drivers off the road.

**Mr. Quaye:** — The report impaired drivers program is now in place all across the province, including P.A. The principle behind report impaired drivers program is that, if we can use all the eyes and ears of the Saskatchewan public to help law enforcement, they will stand to enhance the ability to catch impaired drivers and reduce the total toll with respect to impaired driving. So what we've done with respect to SGI is we've helped fund the establishment of this program within almost every single police jurisdiction in Saskatchewan as well as the RCMP.

We've helped put up signs all across the province, most places. We continue to expand the availability of these signs in different places and it just implores drivers to dial 911 if they see a vehicle being driven erratically that might be the cause, the result of impaired driving. This goes through 911, the respective police agency is alerted, and then the ideally would dispatch a vehicle to the location.

In cases where they go out and they can't identify the vehicle or they are not able to go out, they send a letter to the address at which that vehicle is registered, indicating that that vehicle was seen being driven erratically and so on and so forth and just implore the person not to continue to drink and drive. There

have been cases where they've gone out and they've been able to identify the vehicles and charges have been laid with respect to impaired driving.

With respect to productivity, in terms of the output from the report impaired driving program, we have been very impressed in terms of the number of people that they've been able to lay charges as a result of drinking and driving or impaired driving from the RID program.

The downside of the program is, although they've received numerous, many, many calls from the public with respect to a suspected impaired driver, they are not able to go out, in the majority of cases been able to go out, dispatch a vehicle to the location. We have some numbers and will probably share some numbers with you.

This program started in 2010. To date, up to the end of 2012, we had a total of 9,952 report impaired RID calls, report impaired driver calls. Out of these, the police have been able to lay 518 impaired driving charges, 200 24-hour suspensions. They've intercepted 57 intoxicated persons, and there are numerous other charges that have arisen out of the program.

However out of the 9,952 calls that came, they were not able to attend 5,791 of those because of other priorities. So we have been discussing with the police, you know, how do we make this program more effective? We can put more money into the program, do more advertising of the program. And the result of that is that instead of 9,952, they might get 15,000 calls, but then there's a limit on how many they can attend, right? So that's the challenge that we face with respect to that program.

But like I said, with respect to productivity as compared to our Overdrive program, this particular program has very productive with respect to the ability to identify the impaired drivers. And this is thanks to the Saskatchewan public; now there are a lot more people, a lot more eyes out there watching for impaired drivers.

**Mr. Steinley:** — Thank you.

[10:15]

**The Chair:** — Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Just a clarification around the numbers then. You said 5,000 . . . the police were not able to dispatch someone to how many calls, did you say?

**Mr. Quaye:** — 5,791. That's about 58 per cent of the calls that came in. They were not able to dispatch because they didn't have enough resources. They have limited resources to do that.

**Ms. Chartier:** — So that is the big point here, is that there aren't enough. It's a great program if you've got the resources to make it happen, but the resources aren't there.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. Because if there were more resources out there . . . These are 9,952 potential impaired drivers. It would be nice if we had been able to catch all of them.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Yes. Okay, thank you for that.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Cox.

**Mr. Cox:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just kind of a follow-up to your comments and the Deputy Chair's comments. The Overdrive program, do you keep any stats or do we have any stats showing times and days when there's more accidents with impaired drivers? Or is that too detailed? I guess what I'm thinking is a recommendation down the road, the best use of our resources. Like when should we be paying . . . Obviously it's probably on weekends I guess, but do we chart that at all?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Not with respect to the Overdrive program. But with respect to the intelligence that we provide to the police as to when these are taking place, it's a Friday, Saturday, Sunday, late-night type of activity that we see these impaired driving events and crashes. So we provide that intelligence to them to allow them to be as effective as they can.

In terms of when you want to go out, usually we don't . . . We provide information. We don't dictate when they go. We just say Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday. That's when we have the bulk of these impaired driving, you know, crashes taking place. And it's nighttime. So we give them that intelligence.

**Mr. Cox:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Wilson.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like you to comment on the financial implication of impaired drivers. You mentioned showing good faith by paying little monthly sums annually. In the event if they pass on, does their estate pay for it, or is this a forgiven loan? And what are the implications for SGI? Are you showing a loss on this, or can you find better solutions to address this problem? Because I imagine this does happen that other . . . older people or accidents happen, and you lose that ability for finances. If you could comment on that please.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes, I can. It does happen. And in many cases it even happens right at the very initial accident where the drunk driver is killed and there is no one to recover from, and there's huge amounts of dollars paid out for either property damage or injury.

We do proceed on most of them. There is some funding comes available. We do have reduced injury benefits to drunk drivers. There are some things we do, but there would be a large amount of money that would be wrote off at the end of the day from people who are uninsured for driving while disqualified or drunk driving or other cases where they don't carry insurance because they either don't have any equity, any money, or they die sooner than they've paid off the debt.

Or some of them, in some cases, we get judgments and they never pay us a penny. They just never drive again. We have a judgment and we try and take assets. In many cases these individuals have no assets. So again that would be money we wouldn't recover.

**Ms. Wilson:** — So are you able to find a solution? Are you going to explore this so you don't lose all this money? Or who is accountable for it? Does SGI absorb it?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Certainly Saskatchewan motorists are the ones who all share that. We make every economical attempt we can to recover money from people who owe us money, but in many cases there is just no other solution. And I don't know of any other than what we're doing now. We're very aggressive on where someone does have money where we do recover. We have, over the years, taken someone's farm land. Homes are a little more difficult legally to take. But like I say, in many cases a lot of these people, if they're in jail, have no assets and have no intention of ever paying us back.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — I have a couple of questions from the RID explanation, Kwei Quaye. We all drive on highways in this committee. I will say that I've seen RID signs in municipal jurisdictions only. I have yet to see a RID sign on a highway. Can you answer why that isn't . . . why I haven't seen, when I drive No. 11, No. 6, No. 2, not one on a highway jurisdiction easement. I've seen them through municipalities.

**Mr. Quaye:** — We intend to expand it to the highways. We haven't. A lot of concentration has been in the municipal areas. We've expanded it to RCMP and we have been in negotiations with the Ministry of Highways. They have to help us, provide us some assistance in getting these signs up. So our intention is to work with Highways to get the RID signs. And we've budgeted accordingly for that, so I believe in the next year or so you will be seeing signs on the highways announcing RID.

**The Chair:** — Good. Thank you. I will actually take that as my recommendation as the Chair of this committee. I'll make that in the report for sure, that Highways helps out a lot.

Second thing though, Ms. Chartier brought up an interesting point. Over 5,000 RID reports were uninvestigated. Do you have a breakdown of urban versus rural?

**Mr. Quaye:** — We have that, but unfortunately I don't have the data here right now. But we can provide you with that information.

**The Chair:** — That would be interesting to see. Just again it goes to augment whether, you know, urban police forces . . . if it's happening more in the communities with urban police forces or RCMP officers. It's a curious thing for myself really. Okay, any more questions in regards to impaired driving? Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Just one more. We had heard something interesting at the traffic safety conference around an impaired driving court in Ontario, and obviously that's more of the Ministry of Justice rather than SGI. But I suspect that repeat impaired driving, impaired drivers are a problem, as you've cited the 1 in 500, the chances of being caught ranging from 1 in 500 to 1 in 2,000. But looking at your page 11 where you've got repeat impaired driving convictions, and obviously the numbers of convictions for second, third, fourth go down.

But have you thought, is an impaired driving court something that's been on your radar at all? Or have you examined how Ontario's done it? Obviously you've got a key age group, the 18- to 20-year-olds who likely aren't those who are suffering

from addictions, but those repeat offenders could be people who have long-time addictions issues. So I'm wondering if impaired driving court has been something that you've looked at all.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I can try and answer that. It was very interesting to see a presentation from Ontario. That's probably something better asked of Justice. But I think it certainly had some merit for those types of individuals that appear time and time again before the court. Even though it might not be a large number, it's an important number.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Another question. Mr. Parent.

**Mr. Parent:** — Your question was very valid on the urban versus rural for the 5,791 that weren't dispatched for it. And the reason I think it's important, I'd like the information on that, is if they were urban, you're dealing with city police versus rural which is dealing with the RCMP. I know I'm sure of what, not I know, I'm sure what I heard you say a while ago is that you actually are providing money for the RCMP for programs for impaired driving and that. And do you also do that for city police or not?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes, we do it for all of the police agencies in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay.

**The Chair:** — Any other questions from the members of the committee in regards to impaired driving? Seeing none, we've been here for almost an hour and a half. I think we'll take a five-minute recess, and we'll reconvene at 10:30.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

**The Chair:** — Thank you, committee members, for indulging me in that break. And we're back now to talk about distracted driving, I believe. Kwei Quaye.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Distracted driving. In Saskatchewan, driver inattention or distracted driving is the most cited contributing factor to all collisions. It accounts for about 25 per cent of all collisions in the province. In fatal collisions, it's usually the second-most cited contributing factor to fatal collisions in the province.

With regard to distracted driving, driver distraction, collisions are under-reported, since it is usually very difficult to establish that distraction was a contributing factor to a crash. The interesting thing we've noted in 2012 that, for the first time, 37 per cent of our fatalities involve distracted driving, and it surpassed even impaired driving with respect to fatal crashes. The poster child for distracted driving is cellphone use. However, there are many, many other types of distractions within a vehicle or outside a vehicle: playing with your radio, shaving, doing makeup. All those factors actually contribute to crashes related to distraction.

In 2010, to get a handle on the issue of cellphone use and the increase, dramatic increase in cellphone use, the laws were changed here in Saskatchewan to ban the use of hand-held

cellphones whilst driving. These stats shows convictions for cellphone use and driving without due care and attention from 2007 through 2012. Of course the law came into place in 2010, so cellphone statistics disappear in 2010. The numbers that you see — again, remember 1 in 2,000 to 1 in 500 with respect to the ability to come across somebody who's doing something against the law with respect to driving — these numbers are very disconcerting. And if you look at the blue lines, the blue bars with respect to cellphone use, it even now surpasses driving without due care and attention, and it has been growing.

I think I can attest, and probably most of you can attest, that you continue to see people driving and using their cellphones. Why? The probability of being caught for doing it is almost close to zero. Cellphone use, unlike not using your seat belt or even impaired driving, takes place for a minute here, a minute there, 30 seconds here and it's gone. During that period of time, the person poses a risk to other road users, but because of the very transitory nature of the infraction, and that combined with the fact that we have very minimal ability for police to actually identify or catch this type of event, makes this practice continue to be rampant. And it is reflected in the numbers that we see.

In association with cellphone use are many other types of distraction, like I mentioned, and they all contribute to that. So when you have the combination of these types of activities, which I would say tend to be very difficult to enforce, the implication of that is the 37 per cent contribution to fatalities that I mentioned before and the continued presence of driver distraction or driver inattention at the top of the heap when it comes to traffic crashes here in Saskatchewan.

Repeat offenders for convictions for cellphone use or driving without due care, there you see the trends there. Most people will be caught once. Does it mean they are using it . . . that's the only time they are using it? Absolutely not. Does it mean they are posing a risk to other road users those other numerous times that they are using it? Yes.

There is the misconception as well that even the use of hands-free devices whilst driving is safe. But we do know from research that we've seen over and over and over again that even that poses a significant amount of distraction and is not very much different from using the hand-held device whilst you're driving.

Those are the principal . . . Those are the data that I would like to share with you with respect to distracted driving. And we'll pause here to take any questions that you may have.

**The Chair:** — Any questions from members? Mr. Parent.

**Mr. Parent:** — I have one question. Like you talk about the difference of using cellphone versus Bluetooth or that, and you're saying there's no difference. Have you got data that actually points out that maybe an accident or an injury or whatever occurred because a person was on the cellphone or was on Bluetooth?

**Mr. Quaye:** — I don't have data from Saskatchewan, but we can provide you with numerous pieces of research that people who have taken the time to look at the use of cellphones, hands-free or hand-held, and its impact on risk. And it is a

well-known fact in the field of road safety that these two forms of uses of the device doesn't really make much difference with respect to risk. It is very commonly known. But we will be willing to share that. I don't have the information here with me, but we'll make a point of providing you with this, some of the research that has been done on that.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Just a couple of questions. There was a great paper out of New Zealand actually talking about sort of brain capacity and why hand held versus hands free isn't a difference. But I think, Mr. Cameron, you had explained to me . . . Because you hear people say, well what's the difference between having a conversation with someone next to you? But can you maybe talk a little bit about the difference between having a person in the passenger seat with you, eyes on the road as well, and the use of a hands-free device?

**Mr. Cameron:** — You have a good memory. Yes, one of the items we were talking about is if I'm discussing a topic with my passenger, there is one set of extra eyes on the road. When I'm distracted driving by myself, there's only my set of eyes that are not on the road. And that's the difference between some of the research showing where there's a passenger available.

And sometimes you see that with senior drivers where two or three people in the vehicle, there's three or four sets of eyes on the road. And it does make a difference. It also though can be a deterrent. If you're, as a parent, trying to parent your children in the back seat, that does not add to the safety factor.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Are there any jurisdictions — I think this would be highly unpopular in this day and age of cellphone usage — but are there any jurisdictions that have said, no cellphone use, like not just hands free, but no cellphone use whatsoever?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Here in Canada, no. I can't recall any jurisdiction outside Canada that allows the use of . . . doesn't allow the use of hands free. I think the more common thing that you see is for new drivers in the graduated driver's licence program, they are not allowed to use hand held or hands free at all. No cellphone use for those group.

But no, I think in Canada almost every jurisdiction has some form of distracted driving law, probably except Nunavut, and everyone allows hands free. I think it was probably a practical compromise when it comes to introducing these laws in all these jurisdictions.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Not having looked ahead to your recommendations yet, but will that be one of your recommendations around graduated licences and hand-held devices?

**Mr. Quaye:** — We have that already here for our GDL [graduated driver's licensing] drivers.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. Yes. But that's just for the fifth . . . Our graduated licences are rather abbreviated compared to some jurisdictions?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Pardon me?

**Ms. Chartier:** — Our graduated licences, our graduated period is shorter than other jurisdictions here in Canada though. It's 18 months, is it not?

**Mr. Quaye:** — No. It's a total of 27 months overall considering the learning period. There are some that are longer than ours. We have a learner's period of nine months, stage 1 period; novice 1 of six months; and at least now 12 months of novice 2. There are some that have a learner's period of 12 months and a more extended period than we do have. But our GDL drivers, just like I think every other jurisdiction, cannot use a cellphone whilst they're driving, hands free or not.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay, just one more question. Going back to page 12, just a question about the numbers. So page 12, I'm looking at 2012-2011 where you break out both without due care and attention, and cellphone. So without due care and attention has also increased in basically 2010, '09-10 have stayed the same, '11-12 or '11 and then '12. So without due care and attention, you've got them broken up into separate categories once you had the cellphone legislation. So I'm just wondering, any thoughts or explanations on the increase in convictions for the without due care and attention?

[10:45]

**Mr. Quaye:** — I don't know if I have any particular explanation for that. I think it's reflective of the fact that, you know, the police are doing their very best to look out for distracted drivers because it's been top of mind for us. We have indicated it's a big problem. And they have also indicated to us, you know, they are interested in addressing this as much as possible. We have deliberately over the past couple of years held what we call monthly STEP blitzes. And numerous of these blitzes have been targeted at distracted drivers, where they go out in, you know, in large numbers to look specifically for distracted drivers. And I think some of these intentional actions have been reflected in these numbers that we do see.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you. And is there any one jurisdiction . . . This is my last question. Sorry, everybody. Is there any jurisdiction that's doing something exceptional and I . . . On the area of distracted driving, that there's nothing that I've read so far really jumps out, but is there any jurisdiction in Canada or otherwise that has really been able to tackle distracted driving well?

**Mr. Quaye:** — The laws are different across the country. Ours is just limited to the use of cellphones. You go to our neighbouring jurisdiction, Alberta, and it's really broad-based. Ontario is very broad-based, and so is BC [British Columbia]. You know, there are many other things that you cannot do apart from using your cellphone.

The fundamental problem though is that people persist in doing it. And I think the root of that is that after driving awhile and trying your phone once, twice or shaving once, twice and you're not caught, the driver gets the feedback that the chances of being caught is very minimal, and the practice persists.

I don't know of any similar jurisdiction here in Canada that can



report very successful outcomes post-legislation with respect to distracted driving. It still continues to struggle. The fundamental thing that can help shift that, apart from the fact that we need huge, you know, significant awareness, is that people have to perceive that their probability of being caught is high. It is not there; we'll continue to see these.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Vermette. Sorry, Mr. Parent first, then Mr. Vermette. Mr. Parent's hand up first.

**Mr. Parent:** — Similar to what Danielle just asked is how strict or how severe is the penalty if you're caught on your cellular phone without hands-free, or texting or emailing while you're driving? How strict or what are the charges like? Are they just your normal, not DUI, but driving without due care?

**Mr. Quaye:** — It is similar to driving without due care, the way we designed it. We designed it when we went through this process three years or so ago with the argument that the use of cellular phone while you're driving is just one variant of driving without due care and attention, and therefore the penalties are similar.

The fine for cellphone use is \$280. In addition to that, you lose four demerit points as a result of using your cellphone. Four demerit points, I would say, loosely translates to about \$100 on our Safe Driver Recognition program at SGI, which means you either owe SGI \$100 or, depending on where you are, at least \$100. Or if you are in the positive zone of our Safe Driver Recognition program, you drop four points and you lose, depending on where you are, you can lose a discount on your insurance.

Then there is the other aspect that those points are also shown on a driver improvement program. And it depends on how good or bad a driver you've been. You might be required to take some type of remedial program because of that. So there are a number of consequences associated with it, but for the consequences to kick in, you have to be caught. And I think that is where the whole thing breaks down.

**Mr. Parent:** — It's basically the same with DUIs. I mean your chances of getting caught are probably one in 2,000.

**Mr. Quaye:** — That is true.

**Mr. Parent:** — If not even higher when it comes to texting. Because I see it all the time.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. I think it's probably lower. Because, unlike DUI or even not using your seat belt, it is not a permanent thing. If you are drunk, you're drunk for the whole trip. Using your cellphone, you probably use it maybe six or seven times at different stages of your trip for short periods of time.

**Mr. Parent:** — Yes. That's why I'm saying it's higher, like it was one in 5,000.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes, could be. Yes.

**Mr. Parent:** — Yes. Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Vermette:** — I guess going back to watching . . . And the numbers are very clear of individuals that actually get caught and get ticketed and go through the process of a consequence of their action. And sometimes I think the actions of individuals out there . . . And the consequences I don't think is touching people, and I don't think people really are paying attention to it. I mean you might be upset that you have to pay \$280 or what it is, but at the end of the day, you're going to do it. And that's what I think I'm hearing clearly from over here.

It's got to be frustrating for I guess SGI. And I don't know how much input you guys have into consequences. And do you get to make recommendations to whether whatever fine will be or what the consequence is? Whether it's if you're using your hand-held device, I don't care what, it is distracting. You know, if the consequences are strictly a fine and there isn't any true consequence, like seizing your vehicle for 24 hours . . . I'll tell you something. If all of a sudden you were to say to somebody, well not only are you being charged with this, but your vehicle's being taken away from you for . . . Have you guys recommended that type of a situation where it meets what we're trying to accomplish here? Or is this just a band-aid?

And I mean we don't have enough officers, it looks like, or enforcement. I realize everybody's busy. You're trying some certain areas. I see where you guys are saying you're targeting by allowing extra officers to target certain things. Your blitz are really important and I see when you have a blitz . . . Because I've seen it. I've gone up to them and they don't care that . . . The blitz is for this and they're giving you the ticket for that and that's clear. That's the blitz. I wish the blitz was constantly and we had the resources. I know we don't have them.

But I guess going to this and listening to what I'm hearing — and at the end of the day, I imagine you'll have recommendations — but I guess I'm asking, when you come forward with recommendations of consequences, have we always . . . And I guess at the end of the day, the fines or the consequences, are they enough?

And is the education enough? Because sometimes, you know, you look at educating people too. And maybe there's programs out there that universities, schools could do in communities to reach community people saying, here — where you wear glasses, where you do something to show, something that shows people just how bad it is because you don't realize it. You're busy doing your thing. And I watch so many people do it, and it happens.

So I'm not sure if more resources or the consequence is enough or what we have to do to educate people. There's so many things. And I guess in your recommendation, you'll do. I was just listening to what so far has been presented. It's to me, to be honest with you, it's kind of frustrating. But anyway I just wanted to share that with you to see what your answers will be to that.

**Mr. Quaye:** — One thing we look at, and it comes up later in the presentation at the very tail end, is for any of our measures to be successful, there are three things that we need to see. The severity of the action should be there. The speed with which the

action, the consequence takes place should be there, and the certainty with respect to a consequence should be there.

The severity part is what you're addressing. Should we impound the vehicle? Should there be a higher fine? Should you lose your licence? Yes we look at all that with respect to the consequences for events.

The speed with which somebody suffers a consequence. So if you use a cellphone today, are you're going to be convicted six months from now or seven months, when it's so removed from the event that you lose it? Right? So we look at things like that. Or you do impaired driving. Is it so removed from it that you can't make the real connection to the event and it loses the impact or the ability to deter?

And the last one is what we've been talking about a lot is the certainty. Is it a high probability that if you use your cellphone you'll be caught? That's also important. So severity, certainty, and speed. Those are three important things that we always, you know, take into consideration.

When we brought in the cellphone law, we brought in the fine of \$280, four points, demerit points on your . . . and all those host of other programs. That is one of the highest fines currently that we have in Saskatchewan, 280 bucks. It's one of the highest. We thought, well this is tough; this is severe. Yes it is, and maybe we should have contemplated something more severe than that. But the question is, if somebody's offending for the first time, do you seize their vehicle? Does it meet that test? Now I don't know. It's something that we continue to debate with. We thought, or we still think that if we increase the chance of being caught, we think the fine is severe enough. We think what you're losing is severe enough. It will help deter the action. And we have been, those who you see throughout the process, we've been . . . happened over and over and over again, let's move to a regime where we have enough resources to allow us to increase the certainty of being caught for using your cellphone or driving impaired.

You will see later on in the driving impaired consequences that we have some recommendations that are along the line of more severe types of action for driving impaired and a quicker type of action as well for driving impaired if you are caught. So vehicle impoundment, you see, appears later in our recommendation with respect to impaired driving. So far we haven't contemplated that for cellphone use or driver distraction.

**Mr. Vermette:** — I guess my last comment — and you might refer, and you might hit on this later on — I guess to a family who loses a loved one to somebody operating a motor vehicle in a manner that's unacceptable and the law says you're not supposed to, explain to them, you know, the sad reality of it is, well here's the consequence. And I can see where people walk away from it very frustrated, who lose a loved one or a family member, and they look at the system and say it's not fair and it isn't right. Those are the individuals that we should be . . . And I guess as part of the hearing and the committee, maybe a recommendation will come forward. It's time for some dealing with some of the actions. It's pretty, pretty frustrating and pretty sad for some of the individuals to go through that. Anyway, thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. You know, to that point, Mr. Vermette, it's clear that there's things that will be have to be looked at and considered. I'd just advise committee members again though that, when in committee process when you're asking a question, you're to ask a question, not to debate a process with witnesses or to make a personal statement. That's much more effective in the committee process for an all-party committee procedures. Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Just a clarification on the graduated licence program and hand-held use devices. So it's zero tolerance for, well the learner's permit obviously, and then for novice 1 and novice 2. Is that correct?

**Mr. Quaye:** — That's correct.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. I just hadn't realized that. But on the SGI website, it doesn't actually mention that under the graduated driver's licence program, and I'm very interested in that particularly because I have a teenager, a 15-year-old who just got her learner's licence. And she hasn't had that conversation with me either. We haven't talked about that, but she hasn't mentioned . . . We've talked about other parts of the responsibility but . . . So I don't know. Is that something that kids learn in driver training?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes, they're certainly taught about that in driver training but we will check the website just to be sure. The graduated driver's licence came in in 2005 and this new law came in in 2010, and it was part of the GDL program. And we'll check our website. It's supposed to be part and parcel of the GDL program.

I believe it's certainly in our website that you cannot use your . . . Under cellphone use it's certainly there that if you're on the GDL program, you cannot use your phone at all whilst you are driving. Probably it's not been put in the same place as the GDL program.

**Ms. Chartier:** — And I just want to confirm my understanding of the graduated licence process because I . . . So it's, as a novice 1, it's six months and then as the novice 2, it's 12 months. But included in the graduated licence is the nine months where you've got your learner's permit. Is that correct?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. The whole GDL, graduated driver's licence program starts when you get your learner's licence and goes all the way until you finish your novice 2 stage. So that whole period is the graduated driving licence period.

[11:00]

**Ms. Chartier:** — But if you think about a new driver, realistically if someone gets their licence on their 16th birthday, if they did the nine months prior, you could be off your graduated licence when you're seventeen and a half really. So it's quite young in the scheme of things.

**Mr. Quaye:** — That is correct. And like I said, different jurisdictions have different periods, you know. The latest period of course for all graduated licence programs is the period that most of the benefits are seen because you are driving with a supervising driver and, you know, the crash reductions are a lot

more significant. However here in Saskatchewan, you are right. At 16 you can do your novice 1 and then you go for another what, six plus 12 months . . . 18 months and get out of the program.

And you see one of our recommendations in the GDL program, there is zero tolerance for cellphone use, but there is also zero tolerance for alcohol use. But once you attain seventeen and a half, to all intents and purposes there is no zero tolerance which is sort of contrary to when they are allowed to, how do you call it, drink outside. And we showed you some of the numbers with respect to involvement in crashes for the younger age group. And that's one of the recommendations you see later on, is zero tolerance for 20 and under, a period that we think is very important, whilst you're developing your skills to learn how to drive.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you. And I'll show you the link later where the cellphone usage doesn't come up when you search graduated licence. Anyway, thank you for that. I appreciate that.

**The Chair:** — Okay, we'll have questions by Mr. Cox now.

**Mr. Cox:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. This might be more of a question for Justice, I'm not sure. But we hear on the street that it's very difficult to prosecute under the cellphone charges. Do you keep any stats on how many people are being charged with cellphone use and are, yes, being charged and actually are convicted?

**Mr. Quaye:** — We used to get that information, the charges, from the police. I don't think we do anymore. We used to do that. When the law came into effect, we didn't want to demonstrate how much activity was taking place. But we don't do that anymore, so probably Justice would be in the position to answer that.

With respect to the ability of the charges to stick, we've heard that from police, and we've had numerous suggestions from them with respect to things like seizing the phone and phone records and so on and so forth. But although we've asked them to do is, you know, if they . . . We are not informed. We do not do enforcement. Enforcement is done by police. And if they are recommending specific recommendations that they have with respect to making it more effective for them to make these charges stick and convictions to stick, they should bring them forward, and we will facilitate the process. Or they can bring them forward to the standing committee for consideration.

**Mr. Cox:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Parent.

**Mr. Parent:** — Mine's going kind of the same way. In 2012 you had the blue area, the 3,770 people were charged for cell use. At \$280 it's a little over \$1 million if they're all convicted.

**Mr. Quaye:** — These are all convictions.

**Mr. Parent:** — Those are all convictions. And of those convictions, of that \$1 million, how many were urban and how many were rural? And besides that, where does that fine money go? We always hear the tax grab thing or the whatever you want

to call it.

**Mr. Quaye:** — We don't have the urban-rural here, but we can provide that information for you. If the conviction is in an urban area like Regina, there is a 75/25 per cent split of the fine between the provincial government and the municipality. So municipality gets 75, provincial government gets 25. If it's RCMP, it all goes to the provincial government in terms of the fine.

**Mr. Parent:** — Provincial?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes, provincial government. Yes.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. I just have a couple of points. To Ms. Chartier's point on the graduated driver's licence program, I have in front of me data that's on the portal for the members to look at at their convenience. But it's from the Traffic Accident Information System. And it shows, and this is interesting because I was thinking on the same lines in regards to the graduated, GDL program. But from 2008 to 2012, in 2008 the highest number of fatalities was registered under distracted driving from the 25 to 35 age group. In 2009 it was 55 to 64, 2010 again it was 45 to 54, and 2011 was the 25 to 34. And in 2012 it says it's the 35 to 44-year age group.

So I was along the same lines I think as maybe a lot of the members that the young, new drivers were the ones who were being killed or are responsible, but according to this information it appears that it's a different demographic. You may have the higher . . . I mean you may have more collisions caused by the young drivers, but the role of this committee is to look at fatalities, and it's very much related here that the correlation to youth doesn't equate to death. It's the more experienced drivers that are causing the fatalities.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Were you referring to distracted drivers?

**The Chair:** — Yes, it's right here, the distracted drivers, here.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Well I don't have the data in front of me, but theoretically speaking they should be zero with respect to the youth. They're not supposed to be . . . Well they could be distracted in other ways, but they're not supposed to be using their phone and so on whilst they are driving. And probably that helps or has helped to some degree with respect to those numbers that you are talking about. And so that might be the shift you've seen in more older drivers, you know, being distracted or using their phone. We haven't analyzed that in detail, so I cannot really, you know, provide explanation for that.

**The Chair:** — It's just interesting. I found it on the Traffic Accident Information System, which is a police-reported system which is through the actual HTB [Highway Traffic Board] reports and the follow-up reports done on fatalities. So it's just unique. Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Just to follow up on that comment, wouldn't the graduated driver's licence though . . . So you talk about where you need to target, what measures. But one of the goals

of the graduated driver's licence — I'm sort of looking elsewhere, for example in Ontario where they've got the five-year, I think, blood-alcohol content — wouldn't the goal of the graduated driver's licence is to help young people with that culture shift where you separate . . . So you're a new driver and you're supposed to be learning that you separate driving from this behaviour. Like is that sort of the goal of the graduated driver's licence?

**Mr. Quaye:** — That is the principle behind a graduated driver's licence. The fundamental point in the graduated driver's licence is that new drivers do not know how to drive, so do not add anything to their driving environment that will even make it more difficult for them to be safe. So remove alcohol. Remove, you know, passengers and ensure that their seat belts are . . . They don't carry more people than seat belts are available. Do not allow them to drive during certain times of the day.

So we add those things to the mix to allow them to concentrate on their ability to develop their skills gradually over the years because that's only, it's only time that allows people to develop those skills. And different periods, like you know, in Saskatchewan it's a 27-month period if you're not involved in any convictions or accidents. And then we believe you are now ready to drive on your own without all those restrictions.

So the program looks for different types of risks that can be removed from the environment. So we've removed cellphone use. We've removed alcohol use. We've removed certain times of the day. We've imposed a supervising driver for the year, the first nine months. All those things are deliberate to ensure that that driver, you know, builds up his skills. Are there more things that could be imposed? Are their lengthier periods? Probably yes, but that is the basic principle behind the program.

**Ms. Chartier:** — I just think about when a graduated driver's licence ends, and then are all bets off? So you've got your 27 months under your belt and then . . . So I know you've talked about new drivers not having the skills, but I think for me it seems like that opportunity to change or to shift culture a little bit . . . So when I'm a 30-year-old driver I had this length of time as a graduated driver, and I learned in this time period that you don't do these things. So I see it as an opportunity for a culture shift almost and not just about protecting young drivers who don't have the skills.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. I think that's the principle behind the, you know, the program. Hopefully, they'll learn not to use alcohol, they remain close to zero when they are driving. Unfortunately, that's not the case. And it's not the case because we see in the stats that 20 and under, probably once they hop out of GDL, certain things happen, right? And therefore there are other things that you can do to supplement GDL. But in terms of all bets off, at some point in time for any jurisdiction, the decision is made that you've proven that you are mature enough to drive with other people unrestricted, and those restrictions are lifted so that you can drive unrestricted.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Has there been any evidence in any other jurisdiction where they have a longer graduated driver's licensing period that younger people remain safe? And then is there a bump once that . . . I'm just curious if there's been any data anywhere that shows once a graduated driver's license

comes to an end and you've got the real deal, that there's a bump in whether it's impaired driving or distracted driving or anything like that?

**Mr. Quaye:** — We've looked at our program, and there's been research done on other programs as well. The period of time when there is the maximum gain from the program is during the learner's period, obviously because they are being supervised. And now most jurisdictions have expanded the learner's period to, one year is very common now in most jurisdictions. Ours is nine months, and the reason was they want to maximize the experience that is being gained by the driver during that period as much as possible.

For all jurisdictions though, once the learner gets out of the learner's period and goes into the novice 1 period, what is seen is that the collision experience starts to go up. It goes up for a while, then starts coming down as they gain, you know, they gain more experience. So that's a typical outcome that's been observed in jurisdictions with GDL programs. Those with a longer learner's period of course will have gained a higher reduction in terms of crash experience just because they have those extra pieces in it.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Ms. Wilson, I believe you had a question.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Yes. Thanks, Mr. Chair. Will you be increasing the safe driver recognition program for newer drivers as well as seasoned drivers? You do have a program like that, do you?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes, we have a safe driver recognition, but the same for all drivers. The safe driver recognition program runs on a point system. And depending, you know, for instance not wearing your seat belt, they will subtract three points; running a red light, four points. So everybody has the same point assignment. And if you're caught for any of these, the movement is the same for all drivers. Most new drivers start, well all new drivers start from zero. So for them, the impact is much higher.

When we introduced the program, a significant amount of experienced drivers were in the discount zone because they've driven conviction free in terms of the experience. So they had above . . . [inaudible] . . . Any new driver who comes into the system starts at zero. And anything that you do infraction wise takes you down into the penalty zone right away. But we do not have separate points for new drivers as compared to experienced drivers.

**Ms. Wilson:** — And will you have plans to increase that in the future? Would it be beneficial? What are your thoughts on that?

[11:15]

**Mr. Quaye:** — We've not been contemplating that in terms of safe driver recognition. Another program that goes in simultaneous with safe driver recognition is something called driver improvement program, and the driver improvement program again runs on points. If you are an experienced driver, the number of points you get as you accumulate points in the

driver improvement program, we might require you to . . . we send you a warning or might require you go for defensive driving and so on and so forth.

However for new drivers in the GDL program, we act much, much quicker than that. They don't run on points in the driver improvement program. If their very first infraction that he gets is an infraction that has three or more points, we send them a warning letter right away. The next infraction that he gets, so it's not the number of points that are accumulated, but in the very next infraction that he gets, they have to go for a traffic safety workshop. So we get them into education right away. And if they persist, they might get their licence suspended very much quicker than it is for experienced drivers.

So we use our remedial program to aid the behaviour shift for new drivers. Once leaving the safe driver recognition program, it's the same for everybody, and we've not been contemplating making changes with respect to that with respect to new drivers.

**Ms. Wilson:** — May I have a supplement question too, please, Madam Chairman? And the newcomers that are coming to the country, what kind of programs do you have for them? Because they have language barriers and different cultural diversity, do we have special rules and regulations to help them become acclimatized to our driving practices?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Depending on where the newcomer comes from, they can be newcomers from Great Britain or other European countries or Japan where we have what we call a reciprocal agreement with, so they exchange the licence right away. If you have a newcomer from India or from Cameroon for instance coming to Saskatchewan, we do not have reciprocal programs with them. They have to go take driver education. So they have to go through a driver education program and go through the process of getting a learner's and then get into a GDL program.

We work very closely with the various community organizations, for instance the Open Door Society, to facilitate the ability of newcomers to get a licence. On our website right now there is the ability to translate a driver's manual into numerous languages so that they are able to understand the rules of the road here, you know, rather than waiting for them to learn English before they can go in and actually learn the rules of the road and what it means, by going on a website and doing . . .

So we have those types of programs that we've put in place to try to help these newcomers. We also have the ability to offer the written test that we have in numerous languages as well right now to allow, you know, newcomers again to be able to facilitate their entry into the driving environment as safely as possible. So far that's what we've been doing with respect to newcomers.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you very much for that answer.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Chartier, I think, has another question.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Just a quick question. Did SGI used to have a program to support newcomers in getting their licences? I remember hearing something about it.

**Mr. Quaye:** — We did. It was called immigrant . . . Well let's call it immigrant driver program for lack of . . . And we had that, and we had an Aboriginal, you know, driver program where we provided funding to newcomers to facilitate their access to driver training. But we don't anymore.

**Ms. Chartier:** — And when did that come to an end?

**Mr. Quaye:** — That was in 2011, I think.

**Ms. Chartier:** — And how long had it been in place?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Oh, it had been in place for maybe about three years before then. I'll check, but about three years before then.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. The number wasn't . . . It was about 100,000. I don't remember. We'll check the amount, but it was a small amount of money that we had available for that particular program. Of course some people took advantage of it.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. Thank you for that.

**The Chair:** — There's one more question. That's from me. The law, is it explicit in Saskatchewan that you cannot hold a cellphone? I know it's explicit on the use of it. And we had a court case out of Saskatoon recently that was appealed by an individual, and it was upheld by Chief Justice Popescul on this fact that holding a phone was not deemed to be illegal. So I would understand we do not have holding as explicitly written in the actual statute. Or is it?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Holding, no. Holding isn't. It's using a phone. And I think, again, I think somebody mentioned, I think it was Mr. Cox that mentioned, that's one of the things we've heard from the police that it's frustrating for them to make the charges stick. Somebody can say, well we're just listening to my music on the phone.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. I guess we'll move on to the next . . . Seeing the time as well, it's 20 after 11, we can go past 12. It's okay, you know, for the committee, I think. However recognizing SGI members probably have commitments this afternoon as well, if you have to come back, we can call you back at a later date to finish up your presentation. But maybe we'll try to keep questions very succinct and the answers as well then. So we'll go back to you.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Just to say, we can continue as long as the committee wants to.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Unsafe speed. Speed is, in this section, is a major contributing factor to traffic collisions in Saskatchewan. And it contributes about 30 . . . It features about 31 per cent of fatalities, 15 per cent of injuries, and 9 per cent of property damage.

The current initiatives that we have in enforcement efforts are not necessarily improving this situation. We believe the current methods of enforcing speed is laborious, time consuming, and not as efficient as it could be. Upwards of 24,600 unsafe speed-related collisions on the Saskatchewan roads claims

about 45 lives and injures about 979 people.

Collisions due to excessive speeding tend to be severe. Sixty-seven per cent of excessive speeding collisions result in injury or death, compared to 22 per cent for non-speed-related collisions. And that's pure physics — the faster you go, the faster you hit, the more damage is done to the occupants of the vehicle or other road users.

We don't have many slides with respect to speed. I think the main point you'll see in our recommendations later is that we believe that law enforcement needs all our supplementary tools to allow them to enforce speeds, especially in zones that have been identified to have a lot of speed-related crashes.

And you will see in our recommendation later that we propose the introduction of automated enforcement which means that the enforcement is there on a constant and consistent basis. And that will prove more of a deterrent than the current methods that are used by police which of course . . . You can stop one vehicle but you have numerous other vehicles coming by who are going at or higher than the speed, or they leave the zone and they just tend to increase their speed. In terms of effectiveness and productivity with respect to speed enforcement, the current methods, which are the methods that have been used for a long time, are just not effective and will not help.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Parent has a question.

**Mr. Parent:** — Do you have an age breakdown for accidents due to speed? And the other part of that is, were they occurring in rural or urban?

**Mr. Quaye:** — I don't have them here but we can provide the age breakdown for you as well. I think with respect to fatalities related to speed, you see most of them will be occurring on high-speed roads. It could be high-speed roads in an urban centre or high-speed roads such as the highway system that we have in Saskatchewan. But we can provide you that information. I don't have the information here.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Just a clarification. When you talk about current methods, you're talking about a police officer with a radar gun standing on a corner or wherever a police officer would be standing. When you talk about current methods not working, that's what you're referring to?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes, that's the method I said is highly inefficient.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay, thank you.

**The Chair:** — I have a question. What is the demerit system for . . . Again, of course having not been in patrol for a few years now, I forget. But there was a system of demerits and fine graduations based on speed. Can you guys tell us what that is, please?

**Mr. Quaye:** — In terms of the fines based on speed, the fine starts at \$70. I have to refer to my notes. I think that's the base fine. And then for . . . Let me refer to my book here.

**The Chair:** — Refer to your notes like I used to. I know that it's, past a certain limit, it goes up. I know that.

**Mr. Quaye:** — It goes up. Yes. But I have to review my . . .

**The Chair:** — I'm more interested about the demerits actually, because the demerits hits you after the fact with your licence renewal too.

**Mr. Quaye:** — This is just pure numbers here. We'll have to go through the details on that. But the fine's 70. I think up to 30 after the speed limit, it's \$1 per kilometre per hour after that. And beyond that, it goes up to \$2 per kilometre. But we'll provide you . . . confirm that later on.

There are certain types of speeding though that, where the fines are doubled. If you're speeding past a police officer for instance, that is doubled. In a school zone, is doubled. So instead of 70, it starts at \$140. And then it's 2 kilometres an hour up to 30 kilometres an hour of the speed limit, and then it doubles again to 4 after.

And more recently in construction zones, it's triple. So it's \$210 for the base, and \$3 up to 30 above that, and then again, \$6 above that. So those are the fine structures that we have right now in the province.

Demerits. Speeding in excess, 50 kilometre in excess above the speed limit, it's 4 points. Exceeding the speed limit right now has a demerit point of 1. And that appears of course in our driver improvement program. It is something that we have been looking at. We have been looking at it from the point of view of having or developing something that looks more akin to a graduated scale with respect to speeding where, you know, speeding up to a certain number of kilometres per hour above the speed limit to have a certain fine. And then above that we'll have a different fine, but that is something that we need to develop and work out with Justice. But our current structure is 1 point for that. And all the other speeding in school zones and construction zones and all this will have different demerit points.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Mr. Parent.

**Mr. Parent:** — One other question is, do you have data on the people that speed by type of vehicle, like car versus motorbike, etc., etc.?

**Mr. Quaye:** — We haven't run data like that. I cannot answer yes or no. We have to look at the information that we have to actually see if the conviction notice that we get from Justice actually tells us the type of vehicle that the person was operating. I know we deliberately, when we brought the motorcycle graduated driver's licence — because we introduced certain types of consequences for certain infractions in motorcycle GDL — we specifically requested that the vehicle type be incorporated into the speed or the conviction notice, so we're able to do that. But for the others, I don't know. We'll have to check. We'll have to get back to you on that.

**Mr. Parent:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Seeing no more questions, we'll have you

move on, please.

[11:30]

**Mr. Quaye:** — The next one is seat belt use. And as I indicated at the beginning, you know, distractions, speeding, and impaired driving are driver actions. They're actions that a driver takes that increase the risk. This is a driver action in a way, but it's not a driving action per se, but an action nonetheless that can impact the consequence of a crash. So the seat belt use does not necessarily create a crash per se, but the impact of a crash is affected by seat belt use.

This line shows a graph that shows seat belt use rates in Saskatchewan as compared to the rest of Canada. It shows you, you know, a trend line that grows from around 50 per cent way back in 1984, lower than 50 per cent before then, and has grown to about 95 per cent in the last time Transport Canada did a survey in 2009 and 2010.

It is instructive, probably, for you to know that most of these lines here represent the trend in urban Saskatchewan and urban Canada. The picture on First Nations roads is very different, we do know, because we've been to numerous communities where we've had awareness activities and activities to encourage seat belt use where the use rate is about 50 per cent, similar to the use rate that we used to be in 1984, you know, in urban Saskatchewan.

Rural Saskatchewan, based on surveys that have been done by Transport Canada, is around 80 per cent. We think it's even slightly lower than that. So these numbers do not necessarily represent, you know, rural in Saskatchewan and action that is, you know, in First Nations communities.

The interesting thing to know is that, although you see these fatalities with respect . . . sorry, this seat belt use around 95 per cent, this graph shows, from fatalities, the representation of people who use their belt and people who didn't use their belt. Take 2012, for instance. In 59 out of the cases where the police actually reported whether a belt was used or not, I think it works out to about 30-something per cent, if my recollection is correct, were unbelted. Right?

Well we say you have a 95 per cent use rate, you know, but however if you look at people who died in crashes where police reported the use of a belt, almost 30 per cent of the cases of people were unbelted. For us, this is highly disconcerting. For us again it indicates that, you know, we do know that if you're buckled, your chances of surviving the crash, or less severe injury as a result of a crash, increases by as much as 50 per cent. So we're talking about 30 lives that could have been saved if almost all these people were buckled — or even if they were buckled to the use rate that we see in urban Saskatchewan of 95 per cent.

Rural roads, they're a significant problem for us. Again First Nations roads seem a very significant, you know, area for us. And again it comes down to a perennial issue. The chances of being caught on the highway, on the rural road, unbuckled, is very, very, very low.

Anecdotally we hear people saying, well I'm just driving down

to the farm, you know, and I've driven this many times. There's no need for me to buckle up. Well if I drive and I enter, you know, I roll into a slough, if I'm buckled up I won't be able to survive it, so it's better if I'm unbuckled, and so on. And so we hear many anecdotal things.

And there is still a fair amount of people who resist, you know, wearing their belt. And the chances of being ticketed for instance again is very, very, very low for seat belt use. And I think that's the message that we have so far on seat belts. I will take any questions.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — So SGI does some awareness and education work on-reserve then, it sounds like. You said you've done . . .

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes we do. Yes we do. We do a significant amount of work on reserves. We currently have two First Nations tribal councils; we actually have liaisons who actually work with all the First Nations communities in those tribal councils. And you know, they do impaired driving but a significant amount is seat belt use, principally because we see from our statistics almost close to 100 per cent, most of the years, 100 per cent of the people who die on First Nations roads were unbuckled. It's disappointing and it's very unfortunate, so we concentrate on that.

We also provide funding, community grant funding to those communities. And for the past . . . I think we started the program in about four or five years ago called the seat belt challenge, where we had communities challenge each other with respect to seat belt use. We went in and did awareness programs in these communities and got them to do it on their own and challenge each other with respect to belt use. We had some rather promising results from that.

Again you remember the slide that we started with. Legislation, awareness, enforcement — we need them all together happening. They need to reinforce each other. And I think that's one of the key messages we want to drive across is this enforcement piece works in concert with those awareness programs to help change behaviour. You don't necessarily, you know . . . The presence of the enforcement of it goes a long way to help make a difference.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Do you have a sense — just one last quick question on that — how much you spent on First Nations education and awareness on-reserve?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Well seat belt challenge program in 2012, we spent \$146,000 on that, almost \$147,000 on that. We have the First Nations positions that we have; we spent \$167,000 on that. And those are the two, you know, the two liaisons in the tribal councils. And then there's additional community grants programs that we run in these communities.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you for that.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Vermette:** — I'm just curious if you have the information to which two tribal councils would you be . . . Because

obviously there's, you're targeting certain areas where you're probably . . . It's raised some concerns and maybe with the number of fatalities so you're targeting those tribal councils. Would that be correct?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. We're currently working with Saskatoon Tribal Council and File Hills Tribal Council. There's a couple of reasons for that. We wanted to get our foot in the door with respect to First Nations communities, demonstrate that we have a program that can work and make a difference, working in concert with the First Nations communities. The two tribal councils that were, off the hop, really ready and willing to work with us to help make a difference and had a great interest were Saskatoon Tribal Council and File Hills Tribal Council.

We are currently talking to the Prince Albert PAGC [Prince Albert Grand Council], to that council to get in there as well. So our hope is that by pointing to what we've been able to do with these two other tribal councils, they'll say, well yes this is workable. This is something that can work and that gets us into that community.

Our goal eventually is to be able to work our way into almost all the tribal councils, but we're taking baby steps at the time. We've tried working from, how would I call it, from the top, like going through the FSIN [Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations] right from the top and work our way in. And it proved too much for us to chew, so we started with these baby steps to work our way into the various tribal councils.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Yes and that's good to know because that's what I was going to ask you. PAGC I'm familiar with so that's why I was going to ask that. And I know it targets a large area of populations, about 38,000 First Nations that they represent. So that's good.

Now when you look at the numbers here on the charts, and you said in fatalities where people were unrestrained, in 2012, was 59. Thirty-some per cent of the people were not wearing their seat belts when a fatality happened and they find out that . . . Do you guys have any numbers for costs, what that would cost for SGI to cover the cost for those fatalities of individuals? Because we're talking about 59. Is there any, an idea of what it would cost per individual? I'm just curious to see the costs to this.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Just to give you an example, an average death claim in Saskatchewan would cost Saskatchewan motorists about \$150,000; an average injury claim, approximately 30 for an injury. So you can see very clearly, if you're wearing your seat belt, even if you save half of those lives, there'd be also a savings in cost.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Quaye:** — I think although we do not show the injury numbers here with a seat belt, if you look at our data with respect to . . . Imagine a graph showing the number of people who died or are severely injured with a belt as compared to the number of people who die or are severely injured without a belt. The graph is skewed very much so to the serious injury side with respect to people who are unbelted.

So although we saw a snapshot of fatalities, the number of

serious injuries that result from people not using their belt is quite significant, and that also costs us a fair amount of money.

**The Chair:** — Okay. I guess we'll move on to the next section, please.

**Mr. Quaye:** — This one is more of the engineering type solutions that we have been working on. We see here the top urban intersections with most collisions. The collisions at urban intersections, less so the fatal type, more injury type and property damage type. Nonetheless, in the big centres; Regina, Saskatoon, I'd say P.A., there tends to be certain locations where high volume, high-traffic locations that are problematic with respect to crashes. Then also on the highway system, which is in this one, the locations that are also problematic with respect to crashes, both injury, PDO [property damage only], and fatal.

What we have been doing with respect to intersections, you know, because we are a safe system methodology and say, are there things that we could be doing as SGI or working in concert to the Ministry of Highways or the municipalities to help make a difference at these locations?

So over the years we have invested funding into intersection improvements in these major centres and also on sections of highways to try to help make a difference. The challenge for us has always been, while we might perceive that improvement of a certain intersection is very important or a section of highway is very important, the priorities for the municipality or maybe for Ministry of Highways for that particular year might not necessarily line up with those locations. They might be more interested in improving traffic flow on a section of road so that's where they want to put their funding. And that has a limited ability to be very successful on an expanded basis with these intersection improvement programs.

Where we have been able to do that, the returns have been good. Again we are limited to how much you can do, based on how much our partners have the commitment to help with that, based on the priorities at that point in time.

With respect to urban intersections, we have participated with the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon with the installation of red light cameras at certain locations or facilitated the introduction of red light cameras at certain locations. We have also, with respect to intersection improvements within these particular cities, been able to again make changes with signal control, widening of roads, and so on and so forth.

With highways, we've been able to make changes at intersections, introduced edge line rumble strips to again aid people, or intersection type rumble strips to help people approaching a big . . . from a minor road to a major highway to help people to, how would I say, wake up as they get to the location so that they do not collide into speedy vehicles.

But we wanted to include this particular section with respect to intersections because there are locations, identifiable locations within municipalities of highways that are amenable to change, and we continue our efforts to work in collaboration. Like Andrew indicated at the beginning, it is important that we see more collaboration and more working together with those sort



of agencies to help make our roads safe.

These changes are not necessarily changes from a safe system. We're not blaming the driver. What we are saying, if we can change the length of the amber signal so that that driver can clear the intersection, who's running the red lights or running the lights, can clear the intersection without colliding into somebody else, that helps. If we can change the signal control so that the driver is protected when they are making a left turn at the intersection, it helps. And all these help, you know, work together with driver behaviour to make our roads safe. We'll take any questions.

[11:45]

**The Chair:** — Okay. Mr. Parent had a question first.

**Mr. Parent:** — I find it, wow, that Saskatoon . . . I mean you've got to go through six intersections before you finally get to one in Regina, which is the seventh one for the most collisions. Also one of those intersections in Saskatoon, which is the number one spot, has a red light camera. So have they gone up or down? Because I know a lot of people panic when the light changes and you can't . . . Because I use that intersection all the time, and what I don't like is it's got that flashing hand and . . . Like for wait. And then they say when it goes solid — if that's true or not, I don't know — that once it goes solid, if you're so far away from the intersection you should stop because you won't make it through the light.

And my thing that was on Gormley was using the 15-second clock thing. Like when it gets to 15 seconds from when the light's going to change, it flashes, 15, 14, 13, etc. Because I hate that red light camera. It causes me a lot of grief when I get to that intersection. I slam on my brakes quite often because I don't know — and most people have no idea — how it works. So those are the questions I have. And the other question is related to the highway accidents. Like what is section? I don't understand that. Like it says Highway 1, section 8.

**Mr. Quaye:** — I'll take your first question first. Red light cameras . . . The goal of red light cameras is to reduce right-angle collisions at intersections. These tend to be very severe type of collisions. Seat belts don't help those. Unfortunately, and I think your statement is evidence of what has been observed happening at red light locations, is that people . . . Rear-end collisions tend to increase. People start slamming on their brakes in anticipation of not running the light, not getting a ticket. In the main overall, if you do the calculation with respect to injuries saved or dollars saved, the injuries due to right-angle collisions tend to be a lot more severe than rear-end and, in the main, the effectiveness of the cameras have been shown to be positive.

Nonetheless it doesn't diminish what you're saying with respect to rear-end collisions. And I think I have not heard anybody, you know, articulate it the way you said, or you don't really understand how the camera works and with respect to the flashing hand and whether the light is going to change and so on and so forth. And probably that's an opportunity to do some more education with respect to the signal system and how it works for red light camera locations in particular.

The numbers that change on the hand, flashing hand signal, are meant for the pedestrians, for to warn the pedestrians. When it's counting down, it tells you you can still cross. When it gets to zero, you can still cross because you might have a period of amber that allows you to do that. But like I said, the countdown is used by drivers. The flashing hand is also used by many drivers to anticipate whether the light is going to change. But principally what we're allowing for drivers is to use the signs on the signal head, like the amber, red, and green in terms of managing their ability to traverse the intersection. But like I said, I haven't heard anybody articulate it the way you did, and probably it is . . . We'll communicate that back to the engineers. There's more work to be done with respect to education on how the system works.

**Mr. Parent:** — One thing I have found, I've actually timed that flashing when it goes solid to when the light turns yellow in various intersections in Saskatoon, and none are consistent. Some will be, you've got five seconds to get through once that goes solid before it turns yellow. The next time it turns exactly the same time. So there's no . . . That's why people like myself tend to panic when you see that light hand going. You either bolt, which means if you hit somebody you're going to really hit them, or you stop. You slam on your brakes. That's all I'm trying to get. There's no consistency. There's no education on it.

**Mr. Quaye:** — The point is well taken and we will endeavour to communicate back, to talk to our engineering colleagues about that. Your second question was about sections, the highway. When we pulled the data on the intersections in highways, what we did, because of the way police report these crashes to us, we do not have . . . They will say it occurred at an intersection mile to give us an intersection on a section of road on which it occurred. The highways, each highway is, locations on highways are determined by something called a control section, and the number of kilometres along a control section. So let's take Highway 11, for instance. When you exit off Pasqua on to the highway, for instance, you might be in control section 5, for instance. And within control section 5, there might be about 30 kilometres. Right? So if they want to say where a crash occurred on the highway, they will tell us it's control section 5, 25 kilometres in. So it tells us where it occurred.

So the different control sections along each highway allows us to map where things occur on the highway system. And that is what is referred to here, are the sections. So the sections of highway, the control sections within which there were a lot more intersection type collisions, are the ones that are indicated here on the graph. It's just a different technology on the highway system as compared to the urban road system.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay. I just want to know because we've asked for, in Saskatoon, for a few intersections to be reduced to 80 kilometres an hour from the 110 because . . . And I don't know if they keep that track of how many actually that happen at that intersection versus that section. Because some intersections will be way higher than that whole section, like say, coming to Regina, where Grasswood is for instance. That used to be extremely bad, and they've made some changes to it but, you know, it's still at 100 kilometres an hour.

**Mr. Quaye:** — I think that would be best for Highways to answer. But I think we collect the data and we share the data with them. So whatever information we have, they do have on these roads.

**Mr. Parent:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Great. Thanks. Yes, Highways will be this afternoon. That's a good question for them on speed zone sections. Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Vermette:** — I guess you referred to partners and different organization groups that you work with to try to make sure to reduce intersection fatalities and stuff like that. And that's the main purpose I guess of the committee. And I mean we could talk about roads and stuff, and there might be partners who want to talk about that area. But at this point, we're focusing on intersections and stuff like that.

If a person was to approach, on highways, and not to get into the discussion, but if somebody wanted to approach yourself or any of your officials, people work within your organization, would the public or anyone else have access to information from SGI? Or is that open to the public? Or no, it's not?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes data is available to anyone.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. Thank you for that. That's good.

Now the other thing I was thinking about, an organization, a partner like CAA [Canadian Automobile Association], do you guys work with them in any way? Do you talk with them? Do they give you guys reports? Do they look at your data? Do you guys communicate with an organization like that?

**Mr. Cameron:** — We don't have a formal communication with them, but all of our TAIS [traffic accident information system] data, like Quaye said, is available to them. Some of them use it. Lots of urban municipalities use it. Highways of course use it. I don't know what data they do collect.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. I guess just for clarification, could SGI provide to the committee, on the highway intersections with the most collisions, can you tell us the actual location? Like Highway 1 section 8, if that's 9th Avenue at Moose Jaw, we'd like to know that please, if it's a specific intersection, which is much more applicable for us moving forward as we look to make recommendations. That'd be welcomed.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes, we can provide that detail.

**The Chair:** — Great. Thank you. We'll move on. And looking at the clock, it's 5 to 12. So I think what we'll do for the members of the committee, we'll have SGI run through the rest of their report, and then just make some notes for yourself if there's additional questions. We'll try to get finished by 12:30; therefore we have a lunch break. And I have a couple of interviews to do as well. So if you don't mind, we'll make that work, and if we have to call SGI back, we can. So SGI, please go ahead.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Okay. I'll take you through wildlife while Kwei's away for a second. As you can see, wildlife claims are large numbers. In 2012, 13,658 claims were put in. Total cost of damage and injuries, \$51 million. This has been growing for a while, actually quite a while. And not too surprising. The number, the herd size, especially in southern Saskatchewan, has been growing. We see a change in the number of moose seen in southern Saskatchewan, the number of elk. And moose especially are causing a concern because of their large size. They're very difficult to see at night, and as a result we've seen fatalities from them.

What is concerning about this is there is no evident solution to . . . You can't fence all of the Saskatchewan highways. Fencing works in corridors where there's a natural barrier where you're trying to divert. But certainly we have too many highways and hot spots that we'd have to fence, and we'd just divert them further down the road.

We need to look at solutions to eliminate, have less numbers of wildlife in high-traffic locations. And I think this situation, if we have . . . Like you see outside of Saskatoon, where we have No. 11 Highway with high traffic and a dense population of deer, is probably going to continue to, if not stay static, get worse. This is one where there needs to be a solution where we do change how wildlife interacts in those high-risk locations like No. 11 Highway, like No. 6 Highway. There's some real hot spots. But there isn't an easy solution other than reducing the herd size in those locations.

There's one more slide here. That just shows the severity, and unfortunately it shows the fatalities that result out of wildlife collisions which is the very top number there, the little box in green. So 2011 . . . sorry 2010 was, there was eight fatalities that year. 2011 dropped back to two, and I don't have the 2012 numbers yet but I think it's four or six. I'm not sure what's been finalized there.

So it is concerning. There was some . . . An RCMP officer hit a moose on the way to a call at night and was killed. A family, where the father was killed with three other people in the vehicle, hit a large animal, a moose. Twenty-two people killed in total since 2007 and 2,098 injuries. So you can see where the costs come very quickly when you have that many impacts and injuries, like I said, \$50 million.

That's one where we'll continue work with whoever, including Environment, but there isn't an easy solution to this. It's also one that other jurisdictions are facing and with . . . Short of I think of Newfoundland is having a cull on animals, I don't know any others that are really having much success in dealing with this. That's it for wildlife, unless there's any questions . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Okay, sorry.

[12:00]

**Mr. Quaye:** — Now we'll talk about some of the current initiatives that we have, just to give you an idea of some of the efforts that have been put into place to try to help make a difference.

Legislation-wise, and some of this legislation goes back to 1996, we have addiction screening for different types of

impaired driving infractions. This was introduced in 1996 and the goal there was to be able to identify if an impaired, somebody who has an impaired driving offence, has a problem, an alcohol-related problem that requires them to go through some type of recovery program or they just need to be educated to help make them change their behaviour. Currently SGI pays for addiction screening, and it costs about close to \$500 for the screening.

Driver licence suspensions were increased, provincial driver licence suspensions were increased in '96 — one year for first offence, three years for second offence, and five years for third and subsequent offences. Quite a significant jump at the time from the first offence I think at the time was about six months and it was increased to one year. So we made significant improvements there.

Low BAC requirements. In '96 the low BAC requirement was introduced. So anybody who was caught and blew into a device between .04 and .08 committed an offence and that it was a so-called low BAC offence. For a first offender and experienced driver, the first low BAC offence is 24-hour suspension currently, a second offence is 15 days suspension, and a third and subsequent offence is a 90-day suspension. For new drivers in GDL, it's a 30-day suspension for a first offence, 90 days for a second and subsequent offences.

Zero tolerance was introduced for new drivers in 2001 where they are not allowed to have any alcohol at all during the GDL period of their driving.

In 2001 we introduced an ignition interlock program. It's a so-called optional program, i.e., if you are eligible, you can opt to go on an ignition interlock device, and it allows you to get your driver's licence early. It was initially made available to only first offenders, and subsequently in 2007 it was expanded to repeat offenders.

We introduced a safe driver recognition program in 2002 — reward drivers who have a safe driving record and penalize drivers who display risky behaviour. GDL program was introduced in 2005. Again we've spoken at length about GDL, which incrementally allows drivers to learn while managing the amount of risk that they are exposed to. In 2010 we introduced the cellphone law, which we have again spoken about. And in 2011 we introduced a GDL program, but this time for motorcyclists here in Saskatchewan.

Area of enforcement. We've spoken about Enforcement Overdrive. We've spoken about RID, the report impaired drivers program. We invest significantly in something called automated licence plate readers, ALPRs. These are devices that the police use to allow them to use that device to identify drivers who are disqualified or who are driving unregistered. So instead of a police officer manually checking for this, the machine checks for this. And data is provided to the police through a download into this device and it allows them to more efficiently identify these drivers. The rationale for doing this is that we have a vehicle impoundment program for drivers who are driving disqualified, but if there is no way to efficiently identify these drivers, the law quickly goes to zero. So this device allows police to more effectively do this, and we're working with police to expand the availability of these devices.

In Saskatoon, for speed enforcement on Circle Drive we worked with them to more effectively use or effectively use their plane to identify, you know, speeding drivers on the Circle Drive.

Education. We do an expansive amount of education. This is just a few of the things that we do. Education that we do extends from radio, TV, billboard-type awareness campaigns, to actually going to schools, to working in communities, and like we mentioned earlier on, with liaisons in First Nations communities to try to educate as much as possible. So we educate across the board.

Any piece of legislation that you saw earlier on, we try to support with education and awareness. So whether distracted driving, seat belt, child restraints, motorcycle safety, wildlife, drinking and driving, we invest a fair amount into education to support these because, again, the principles of safe systems you saw earlier on. So we need all those pieces together with good legislation to make it happen.

With speed, we work through the various municipalities and the RCMP to cost-share the purchase of intelligent speed reader boards or the mobile speed reader systems — you might have seen some around the city here and some other places — which tells you what your speed is and tells you to slow down. Again, the police have found this to be a very effective tools to use to try to calm speed and to more efficiently allocate their resources.

We support the Students Against Drinking and Driving through funding to allow them to bring a message to the youth with respect to drinking and driving. We ventured into the high-tech world by the introduction of an SGI safe ride app, which allows people who have been out drinking to locate an alternative ride home, be it through a designated driver that they have in their system or calling a cab to get home.

We run seat belt challenges, we mentioned earlier on. We run child restraint clinics all over the place to help make a difference.

In the engineering world, in support of helping reduce crashes, wintertime crashes, we work with the city of Regina. We in fact bought the sanding truck you might have seen around the place with SGI written on it. And the goal was to concentrate on high-speed roads, the Ring Road and Lewvan Drive, and to get there as soon as possible so that they can sand these roads to minimize crashes on these roads.

We've done lots of investment with respect to infrastructure-related improvements. I indicated examples from the intersection area.

And with respect to wildlife, what we've done from an engineering perspective is to work with highways to build a fence just outside the town of Harris, a 5-kilometre fence in the game reserve there to minimize the number of deer crossing the highway and hence reduce the number of crashes.

So this gives you a sense that we in fact concentrate as much as we can, within the scope of our ability to influence, to invest in engineering, awareness, education, legislation, and enforcement

to help make a big difference, consistent with the safe systems approach that we spoke about.

The next section talks about our recommendations, the solutions that we have. And the solutions you see will be consistent with some of the discussion that we've held this morning. The first one that we have relates to enforcement. So enforcement relates to the certainty of being apprehended. Most of the crashes, most of the fatalities that we indicated earlier on, are in RCMP jurisdictions. And we believe that by investing in more enforcement, particularly in RCMP-related jurisdictions, would go a long, long way, would be an overarching component to all the various types of fatalities or causes of fatalities that we've seen earlier on. Additional enforcement to increase the perception that the violator will be apprehended will help change driver behaviour. And we believe it will reduce, help reduce the injuries and fatalities that we see.

We've done some analysis on the, I'll call it the optimum number of resources that we need. You can see on the slide how we compare to our sister provinces, Alberta and British Columbia. And based on the analysis that we did, we determined that we will need about 120 enforcement positions here in Saskatchewan dedicated to traffic enforcement. So these are not positions just, you know, available to do any other thing, but dedicated to traffic enforcement. And we in fact did some analysis on the possibility of how we can introduce this over a four-phase regime.

**The Chair:** — Excuse me.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes.

**The Chair:** — Kwei Quaye, you know what? I'm just thinking, and I'd like to talk to the committee about this. You know, this last section of the report's going to be probably one of the most critical parts to go through. I don't want to rush SGI through this. I've looked through some of this already. I have a lot of questions already coming out of this last section.

With all due respect, thank you for your time, but I think we should just probably have you back. Because I'm thinking if we were to go and listen to all of the stakeholders now, and then we convene back at some later date and have you here to go through your possible solutions, that might actually help to form a good premise for us to go forward with recommendations after everything we've heard.

Would the committee be in favour of that, versus rushing through this and missing some points? Because this is going to be tabled for the public as well, so the stakeholder groups can also look at this who are going to come present to us. And they may want to talk to the recommendations.

And for us, I just have to wonder . . . I just think personally I'd like to take a longer time to go through these possible solutions. Would that be a consensus of the committee?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Okay. I think then, if you do not mind . . . I hate to cut you off. I didn't mean to be rude. But you've done a great job today. This last part of your report is going to be very

critical for this committee, I believe, to look at what's been worked on already, where you've looked at going in the future as well. And I think after we talk to the rest of the stakeholder groups, it's going to form a good basis for us to come forth with recommendations.

So I guess, just for the committee and the public to know, this report will be tabled, as I've stated, so the public can look at it now. And we'll come back. We'll confer with SGI to come back again for another date and time that'll work. But, Andrew?

**Mr. Cartmell:** — I understand for the record we have to mention we're actually going to be submitting a written submission as well.

**The Chair:** — Okay.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Which is over and above this document. It's ready to go.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Great. That's even better then. Okay, that's even better for us to have it all in totality when we come back to meet with you at the very . . . You may be one of the last groups we see now looking into this, what's happening after today with the great presentation and some of the stuff I've seen already, at first glance, for recommendations and solutions.

So on that note, I guess we'll take an adjournment now or just a recess. We'll recess and return at 1 o'clock. Thank you.

[The committee recessed from 12:12 until 13:00.]

**The Chair:** — Afternoon, everybody. Welcome back to the all-party Traffic Safety Committee. This afternoon we're going to have some more presenters and we're going to start with Highways.

But before I begin, just to advise the witness of the processes. I call you witness. Don't take that as a . . . This isn't a court of law but it's just procedure. I'd like to advise witnesses of the process for presentations. I'll be asking all witnesses to introduce themselves and anyone else they may be presenting with. Please state your name and, if applicable, your position within the government or organization you represent.

If you have a written submission, please advise that you would like to table your submission. Once that occurs, your submission will be available to the public. Each presentation should be limited to about 15 or so minutes. In your case we have an hour scheduled so you can adjust that accordingly. And we have questions and answers from committee members after.

Once you're completed, we'll have questions for you as well. I'll direct the questioning and recognize each member who is to speak. Members are not permitted to engage witnesses in any debate and witnesses are not permitted to ask questions of the committee members. So we have a prescribed amount of time and, having said that, please begin.

**Presenter: Ministry of Highways and Infrastructure**

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — Good afternoon. I'm Jennifer Ehrmantraut with the Ministry of Highways and Infrastructure.

I'm the assistant deputy minister for ministry services and standards division. On my left I have David Stearns, the executive director for technical standards branch, and on my right I have Sukhy Kent, the director at technical standards branch.

So I understand that the purpose of the committee is to really look at ways for improving traffic and reducing the number of accidents and injuries and fatalities that could be caused by impaired driving, distractive driving, excessive speed, wildlife, and intersection treatments. So we've prepared a presentation today to address a couple of those issues. And a lot of it is based on a conversation that we had last week, and it's really focusing on the speed side of things. How does Highways determine what speed limits to set? And then looking at the intersection side of things. So we've kind of tailored our presentation to what the needs of the committee were going forward.

So I wanted to start off with the mandate of Highways. And our mandate is really to manage the Saskatchewan's . . . the current and the future transportation network as it relates to economic growth, population growth, overall social and well-being of the province. We manage 26 000 kilometres of highway as well as manage some northern airports, bridges, culverts, and ferries. And really our overarching lines of business are to build, maintain, operate, and regulate the system.

In everything that we do, safety is a top priority. You know, coming from the engineering side of things, you know, the intention of Highways and what we do is we use standards to build roads safely. We take into account human factors when we have designed the standards when we're building the road. So safety is always at the forefront. That's the mission, is that we design the roads safely to begin with.

So getting right into what you were really asking for, and this is not going to be a 15-minute presentation. It's probably going to be about a five-minute and allow questions.

So the setting of the speed limits. So really there's a couple of things that we look at when we're setting the speed limits. First, you know, regulation dictates that the speed is 80 unless otherwise posted. So that's the basis of where we're starting. And everything else, you know, we're looking at the engineering side of things. We're looking at engineering studies when we're changing the speed limits.

We're making sure that the speed limits that are set are safe. We're making sure that they're enforceable. So if we're going to set a speed limit out on a twinned highway, say, of 50 kilometres, well that's not enforceable. Nobody's going to drive that. That's not reasonable. Things like that. So that is taken into account when we're looking at our engineering study. And you know, it has to be obeyed by the majority of drivers, and if that's not going to happen, you're never going to be able to manage that speed. We want to make sure that the speed is consistent with the travel, and we don't want to provide that false sense of security. We want to make sure it's respected by the public and that it's close to the speeds that are driven.

So changes. Changes are initiated by several different ways. It could be a public complaint. We could have people coming and calling our office to let us know that there's an issue. It could be

an RM [rural municipality] request.

We could have changed the road in some way. We could have twinned the road. We could have upgraded the road that prompted a change in the speed. We could take a look at the collision records, and it could determine that something needs to be changed. Or it could be an internal assessment, you know, just going out and having the engineers or crews or anybody inspecting the road determining that something might need to be changed. So all of that is how it's initiated, and then it goes back into the previous slide where there's an engineering study that's done to take a look at what's required, what's reasonable, what's safe, how can we make sure that everything is maintained.

And intersection changes. You know, there's several different things that we can do on the intersection side of things. And really we look at where those conflict points are going to be, and that's when we design the road. We take a look to make sure that the sightlines, that people can see, that there's not a big bunch of bushes that are sitting there so that people can't see the stop sign, or if there's a hill approaching or a curve approaching so that people can't see. So those are taken into consideration when the road is designed, and it's continued to be reviewed after that, and then it can progress from there.

There could be driver alerts, could be amber flashing lights that are added when, you know, when it's warranted to be. There could be noise bars that are added. We could have different signing, different lighting, turning lanes, and then that ultimate enhancement would be any intersection or interchanges that are required.

So there's a huge progression. And all of that again goes back to what I was explaining to you on the speed side of things. It really is based on an engineering study, so we're looking at people who are coming in, you know, the complaints, collision records. We're looking at, you know, all of those different factors when we design this. It's not a . . . You know, it's both proactive and sometimes reactive when we're looking at the design of things.

Like I said, a fairly quick presentation and really kind of tailored to what you were looking at. And I'd just like to reiterate that, you know, everything from that engineering point of view is looking at safety as the utmost factor, and everything would be reviewed based on an engineering study.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Are there any questions from the committee members? That's actually a great presentation because Jennifer did call me and asked, what is it you're looking for? And rather than having — and no disrespect to engineers — talking about gradients and slopes and coefficients and friction and all that kind of good stuff, we thought we'd keep very high level to the two areas I believe which really are relevant to highways in regards to the five parameters we're looking at.

So if I've erred though, please feel free as a committee to ask questions involving the other avenues as well. So we have Mr. Vermette first.

**Mr. Vermette:** — I guess I appreciate you explaining the

process, and we're trying to figure out and to reduce the fatalities in the province. And I mean there's many areas that, you know, we were suggesting we're going to look at. But coming from highways and engineers and looking at that, whether it's intersections, whether it's road, I mean engineers would look at roads. And I mean we could talk about all the different areas that you guys want to talk about.

My biggest concern I guess, at the end of the day, if people are going to bring and raise concerns to the committee and, you know, our job at the end of the day is to look at all the information we get. People will share their views, their ideas and, you know, they want to make recommendations. But at the end, I guess for us as a committee, my understanding — and Mr. Chair will correct me if I'm wrong — is to try to reduce fatalities in the province and to make sure our roads our safe. Having said that, you're looking at it as an engineer.

Information that Highways provides, is it open to the public if the public decided they wanted to look at something? You mentioned in your opening comments that you . . . How did you say about . . . It's reactive. It's proactive. There's different things you guys will do on roads, whether it's intersections, whether it's any highway in the province. That's what you try to do.

The information that you guys do look at, and certain highways we'll say . . . I don't care if it's Highway No. 2 or Highway 102 or Highway 11, 16, you name it. Is it open to the public to look at some of your guys' work that you're doing as engineers, and previous stuff that you would've done when it, we'll say an old road versus a new road? There's times you review roads, whether it's intersections, roads. Is there certain times . . . And why do you guys review roads? And to reduce fatalities, to reduce collisions, you made that in your opening comments. So I'd just like to . . . I guess it's a big area, but I'd just like to see your thoughts on that. And at the end, to try to explain to me how would the public or how would we as committee members have access to that information from Highways?

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — From the public access side of things, you know, I think it's really that two-way communication where we have those conversations about where we need to be looking at things. You know, I don't think that the public, and I know certainly I can't read the engineering reports. They're very detailed. I think that you commented on the slopes and the gradients and the coefficients. So from a public sampling, those engineering reports probably wouldn't be very useful to the public. But it goes back to, you know, it's based on an engineering study. And how it's initiated is through the dialogue.

So I'm expecting that the committee would bring forward some of the recommendations and we could work forward on those intersections together. I know that SGI presented their, this morning, their top 10 intersections and what some of the issues are around that. And I know some of them could be covered through some of the major infrastructure that's being looked at across, you know, across the province. And how do we prioritize that? How do we look at that? So there's some of them that are being worked on actively right now.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Thank you. I'll come back after to a

question.

**The Chair:** — Sure. Thank you. Mr. Parent, you have a question?

**Mr. Parent:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I had a question on when we had the presentation from SGI earlier. They talked about the different highways and sections where there was lots of, most of the collisions occur. And they didn't really know, like is this section 30 kilometres long? Is it 2 kilometres? So is there a location that we can look on your website that shows us where that section 23 is, for instance, on a certain highway?

[13:15]

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — Is it on . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . But we have access. It can be available where it is, if it's the slide that you're talking about, the intersection with the most collisions. Is that the slide that you're talking about?

**Mr. Parent:** — Yes.

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — It would probably be at one of those intersection points, and I think that they have it in here. The first one was Balgonie to Regina. So there would be one intersection in that area that was the highest for the collisions, and we can work with SGI and get that.

**Mr. Parent:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Oh, sorry. Ms. Chartier, you go first.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay, thank you. Just with respect to your comment about SGI coming forward with its top 10 urban and rural roads, is there a great deal of data sharing between SGI and the various ministries? I'm assuming that you probably had this list, and that's how you create some of your targets for infrastructure spending.

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — That's definitely shared back and forth. We do have access to the database; we have access to the reports. And we do have a good working relationship with SGI to share the information back and forth. When there is a collision or when there is a fatality on the road, we do an investigation on, you know, where it came from, what were the causing factors, and to see if there is anything that should be done from an engineering point of view. But there is definitely sharing between ourselves and SGI.

**Ms. Chartier:** — So this would be involved in your prioritizing of infrastructure spending then?

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — When you're looking across the board on what different treatments, what different things should be done, that is definitely a factor. Safety is always a factor in everything that Highways does.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you for that.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. I guess I'll have a couple of questions. We look at the population of the province is growing. We see certain urban centres are sprawling. I think of Warman, Martensville outside Saskatoon, increasing traffic volumes

going back and forth on . . . And not to criticize any of the infrastructure work that's still outstanding there.

What determines then in a case like that where you would do a reduced speed zone area because of safety issues for egress and access on to the major roads? I've been in that Martensville area a couple of times driving back and forth there, and I'll tell you, it's an interesting . . . It's 4, 4:30 to 5 o'clock, and then again in the morning it's actually kind of interesting as well for traffic flows through there.

Is there something that is prescriptive to reduce speed zone areas? And then on that point, what's the responsibility of the municipality versus the Ministry of Highways to set the speed in a prescriptive area?

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — I'm going to pass this over to David Stearns, the executive director for technical standards branch to answer.

**Mr. Stearns:** — First of all, you mentioned at supper time and those times in the day better known to us as peak hour. Peak hour traffic volumes are based on the highest flow rate in a 15-minute period. What we look at, we have to balance what is happening in those periods of time in the day versus other parts of the day. So if we have a situation where there's a corridor or a number of intersections that are operating and they exhibit some problems during those peak hours, which might be less than an hour by the way in terms of that flow rate, we would look at some of the devices that Jennifer has mentioned.

We have to balance that with other parts of the day where the problem doesn't exist. Obviously as the traffic volumes increase and drivers take risks to make left turns and gaps and all of that kind of stuff that we get into, then we have to look at more and more devices. The process would not be to go to speed first because of course we're looking at a high-mobility corridor. The whole intent is uninterrupted flow with high mobility to get the movement of goods and people across the province. So that isn't the first avenue that we would go to.

If we do have an existing problem that we've gone through all of the other myriad of opportunities to address it, we would consider putting up some advisory signs because of course during that one period of time . . . to the point that we even try to reinforce the speeds. For example, out on Highway 1 just out of Regina east here, we have some of the photo or the radar relay signs that tells you what the speed is. And we try to go through all of those things long before we look at reducing speed because of course that has a dramatic effect on the mobility and therefore the cost to society, if you want, in terms of moving those people and goods through.

The other part of that is, as Jennifer mentioned, it's got to be realistic. There is no sense putting something out there that just becomes, unrealistically becomes then an enforcement problem. And so that's part of it.

**The Chair:** — Can I ask a further follow-up question then? There are other areas in the province, and I can't remember if it's Borden or Radisson, where there were some fatalities at an intersection, I believe, because of pedestrians. And there was a reduced speed zone put in there. Is that why the reduced speed

zone over time would have been put in place versus doing a highway speed because statistics drive the change?

I'm just kind of curious how that works. Because I know, again it goes to my first part of the question where we see certain parts of the province that are doing very well. I mean, I even think of the North. Been up there fishing a few times in my life, and you know what? You see some of these roads are not in bad shape but there's truck traffic which is pretty bad. They're going pretty good. And you know what? Those kind of things as well.

So there's been some questions have been raised by some of my colleagues about do we need a truck reduction of speed in certain areas to prevent overall . . . to encourage safety. That's the idea of a reduced speed zone. So a couple of different things. How is it you determine when you do a speed zone reduction? Is it based on statistics and fatalities? And then when you look at trucks versus cars for speed, has that been a factor in some areas as well? And that's not just for the North, it's for the rural areas and the South as well.

**Mr. Stearns:** — First of all as Jennifer pointed out, we do an engineering study that considers a lot of different factors that might've contributed to whatever it was — a crash or, in that case, injury or fatality possibly. Every fatality is reviewed by our ministry. Out of that, we try to identify the root causes before we go off and put various things in. If it's something that is in a semi-urban or suburban type of area, we may very well look at speed reductions or speed zones. The classic one we often get faced with is school zones on a rural cross section where there's very low traffic volumes. And of course again to artificially impose things in those kind of settings becomes not as good as possibly just retaining the speed and maybe addressing it in some other fashion.

The other thing that you mentioned is having different speeds for trucks versus other types of vehicles. One of the factors that we do look at is the variation in speeds or the range of speeds that are going through a particular section. What we know from research and studies is that as that speed range increases, as you get slower vehicles and faster vehicles all mixed together, actually the crash rate will increase. So we have to be careful in terms of how we just artificially go in and, even worse, if we artificially create a bigger speed range than what is actually there.

So we look at a lot of different things. Every one has often got their own unique characteristics. Ultimately we do engage the services of experts in human factors engineering on occasion if we need to because sometimes we've exhausted some of the obvious engineering solutions and we've got to try and find out what maybe is really clicking there.

And at the end of the day we should mention that there are the three Es that we certainly . . . Engineering is only one part of this. The enforcement and the education is obviously another part. We look at driving as a system, so we have the road, the vehicle, and the driver. And so it's kind of comprised of three. So we look at each piece of that when a collision or something's occurring or if we have a high, what we call a black spot location where there's a high absolute number of crashes occurring, or in fatalities. We look at that sort of thing.

So it's a complex solution to a complex situation.

**The Chair:** — Okay, thank you. Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Vermette:** — I guess thinking about, and the Chair mentioned it, about roads in northern Saskatchewan. And some people will have their views of those roads. And as those roads lead, sometimes they're very long, could be 100 kilometres of terrible roads to drive, but you come to an intersection where everyone's safety is what people are concerned about. And if you look at some of the roads that we have to travel on up north, and, yes, it's even worse when you get to the intersections for safety.

And I think about it, and the one I kind of look at in La Ronge, and I mean, there we're having roads that's paved. But we see the way they've tried to . . . The engineers went up there to Highway No. 2, I guess, some three years ago, where they did some, I guess, upgrades, tried to fix the problem. There are no lights there, so I mean traffic travels at the speed they're going to travel. And I mean, I'll be honest with you, sometimes the congestion is, at that intersection, is scary. You're picking and deciding when you're going. And I mean, I'm surprised that actually there hasn't been more fatalities in that area, dealing with La Ronge. And I mean, I look at Air Ronge and just the traffic flow that's going in there as it moves along, and that's going to be interesting to see.

Have you guys done any studies, reports on it? And was that why the engineers did the work they did? And I'm just thinking about that because it's just one area, and that was the concern with the fatalities that were there. So I'd just like to see your guys' comments, if you can, on that area. And then I've got some more . . .

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — I don't have the specific details of that exact intersection in front of us. If it's something that the committee would like, we can definitely go back and take a look at it. From that standpoint, everything kind of goes back to what both Dave and I have been talking about. We're taking a look at the intersections, making sure that everything is as safe as we possibly can when we're prioritizing what we have on an annual basis.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. And I guess that's fair. And I understand, I don't expect you to bring on every . . . And I'm naming one because of course it's an area where I live so it's a concern. And I realize we're supposed to be looking, and I have to sometimes look at the whole province and intersections. I appreciate that.

If the public wanted information for highways when they're talking about roads and intersections and when fatalities . . . and concerns, that people are concerned now whether they're going to have looking at all the engineer stuff. But if they do have concerns, then how would they approach your ministry, and how do they get that information? Is it open to the public for the public to, or for any committee member who wants, to follow up with some information from you? Is that possible, and how would they do that?

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — There's also information that can come back from the ministry. It depends on the detail that you're

really looking at, but it can be done through written letter, contact with our ministry, with the area manager, with a director or ourselves. So that's how the information can come back.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. And I appreciate that because I know we're limited, as the Chair will let us know, we're limited to, as a committee, where we can go when we're talking about fatalities. And they want to look at intersections; they don't want to talk about roads. So we're being limited to where we can go, so we have to be careful. And I want to be clear on that.

So I'm trying to word my concerns and making sure we're looking at the whole province — intersections, fatalities. It's been very delicate to try to do that because the Chair will call us out of order. And I appreciate he has his role. But we're trying to deal with fatalities in the whole province, and sometimes it is road conditions that make intersections probably more unsafe than anything, so that could play a factor in that, whether it's bumping, falling apart, whatever when individuals . . . So I'm trying to say but there is so much more I'd like to say, but we're limited.

But I wanted to be clear that the public does have access to your ministry. If they have certain areas where they would have to raise concerns to bring forward to the ministry or for asking for input, I think you've made it clear that they can, whether it's a letter, a contact, there are provisions for them to contact you. Correct?

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — That's open to everybody all of the time through letters. But I'd like to just comment on what you were talking about.

I know SGI has provided a lot of information and a lot of information on high priority areas, on intersections. And that would be, you know, the main focus of what we're looking at too, is that, you know, those high-risk areas — the areas where, you know, a number of injuries, damage claims, those kinds of things have been identified. So that would be the first place we would start on our review. And that is the first place that we start, is looking at that same data that they've provided you.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. On that point too, I mean I also recognize, to Mr. Vermette's point, that you have ongoing consultations with SUMA [Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association], SARM [Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities], New North as well. So there's, those municipal groups come forward as well — having been the minister involved with them — that they also come forth and they talk to you individually. And always you have district area managers as well that are in communication continuously with municipal leaders. So that's a good thing as well. Ms. Wilson.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. In certain areas of the province, there's seasonal traffic, be it agriculture or tourism, that drives up the traffic volume. And it probably increases at peak times during the day as well, such as long weekends. And what I'm wondering, what is your idea of safety, say traffic turning lanes, or do you have traffic counts at specific times to help you monitor the safety and the volume of traffic that is



going through?

[13:30]

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — We do have traffic counts that are done throughout the year. Some of them are permanent traffic counters and some of them are traffic counters where we go out and we do some of the traffic counting and then we normalize it through the year. And we do take into account some of those things that you're talking about.

One really good example of what's going on right now is the Highway 10 passing lanes. You know, it's a really good example where you do see a lot of traffic increased in the summer. The traffic counts are growing on that road, so the passing lanes are a really good example of something that the ministry is trying that's innovative that will, you know, that has been identified through safety, increased traffic, to deal with that.

**Ms. Wilson:** — All right. Thank you very much. And will you be considering more traffic lanes as the economic activity grows, as the province grows?

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — Yes. What we want to really do after we install the passing lanes on Highway 10 is be able to do a study, be able to take a look over the next couple of years at the impact that the passing lanes are having, to be able to analyze it before we go start and looking at all the other different places that we would put it in. It's really one of those really good pilot projects that we want to really understand the impact before we start going and putting more up.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Cox, then Ms. Chartier.

**Mr. Cox:** — Just a general question, and I've had it posed to me here the last little while coming through the winter that we've just come through. Can you tell . . . Who has the ultimate decision as far as closing a highway? Is it Highways or is it RCMP or who is it? And if it is Highways, is there any thought to maybe tightening that up a little bit with the accidents that we've just seen through this past winter?

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — Yes. The ultimate authority lies with Highways. We do consult with the RCMP and there's ongoing dialogue with the RCMP in certain situations. This winter was a very high anomaly winter where there were a lot of very, very quick-moving storms where, you know, within an hour the conditions had changed and swayed drastically on the road.

So it's something that it's not a typical winter that we have just come through. And I know that the crews and everybody were out doing an amazing job this winter. So it's something that we're looking at and it's something that we do work very closely with the RCMP on the closure of roads.

**Mr. Cox:** — No, I 100 per cent agree with the excellent job that the Highways crews did all winter. But it just seems that sometimes there's people out there that probably shouldn't have been, and maybe it should have been tightened up. And maybe that's something we could look at, that it should be closed

quicker maybe.

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — It's a dialogue that we continue to have in our ministry and we'll take that back and have that again.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you. Darryl, or the Chair, and I had an opportunity . . . Sorry about that.

**The Chair:** — It's okay.

**Ms. Chartier:** — To go to a traffic safety conference in Edmonton, and there was a presentation on Vision Zero in Sweden. And they talked about 2+1's which were lanes which, as the Chair pointed out to me later, sounded like passing lanes, but it sounded like a brilliant idea to me, with two lanes. But the way the presenter made it sound like, in Sweden it wasn't just . . . It was sort of a constant flow where you've got three lanes and they're all going. For one period you'll have two lanes and . . . different than a passing lane. The only time I've experienced passing lanes are in Alberta. So I'm wondering first of all, is a 2+1 in fact just a passing lane?

**Mr. Stearns:** — The phrase . . . It can work both ways, but what you're actually talking about, if I catch it correctly, is what are called counterflow lanes where we would look at peak hour traffic volumes and if the capacity in the travelled lane is not sufficient enough, quite often in higher population jurisdictions and so on, they'll actually have a reversible lane. That is, on peak hour morning traffic when everybody's coming into the community for example to work, the lane would be dedicated to that. In the afternoon, it would be reversed, and the lane would be dedicated to that. Obviously with that lane in place, it does provide that opportunity for passing. Those are generally in locations where there are significantly high traffic volumes, if it's what I'm thinking you're talking about.

**Ms. Chartier:** — I don't think I'm explaining it very well. I think the 2+1 actually was a more rural kind of passing lane, but it sounded like . . . I had a vision of three lanes for a long, flowing for long periods of time. So I'm curious about passing lanes here. So in terms of a pilot project, this will be our only passing, our set of only passing lanes in Saskatchewan right now, on Highway No. 10. Is that correct?

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — That's what we have planned right now, yes. It's in contract. We're expecting the construction to start this summer.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. And I'm curious if there is an engineering standard in terms of you've got X amount of kilometres and you put X amount of passing lanes in that, how that works.

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — It's definitely an engineering standard, and I will let Dave explain what that is.

**Mr. Stearns:** — One of the factors that's looked at is the passing opportunity, and so rolling topography doesn't necessarily allow for that opportunity. The other part of that factor is the opposing traffic and the availability for passing. Long and short is there's a fairly complex calculation gone

through to see what kind of a warrant is there for putting that kind of an investment in place. And long story short, there is a complex approach to it. Sukhy actually is the one that would have the details on that.

**Mr. Kent:** — Yes. Now we do have a warrant for it. And I think they've explained it in a short duration. I might take longer to do that. It's quite technical. I mean the amount of vehicle following, and once you've built a platoon and then how do you relieve it, and that determines the distances. Normally 8 kilometres is the distance that would build up and relieve the platoon of slow-moving vehicles. So that's what . . . It's a pretty rigorous warrant, you know, not just traffic volume. It has to satisfy economic warrants so that, you know, the investment is durable and lasts 10 to 12 years rather than, you know, short duration.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Just two things here. So I think that the 2+1's might be something a bit different. But I don't . . . I'm not an engineer. My brother is a civil engineer. Perhaps I should talk to him about that. I know you said you're doing this pilot here. But looking at other jurisdictions where passing lanes have been used, what does the literature say on passing lanes? So you'll evaluate here what these Highway 10 passing lanes do, but what generally does the literature say around safety around passing lanes?

**Mr. Kent:** — I could add to the conversation on this 2+1. In Scandinavia they have used that. And you're right. It is a two-lane for most of the time and then they, with markings, put them in to different . . . And Alberta, as a matter of fact, did a study whether it was feasible in Alberta and they determined it wasn't. And the reason is, you know, you've got to reduce the number of conflict points, which are the access points. You've got to be able to have barriers put in left and right. With our snow conditions and our fluctuations in the peak hours and throughout the day, if Alberta determined that it wasn't feasible in there . . .

So we actually did look at it, you know, when we were twinning No. 11 Highway North. We started looking at a strategy if 2+1 could be utilized and then Alberta's study and some other studies . . . Texas called them super 2, and they used longer passing lanes as opposed to strategically placed passing lanes that we are going to be using.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay, thank you. So just generally then . . . So thank you for explaining the 2+1. I wasn't completely out to lunch. That's good. But just wondering what the literature says on passing lanes in other jurisdictions around Alberta. So you'll look at Highway No. 10 and how that works. But you probably have a sense of what you expect from the passing lanes.

**Mr. Kent:** — Yes, there is apparently in the passing lane area . . . Passing lanes are called low-cost improvement, and in the passing lane areas there's a reduction of up to 25 per cent fatal collisions, and there is I think a higher percentage for all types of collisions.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. Thank you for that.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Thank you. I have a couple of extra points. Years ago when we first came into government though,

we started out, there was a night rider program on for winter driving for highways. Is there still that program where at nighttime you have maintenance crews? There is? Okay. By acknowledgement . . . [inaudible] . . . Thank you.

Next thing is the report impaired drivers signs. SGI reported this morning — and Jennifer, you and I have talked about this — in the municipalities it's definitely, they're in place. Along the highways though, we don't see them. SGI is going to start working with you, I understand, in this next fiscal year to put some of the signs forward. Is there a certain reason why it's taking longer than necessary to put the RID signs on the highways? Is there just a . . . Is it a policy issue, possibly? Signage colour issue? Just kind of wondering from the committee's perspective why we don't see those on the highways.

**Ms. Ehrmantraut:** — I think that we have to have that dialogue with SGI on just determining where those strategic points would be. Before that we had talked about it, I didn't know that there was an issue where SGI wanted to have these signs put up and we were saying no. So if it's a recommendation of the committee, we will definitely work with SGI to make sure that we're putting them up in strategic locations on the highways versus, you know, putting them up everywhere on the highways. As we put more signs up, you know, the impact of those signs diminish. So we would work with SGI on the strategic locations of them.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Any other questions from the members? Seeing none, I want to thank ministry officials for coming today — Jennifer, yourself and your officials. And again if we do make recommendations, it will be definitely for the bigger part of the issue, working with collaboration amongst ministries, and Crowns I think as well, as we go forward to improve overall fatality reductions. So thank you.

Looking at the clock, I guess we'll take a recess until 2 o'clock when the next presenter's scheduled to come. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

[14:00]

**The Chair:** — Okay. Thank you. Welcome back, everybody. We're here to resume our committee hearings. This afternoon we have now presenting — and if I get this right — it's Paul Legrand, executive member and treasurer of Regina Fish & Game League. So Mr. Legrand, just a couple of quick things to talk to you about. No member of the committee will go into debate with you, and nor are you to ask us any questions either. So we will give you an allotted amount of time as an hour. So feel free to give us your presentation, and I'm sure we'll have questions for you after. So please feel free to start.

**Presenter: Regina Fish & Game League**

**Mr. Legrand:** — Okay. Thanks, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, everyone. Again my name is Paul Legrand. I'm a director of the Regina Fish & Game League. I'm a treasurer this year for our club here. Anyways, the Regina Fish & Game League has been around for 59 years in the Regina area. We have just under 1,300 members. Most members are involved in the shooting

sports, hunting, fishing, and conservation.

Our two main objectives of the Regina Fish & Game League is to promote the conservation and propagation of wildlife, to assist the various governmental authorities in developing, maintaining, and enforcing the fish and game regulations from time to time promulgated in relation to wildlife. The Regina Fish & Game League currently holds a seat on the wildlife advisory committee board.

Every year in Saskatchewan, hunting licence sales generates millions of dollars for the provincial government and our economy. The province of Saskatchewan could have lost between 275,000 to \$453,000 in hunting licence sales in 2010, and \$262,000 to \$433,000 in hunting licence sales in 2011, plus the value of wildlife itself. Our provincial economy would have lost between 13.3 million to \$26.8 million in 2010 and 2011. Hunting licences are used as a tool in managing wildlife.

According to SGI, insurance claims in 2010 were \$48 million, with 13,733 collisions, eight deaths, and 376 people suffered injuries; in 2011, 13,148 collisions, two deaths, 309 people suffered injuries, and \$48 million in insurance claims. SGI has, in 2013, started recording wildlife collisions as to what kind of wildlife — deer or moose.

Most wildlife collisions occur between sunset and sunrise, with most collisions occurring during the mating seasons when wildlife movement is at its peak, or when we have a bad winter with lots of snowfall, wildlife moving to and from their bedding areas to the food source. There are other factors like speed, distracted driving, fatigue, visibility in some cases, which are all human factors that can lead to wildlife collisions.

With deer, you can see their eyes reflected in the headlights in the ditches or on the shoulder of the road. Now that we have a good moose population in the grasslands and parkland ecosystems, farm land moose, moose are harder to see in these peak periods because of their black hides, and their eyes don't reflect in the headlights.

Saskatchewan's economy is growing. With this growth, more people are moving into the province. Our cities and towns are expanding, more acreages. More people are commuting to and from their job. In today's economy, everybody's in a rush, and this can present some real challenges to traffic safety.

SGI and the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation have been trying to bring awareness to the public on wildlife collisions through the Save a Buck and Moose on the Loose public service announcements.

My recommendations are: (1) identify the hot spots; (2) educating the public; (3) reduce your speed and slow down and increase vigilance in peak collision areas; (4) more signage on high collision areas with flashing lights, with solar panels; (5) making sure ditches and road allowances are cut (Department of Highways and the RMs); and (6) working with Crop Insurance and other government agencies or groups.

In closing, I would like to thank the Special Committee on Traffic Safety for giving me the opportunity to make this presentation. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Legrand. I'd like to say for the committee members and to yourself too, sir, that SARM [Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities] submitted a letter last week which has been sent to the portal for us to look at. And they're asking for a recommendation involving ditches being cut and stuff as well. So you aren't, you know, an island amongst yourself in that one. So it's interesting that you bring those points forward. Anyone have any questions? Mr. Steinley.

**Mr. Steinley:** — Thank you very much for your presentation. I was just curious because a couple of presentations now has talked about fencing along hot spots. But seeing the size of moose, does that affect the moose population or not, or do they just walk through it when there's fencing, assuming that snow fence won't really stop a moose going where it wants to go?

**Mr. Legrand:** — Yes, that's true. Fencing from what I've . . . has been discussed at the wildlife advisory committee, is very expensive to do. Again if you're going to stop, especially a moose, you're going to probably be looking at 8-, 10-foot-high fencing. Is that going to deter them? It'll stop them going from that one spot, but wildlife is adaptive. They will find, maybe a kilometre, 2 kilometres down the edge of this fencing, of this corridor, and they'll go around it.

**Mr. Steinley:** — So just a follow-up. You're suggesting fencing isn't the optimal answer to some of these wildlife collisions then?

**Mr. Legrand:** — No. Just for the fact that from what I've heard in the past, it's expensive.

**The Chair:** — Any other questions? Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Briefly this morning — first of all, thank you so much for being here — briefly this morning in the SGI presentation there was a reference to Newfoundland and a cull of moose there. But we didn't get into great detail; that was a shorter presentation. And I'm interested to hear that or see that that's not one of your recommendations. So I'm wondering if that's been on the table for discussion at some point in your organization.

**Mr. Legrand:** — Well first of all, I'm a conservationist. That's, you know, I think we all like wildlife. And I guess there is always that line, that fine line when the conservation stops and then when we have to do public safety. This is fairly new for Sask Environment. With the moose population that we do have in the South, I know they are very coveted tags. There has been expressed that we should have more tags to reduce the numbers. Again, what's an appropriate level to reduce these things?

In my presentation here, I know SGI has never really separated their collisions. It's just been wildlife, and so that makes a big thing because we really don't know how many collisions that we do have, and particularly with moose. And we all know that you don't want to hit a moose because there is probably a good chance that it's going to probably be a fatality with a moose. They're just harder to see. They're a bigger animal. They've got long legs, so it's harder.

You know, if it has to be done, I know in the community of hunters, they will probably fight it because it's . . .

Saskatchewan probably has one of the best renewable resources when it comes to fishing and wildlife. I think we're probably in the envy of a lot of jurisdictions of what we do have here.

Again one thing I didn't have in my presentation is winters. I know when we had the winter of 2010 and 2011, it was quite . . . you know, we had over 13,700 collisions. And then in the following year, in 2011, we still had 13,000 but 700. So it showed that there was an impact, but not that much of an impact. So when we have really tough winters, it really congregates the wildlife together. Again now we had the bad winter of 2012-2013, I think we should see a really dramatic number drop. I wasn't able to get SGI's stats for 2012 here on their collisions here. So it would've been nice if I would've had that and could've shared it.

**Ms. Chartier:** — This might be better put to the Ministry of Environment, so you may not be able to answer this question, but as a conservationist, can you tell us a little bit about the downside of culling if that were to come forward from someone as a recommendation?

**Mr. Legrand:** — When it comes to the culling, like the tags are draw tags. And so it's just not a regular licence that you can buy up here, as compared to when you go to the forest where it's more or less an open hunting season. So to get a moose tag here it's pretty coveted. And if you were to go look on Sask Environment's website and see the number of people that apply for these tags, they're coveted tags.

If Sask Environment was to increase the tags, there probably would, well there'd be a little bit, you know, of a concern that, you know, are we still going to have that sustainability of moose seasons in the South here? So there'll be a little bit of concern, you know.

But I understand that, was it last year or two years ago when the RCMP officer was killed from hitting a moose, all of a sudden we did have 300 extra moose tags in the province. And you have to kind of take that into consideration, 300 tags. That's enough, but you consider how many zones maybe are in the South. So if we have 30 zones in the South here that have moose seasons, that's only 10 tags a zone. So there really wasn't that much of an impact.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay, thank you. I think that that's all. I was just curious about — obviously there's pros and cons to everything that one does — so I was curious about your thoughts on the downside. But thank you for that.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Parent.

**Mr. Parent:** — Yes. Paul, I have one question that has always bothered me, is when the new gun controls came out, a lot of younger hunters didn't establish themselves because of the rules of the new gun controls, like when they were . . . If the rules came out and they were not able to hunt yet, do you think that some of this is related to the fact that we had gun controls and a lot of the younger ones didn't hunt? So therefore, even the fathers quit hunting because they didn't, you know, they really wanted to hunt with their son and it didn't happen?

**Mr. Legrand:** — I think that it probably has had a bit of an

impact. I know hunters, you know, maybe our age, with the gun control out maybe you kind of figure, now enough is enough, that we're just going to pack it in. So we probably did lose an age group of hunters. But we just look at how busy our gun range is, and it's lots of young people that are really getting into the sport, and first timers. So that's good for our sport, you know, that we have lots of shooters and guys who are starting to get interested in, you know, be able to go out and harvest an animal. And they're taking the courses. And then of course, now we have the gun registry gone, so we've got lots of young people coming up, which is good for . . .

**Mr. Parent:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Good. I have a couple of points just for the committee's benefit. Based on your question about culling, I think we'll ask the Legislative Assembly Service to draft a letter up to the Ministry of Environment asking for what would actually be a cull, and when would it be necessary? I think there's a difference in population density in the province size when we look at us to the East. So I want to ask that question sure, just for our knowledge.

And then I think also, I'd like to know if this year . . . I had a conversation with a Ministry of Environment person, just in passing in the hallway, and I asked about this targeting hot spots. And that's a good point you raise here too, sir, is that, you know, I think they might in fact actually be looking at this year's targets in the zones to the South where there's been more accidents. So I'm going to ask for that as well in the letter, I think.

And then we'll also ask for predators. Is there a predator base that's moving the moose from the North to the South? I'd like to know that. I've heard that there is. Some hunter friends of mine say that there's wolf and stuff pushing to the South. But me, I'm a little scared that if I'm driving down the, as a farmer, in my back forty and I'm out in the middle of the night harvesting, I might come across some wolves. I guess I'm kind of curious now, thinking about that as a question to ask Environment as well.

Your area of recommendations I want to ask you about is signage. So I've seen some signage on the highways. Is there a particular jurisdiction in Canada that you would be aware that maybe has more effective signage than what we see in Saskatchewan?

[14:15]

**Mr. Legrand:** — From my research, of course just on the Internet — from BC, and I can't remember if it was in Alberta also — but I know, probably in some of these high spots where they do have a lot of collisions, they do have the flashing lights, the yellow lights. So that's going to probably alert the motorists that there's something that's coming up. And I don't know if we have anything like that in the province for wildlife. I know we do have them on the corners of the highways in Saskatchewan. You just go just east of Regina, you go to White City, Balgonie, you know, just some of the places. These are intersections where there's high traffic and there's been a lot of traffic accidents. So it's just getting you to slow down and be aware. And I think that's a good idea if it's possible.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Wilson.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thanks, Mr. Chair. In your opinion, is there anything you can put on a vehicle, an attachment . . . I've heard of those different vehicle . . . little attachments that are supposed to repel the deer because of the noise. Is there anything like that, or engineering solutions, that will repel moose and deer off the highway?

**Mr. Legrand:** — From our meetings at the wildlife advisory committee, SGI did do a presentation this past winter. And that was one of the things that they talked about, is if there's anything that manufacturers, car manufacturers can come up with, a device that is going to maybe be a little bit more sensitive to the animals' ears. Maybe we won't be able to hear it, but maybe the animals might. So that's, again that could be the insurance companies of Canada, you know, bringing that up to the automakers and that.

I know there's some aftermarket stuff that you can put on your vehicles and that, but I really don't think that they work terribly that good.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you very much. Any other questions from members? Mr. Parent.

**Mr. Parent:** — Yes. To your question on the flashing lights, which is a good one, they actually have that at Harris, that fenced off area. And then right away it warns you that there is something there, and then all of a sudden you see that 8-foot-high fence all the way along both sides of the road. But it does, it does bring your attention if they had flashing lights with maybe a moose sign or something like that for the next, you know, 4 kilometres or whatever.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Any other questions for anybody? Okay. Seeing none, I want to thank you for your presentation, sir.

I mean I do have one point I guess, a question to ask. The Sask Wildlife Federation, are you associated to them?

**Mr. Legrand:** — No, we're not.

**The Chair:** — Okay. I'm sure they have a particular view. I think we've actually asked them to maybe present or give us a written presentation, but they haven't done so yet. So thank you for your time this afternoon. And if the committee has any other questions for you, we'll ask you to return, but I think right now you may have answered them all. Ms. Chartier, do you have anything at all or . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . No? Okay. Okay, we're done then. So thank you so much, sir. We'll reconvene at 3 o'clock.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

**The Chair:** — Welcome back, everybody. We're back here now to listen to the Riders Against Government Exploitation, a 3 p.m. presentation. I see that we have Rhonda Cwynar and Don Fuller with us. So I ask you as witnesses to understand a couple of things. We have an allotted time for your

presentation, and there'll be questions from the committee members. But at no time can a committee member enter into debate with you or you ask us questions. So that's how it works.

But it's been a very seamless, good process so far, so the floor is yours. All we ask is that, I guess, when you're going to present, make sure the mike has got the red light on. And when there's questions and answers going back and forth as well, you'll have the red light would come on and that's when you should start talking so the camera gets a picture of you. So thank you very much, and we'll let you start.

**Presenter: R.A.G.E. — Riders Against  
Government Exploitation**

**Mr. Fuller:** — Who are all these wonderful people?

**The Chair:** — You can see our name tags.

**Mr. Fuller:** — Yes, but where are you from?

**The Chair:** — Okay. Well I can start. We have Ms. Wilson is from Saskatchewan Rivers in the North by Prince Albert, Roger Parent's from Saskatoon, Warren Steinley's from Regina, Herb Cox is Battleford, I'm from Prince Albert Carleton, Danielle Chartier's from Saskatoon, and Mr. Vermette's from the North by I guess La Ronge and north from there's a good way to let you know where he's from.

So we have . . . It's an all-party committee. We have the NDP [New Democratic Party] members, and we have the government members on this side. However an all-party committee works, and should work, on a premise of a non-partisan relationship insomuch as making recommendations moving forward to the government. And so that's what we're asking your committee to, the committee's asking you to give a presentation today, because you submitted that request. So the floor is yours, sir, and we'll let you talk about what you want to present.

**Mr. Fuller:** — Ours is mostly going to be focused around motorcycles but not . . . It's not specifically because it's more than just motorcycles. The majority of accidents are multi-vehicle, but we'll get into that. So we'll start off with a background, looking at accidents, long-term injuries, those kind of things, which cause us as well as you folks a great deal of dismay.

These conditions, as I started off to say, are not just attributed to motorcycles. More often than not, in a multiple-vehicle accident with one vehicle being a motorcycle, the majority of the accidents are at fault from the other vehicle. Saskatchewan seems to be in a bit of a quandary with this right now, but that's for a whole other topic. But generally that's what's found. And usually it centres around inattention, road conditions, driver experience; evasive action, one driver or another of the operators avoiding each other; loose gravel, big surprise; animal action, for you people in the North, wildlife, moose, things, deer, whatever, running off, causing mayhem on the public roads; and careless driving and stunting. But that's where SGI seems to be finding a great deal of issue.

If we look at a little bit more background, SGI's practices and the rationale they're using for their statistical analysis is kind of

questionable, and we're really quite concerned about it. Using things like actuarial tables as opposed to real causation studies for data to determine and develop safety programs is pretty questionable. It's questionable as far as in developing insurance rates, let alone looking at real causes, like the root, not a symptom, the root cause of accidents. And if we look around the world — and we've done lots of studies on this, from Australia to Europe where there's motorcycles every 2 feet — we're finding that 80 per cent of all motorcycle accidents where multiple vehicle, where one is a motorcycle, three-quarters of the time it's the other operator that's at fault.

However driver training, particularly with regard to motorcycles, in Saskatchewan is pretty much minimal. If you take . . . If you're a learner in a four-wheel vehicle particularly, about the amount of time that's spent on it is, you should read the section on motorcycles. And that's the extent of learning how to share the road, which is not really workable.

And punitive action for drivers who cause accidents — and I'm not talking motorcycles; I'm talking about drivers in particular, those causing accidents, serious injury, and death — are minimal. And good public policy should shape public behaviour, and they're not. They're not anywhere near taking those kind of considerations into shape.

Existing measures such as surcharges are absolutely and completely avoidable. If you are a bad driver and your licence plates go up, well you just drive your wife's car. You can escape it. And of course any time there's a rule, there's a lot of people figuring out how to escape those rules. But that one is very obvious, and people do it all the time. It's just a waiting game. Wait it out until the surcharges come back down and away you go. As a matter of fact, it's \$2,500 if you kill somebody. Which, wow, if you lose a husband, a wife, your family, \$2,500 for a one-time charge doesn't seem to be appropriate. It's certainly not public behaviour shaping. It's certainly not a deterrent. It certainly doesn't recover costs that the province sees in health care alone. \$2,500 — I mean it's cheaper than divorce court. That's scary.

So existing discounts and demerits also aren't reflective of driving infractions and dangerous driving. It's \$25 one-time charge if you are caught with a driving infraction. It goes up minimally after two or three or four but really it's not anything that would shape driver behaviour, nothing that would make people conscious of what they're doing. Twenty-five dollars — we can't take two of us for lunch for \$25. One-time charge. It hasn't kept up with where we're at today, the issues and the costs relative to today's expenses.

Second largest cause of accidents, 20 per cent is single vehicle accidents, and most of those are inexperience, handler error, road conditions, and of course poorly marked roads. The 80 per cent of the multiple vehicle accidents are where the automobile is at fault, is where the serious injury comes in and that's where the costs are really escalating. The 20 per cent which are single vehicle which is mostly handler error, those kind of things, are really minor. If a vehicle, your motorcycle tips over, you might need a little counselling because of having to spend money on your paint job but really, you know, you break a fingernail. That's not where the issues lie.

So why are we having problems? Well to tell you the truth, if we look at background safety and learner operator requirements, SGI permits a learner on a motorcycle to ride a motorcycle today on today's roads and today's traffic after completing a non-motorcycle-specific, 10-minute, on-screen learner's test. Now the anecdote I like to use, it is about the same requirement as being able to withdraw \$20 from an automated teller. If you can draw 20 bucks from an automated teller, that says in Saskatchewan you can ride a motorcycle. That's ridiculous. And you're not even required to have a regular driver's licence. You don't have to have passed those more rigorous tests for four-wheel vehicles to have a motorcycle licence. You can just go ahead and take your 10-minute touch screen test and away you go. You're dangerous on two wheels.

Now when you think about that, there's 31,000 class 5 drivers who hold a motorcycle learner's endorsement. Some of them, I know personally, have had these endorsements for over 25 years, have never taken an exam, have never been tested. They are just out there. And they, maybe even worse, ride casually. They don't ride all the time. They're not experienced. They might be borrowing somebody's bike — another huge way of accidents happening, unfamiliar with the vehicle.

And we'll kind of put this into context: 25 per cent of all the motorcycle accidents involve somebody on a learner's endorsement; 25 per cent of the \$9 million shortfall SGI is presently experiencing is \$2.25 million, and that's just on learner's endorsements. So what we conclude is training and safety requirements are woefully inadequate in Saskatchewan. That's just ridiculous this day and age to be able to do that. I mean it's a little insane.

And these facts are true, not just for motorcycles but for regular drivers too. I mean when you get told from your instructor you should read the section on motorcycles . . . Come on, that's not the way it works. So both regular vehicle operators and motorcyclists are contributing very heavily at the learner's end of the game to statistics and accidents in Saskatchewan.

So if we look at what the insurance industry . . . Although I can kind of badmouth them a little bit, it's a good place to understand risk. And right now, recent studies that they're doing show the behaviours predict a likelihood of a claim far better than any traditional insurance ratings, which is what we're using: driver's demographic, their profile, age, year, make or model of whatever vehicle they're driving. And they've found that from 5 billion miles of real time analysis, that driving behaviour has more than twice the predictor of, there's an insurance claim, than any other factor. And low cost drivers with highest, for low . . . Loss costs for drivers with highest risk behaviours are approximately two and a half times the cost for drivers with low risk. And it's behaviour, behaviour, behaviour, not actuarial studies.

As a matter of fact, everybody knows Flo from TV, right? Sure, everybody knows Flo from Progressive Insurance. Her boss, Glenn Renwick, says, and I'll quote him:

We believe that driving behaviour was the most predictive rating factor — but didn't expect the difference to be this dramatic. Actual driving behaviour predicts a driver's risk

more than twice as strongly as any other factor.

Which is not actuarial studies; it's the behaviour. What people do is what they do. What they've done in the past, they're likely to do in the future. Everybody should understand that.

[15:15]

So what we can conclude, if driving behaviours are better indicators of risk than traditional rating variables, then the cost associated and the escalating accident and injury costs should be placed directly on the operator's licence, and they're not. They're placed on a vehicle. They're placed on the licence. It doesn't follow me with my behaviour. And they're looking at, of course, across the insurance industry, getting far more personalized, understanding that behaviour is the big piece. We are not members of some arbitrary actuarial class.

So if we look at that, we could say risk is defined as the potential that a chosen activity or action will lead to a loss. Then for purposes of speaking here, that risk and its associated costs are defined by behaviour, not by an object. Therefore to mitigate risk, it is the behaviour of the operator that must be the focus of the cost recovery mechanism and, in this case, as well as punitive and behaviour-shaping policy. It must be with the individual, not with an inanimate object.

So what we're suggesting — and rather than just complain — is that, particularly for motorcycles, mandatory motorcycle awareness and safety training should be across the board, all new drivers. I just recently came back from Europe and every other vehicle on the road is a motorcycle. And they drive like . . . We wouldn't survive there in a day. And there's no accidents. People live on the road together in very, very, very congested areas. It's part of the culture, and it's growing here too. And we need to recognize that.

So we need more awareness for motorcycles. We need people to understand that they're here to stay and they're going to be growing; how to share the road; learning things like appropriate distance to follow a motorcycle. They can stop in a third of the distance a vehicle can. They need to understand how motorcycles move and operate and live on the roads with this, particularly things like left-hand turn situations. We kill people there all the time. We injure way more. People just don't understand, don't see them. And they don't understand how motorcycles travel, that they, because they're smaller, they appear to be slower moving, and they're not.

And particularly there's a big issue in Saskatchewan of right to the road as a motorcyclist. In fact it was just last night I had a fellow behind me in a car. And I waved him to pass — I was going slower — round the clover leaf and out on to the Ring Road. And my son was riding his bike beside me. And the fellow waved him up beside him — and this is after I gave him a courtesy, go by — waved him up beside him and flipped him the bird out the window, shaking his fist and yelling at him out the window from the vehicle because he was on a motorcycle.

And this happens more often than not. And people will try and force you off the road, force you, try and steal your lane. There really seems to be a serious aggression here in this province. And I don't know where it's coming from, but it's a problem.

So mandatory training for all new endorsement applications, here's the fix. What we're saying is graduated motorcycle endorsements are required. A level 1 endorsement which would require you to pass a written test which would give you a temporary permit to be used only for training purposes. You would not be allowed on a street or highway with that endorsement. It would allow you to take classroom time, hands-on driver training, much like the existing programs they have today, and it would involve adoption of a standardized, simulated road test to ensure that you're capable of handling a motorcycle and driving it on the streets. That would get you to a level 2 endorsement which would make you road eligible.

Now what we're also saying is that you would only be able to keep this endorsement for one year. You couldn't drive for 25 years without being tested critically to be able to manage this motorcycle. And it would have the same restrictions, although we see from reading SGI's restrictions that there should be more for this one to three years, with a zero tolerance for alcohol, not .08 or .04 — zero. If you're already learning to operate a vehicle that is somewhat unstable, then there should be no blood alcohol whatsoever. And no traffic violations. If you can't follow the rules of the road, your endorsement is pulled for some period of time and you could try again. At level 3, you would graduate to a full endorsement with the restrictions that SGI has, although we think that they need to be more stringent than they are. They're a little lax.

As far as administrative, everything has a cost. Administration is one of them. And to review those motorcycle endorsement restrictions to see if we can make them more stringent. And the rates for training should be moved towards compensatory rates and show a profit motive. That way the private sector is likely going to step up because, well the rural gentlemen, you know that it's easier to get training in all sorts of things in Regina and Saskatoon than the smaller, more remote communities. But if there is a potential profit, we see and we know that there are people ready to step up and put these training programs together and make them a little more universal across the province, and to enhance the regular driver training to include this motorcycle awareness, this growing culture.

Now I mentioned earlier, that good public policy should shape behaviour, and it should. One of the ones that I like to use is .08. There was not so long ago that people drove drunk, what is now considered drunk. Friday night after work, go down to the bar, have two or three beers and you're driving home. Well now you can't. And we were killing people in the thousands at one time.

But the .08, the government did good public policy. And the numbers dropped and dropped and were reduced. And there's advertising, there's all sorts of things going on. I know the numbers are rising right now, and we all have a pretty good idea why. I mean, that's the price you pay for being affluent, right? So I like to use .08. It's worked. It's worked in the past.

I know that in the last year or two, since we've got an influx of young guys on the rigs and stuff, that those numbers are getting a little wild. They're making huge money and they're in a high-risk category right now. But I mean, that's not hard to equate; those numbers are going up exactly at the same rate.

So what we're saying is revise SGI's existing safe driver recognition program. It's a good program. It's already in place. The demerits and surcharge and schedules for all operators, not just motorcycles, but all operators based on their behavioural record, not a class, vehicle, or body type. It has to follow the licence. Put it on their licence. It reflects how a person drives.

Their personal injury insurance costs again should be tied to their licence and that's where it should be reflected. So the existing safe driving program surcharge can and should be revised to reflect the realistic . . . [inaudible] . . . consequences of high-risk behaviour accident and injury costs on the licence. They're not reflective of that today. They're way, way behind the times.

So revise those demerit categories to reflect the high-risk behaviour. Increase the demerit surcharges for driving infractions. Lengthen the premium surcharge from a one-time to a length of time, example of three to five years. Also, escalate the demerits and surcharges for driving infractions which cause damage, injury, and death — \$2,500, I can kill the breadwinner. I can kill a wife. I can kill children, one-time charge. Something's really, really wrong with that.

If you have a good driving record and you're on the high side of 20 per cent discount, if you cause injury or an accident, you get less of a discount. Well that's just insane. You should immediately go to the back of the bus to the highest surcharge available, and you should pay that rate for three to five years before you even start to get looked at as being a safe driver. That will make people think before they act.

Right now if you get caught going 50 kilometres an hour in Ontario over the speed limit, they impound your vehicle. They pull your licence, and it's a \$10,000 fine. Now I think that's a little excessive. But it sure will make you think about speeding. Good public policy shapes behaviour.

And also escalate and expand the existing licence suspension policy. You can go on and on and on getting tickets and really bad behaviour and luckily you don't kill somebody, and it costs you a couple of hundred bucks, one-time surcharge. That's wrong. It's just wrong. No wonder people are driving like fools.

And maybe even increase the 20 per cent for real good drivers. There is a slide. Have you got that slide on the graph? There you go. If I can just get you to have a peek at that. That is what we're proposing happens to the SDR [safe driver recognition]. Right now if you're at a 20 percent discount from SGI and you kill somebody, it's a one-time \$2,500 fine. We're suggesting things like it's \$5,000. That is your fee, and it's not for a year. It's not a one-time charge. You're at that rate for year five. And it will slowly decrease back to year one and then you spend two years of clean driving before you can go to your discounts.

If you have driving infractions, one to two infractions, you go somewhere in between that zero to \$500 and it stays there. One infraction, one year; two infractions, two years. And it goes on and on and on, up to three and five infractions, to three and four years. You're paying up to \$3,000 premium for your licence, for the havoc that you've caused out there. And I think it's fair. I think it's right. It's still not in the line with the cost of today, but it sure does shape public policy.

And when you look at that, the revenue stream that comes out of that would be tremendous. But what it really does is it has the potential, like .08 did, to shape public behaviour. People will think when they're driving. They'll think before they're road raging. They'll think before they just drive so casually. It has a real chance of shaping things.

As well, once you began to shape public policy, you're going to see costs go down. You're going to see accidents go down. You're going to see the health district costs go down because they're taking some of this. You're going to see industry coming up because people are not sick. They're not being pulled off their jobs. They're not being disabled for years and years to come. All of those kind of things come down. Your safety record starts to go up and everything starts to change.

It's going to take some time, but unless there is something that's put into place that's behaviour shaping, you're not going to have a chance. You can run all the ads you want. But if there's no consequences to me, what am I going to do? You have to put real and actual consequences of the day. And we think this works, and it's existing. They don't have to reinvent the wheel.

For everything that you will try and implement there's always a huge cost involved. I worked in a Crown for years in the policy world and I know the expense. This exists and it works. It's progressive. It requires stringent, ongoing assessment of fault, which there should be. SGI was a little remiss when going with no-fault, thinking no-fault meant you didn't have to assess fault on people. Well you do have to assess fault. People need to be held accountable. It would enable the ongoing focus, fair-cost assessment and revenue recovery — a nice plus for SGI — increased ability to gauge and predict future behaviour of drivers. Because there it is; it's right on your record. We know who you are. You know who you are. You're accountable for what you've done.

It will require law enforcement due diligence, of course. You can't just sort of say, ah gee whiz, it's hard to say. Somebody's always at fault. And it's back to that focus is on vehicle operator not a vehicle, on management of people. It's a progressive, self-healing policy. People will start to think once if you're paying \$500, \$3,000-something for your licence, it's going to be self-healing. People are going to stop, they're going to think. They're going to behave differently.

And again I hate to harp on this, but that's what good public policy does. It utilizes in-place systems. It aligns with the provincial idea of rate shock avoidance. All of this is avoidable. None of you people, other than the 20 per cent discount for good driving, will see any of these exorbitant costs. All you have to do is be aware and drive safely. It's all avoidable.

Rate increases that we keep seeing coming forward, that would also be, not a thing of the past but seriously reduced. It supports all public safety initiatives. There's not anybody who's going to say, my God, that guy killed that man and his wife. He deserves not . . . you know, he needs to get off. Nobody says that. The same as they don't say that guy with .08 who killed that man should get off. They don't. It will be supported positively all across the board publicly.



It focuses on all public safety initiatives, focuses on high-risk segments. It's very easy to implement. It's already in place. And it reduces risk with long-term learners' endorsements. All those things. So we recommend that you folks on the committee recommend this adoption of behavioural-based individualized insurance ratings. It's the consequences that are required to change and shape public behaviour.

And the adoption of the mandatory graduated motorcycle learners endorsement that focuses on rider safety, inclusion of motorcycle awareness and safety into all existing driving programs, and utilize the national campaigns that are already there. I've seen SGI keep reinventing the wheel when there's great public campaigns out there that we could just ride on their coattails, and those have a serious cost associated with them.

So those are our thoughts. I don't know if we took more time than we needed to or not, but I guess it's your turn. If you've got any questions at all, fire them up.

[15:30]

**The Chair:** — Okay. Looking to the committee members, any questions? Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you very much for your presentation. Just a couple questions. And the good news is SGI presented to us this morning, but they're coming back in a few weeks. And we'll have an opportunity to ask them follow-up questions to what we heard this morning, and perhaps what we heard this afternoon here too.

But with respect to the actuarial versus causation insurance, are there other jurisdictions in Canada that operate on the causation model?

**Mr. Fuller:** — It's long term, and we're in a funny place because our insurer is actually our Highway Traffic Board at the same time. So in other jurisdictions there's mostly private insurance and their highway traffic boards are separate. So we have a strange marriage going on there.

The industry's changing and mostly because of accident statistics, although they're going down everywhere except Saskatchewan. So yes, they are quite separate. One is insurance and the other is traffic.

**Ms. Chartier:** — And maybe some of these questions could be put to SGI as well here. But I know we've had a conversation before, and some of your references talk about studies, and in multiple vehicle accidents that it's often not the motorcycle rider. It's the four-wheeled vehicles. Do you have some documents you could table for the benefit of all the committee?

**Mr. Fuller:** — We do, starting with the sort of report of all reports which is the Hurt report, the MAIDS report [Motorcycle Accidents In-Depth Study], FEMA [Federation of European Motorcyclists' Associations] from England, and the one from Australia . . . I can't put my finger on it right now, but yes we do. We have sort of a list of everywhere we've been.

**Ms. Cwynar:** — I can forward you the bibliography. Yes.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. That would be very helpful.

**The Chair:** — Any more questions?

**Ms. Chartier:** — I'm good for now.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Parent.

**Mr. Parent:** — The chart that you showed, is there any way we can have a copy of that?

**Mr. Fuller:** — Absolutely. Do you want electronic or paper or both?

**Mr. Parent:** — Whichever.

**The Chair:** — We've got a copy of it here, yes. We'll have a copy of it here, yes.

I have a couple of questions, if you don't mind. First question is, who do you all, who do you represent? Because is this a group within Regina or do you have a provincial body?

**Mr. Fuller:** — We're provincial. I'm sorry. I guess we should have gone into that first. There's about 5,000 of us. It's Riders Against Government Exploitation, R.A.G.E. group, which was sort of struck around the SGI's 2013 rate proposal. But once the group was struck, it sort of took on a larger life — safety, awareness, that whole bringing the motorcycle in Saskatchewan into a more positive light, both traffic and socially. It's a huge, growing vehicle, or demographic, and it's not going to get smaller.

**Ms. Cwynar:** — Just to answer your question, we represent all motorcycle riders and people who encourage and support motorcycle riders in Saskatchewan. That's who we're representing.

**The Chair:** — Okay, thank you. That's good to know. So out of everyone that drives, rides a motorcycle then, you represent them. So that's good to know. Next thing I had to ask you was in regards to your consultation on this particular group and this particular paper you presented, which is going to be, you know, helpful moving forward from the committee perspective on looking at its recommendations.

You would advocate then for a broad range of changes. One of course would involve public awareness through a media campaign, correct? You're asking for policy changes from the government insurance body, okay? Now in regards to your studies and your evaluation of providing the actual driver training component of your endorsement package, who have you talked to? Are there agencies in the province that are prepared to step forward and do that right now, not just the bigger urban centres, but are prepared to go to the urban centre . . . rural centres? You say you believe there's a chance for that to happen, but have you talked to the providers to see if it actually is available now?

**Mr. Fuller:** — Actually it is in the larger centres. And we recognize there is a bit of a problem right now with getting to the more rural and remote areas. Although it's interestingly. One of the conversations we have is people who are truck

drivers, drive aircraft. And those people not only live in Regina and Saskatoon but they live in La Loche and La Ronge, and those people all manage to get a pilot's licence and they all manage to get semi-truck driver licences and they all manage to do these things. People, if there's a will, they will find the way to do it and granted we don't cover the province but we figure if . . . And we have had people step up and say they're willing and can be ready to go within a year.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Ms. Wilson, you have a question?

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is a lot of information. However, I don't see anything about what is happening in other provinces. Have you talked to other provinces and do they have a model, a working model?

**Mr. Fuller:** — They're all across the board. Everybody is struggling with this right now. I know Manitoba's rates are, have come down. Their accident numbers have come down. Ontario has just put information out that they're in . . . Because it all relates to insurance. Their insurance rates are coming down, and their accident rates are coming down in accordance with that. And some of the groups like the Manitoba study, etc., have shown training decreasing the accident rates.

I mean it only makes sense to operate a motorcycle if all you have to do is withdraw \$20 from the bank. That doesn't seem to be like adequate training for such an unstable vehicle. So if you do provide that stringent training, you're going to be better off right away.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Do you know if there's other groups across Canada that are similar to yours?

**Mr. Fuller:** — Yes. Yes Manitoba has one, Ontario, BC. Yes I think they're pretty much covered.

**Ms. Wilson:** — But you haven't been in touch with them to see . . . I'm just saying, if the wheel is working, why reinvent it? If you've done any studies or just been in touch with these people.

**Mr. Fuller:** — Well some wheels are squares. Some of the wheels are triangular. Some are hearts. Everybody seems to be doing something a little different. But we sort of have taken studies and reports from those people and looked at what they're doing. We think ours is the best of the best.

**Ms. Cwynar:** — I think one of the major problems when you compare us to the rest of Canada is, like SGI is saying, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Quebec have always acted very differently when it comes to licensing vehicles than the rest of Canada, motorcycles included. The rest of Canada has followed kind of like what Saskatchewan is doing in the sense that they've sort of ignored this motorcycle class until now.

So the rest of the world or the rest of Canada is catching up with what the rest of the world has been doing for years. So when we follow the Hurt report, when we follow the FEMA reports, when we follow the MAIDS reports, we see that there's other countries that have been bringing in better safety programs, better training programs, better awareness programs than Canada has been, and we're just playing catch-up now. When you look at the numbers, it's very few accidents that

drive the high numbers and that's always been the dilemma. It hasn't caught anybody's radar because it's very few.

**Mr. Fuller:** — The other part of this is that a lot of the organizations such as ours are embroiled in battling with their government, trying to be heard, trying to be a voice at the table, trying to be recognized. And at the risk of a bouquet I guess we seem to have an ear here, and as a matter of fact the rest of the jurisdictions are saying, holy, how did you guys do that? Somebody seems to be listening and I can only credit you folks for doing that. I mean, you know, of course Saskatchewan is Saskatchewan, right? And we're always quite different, we're always quite vocal, and government in Saskatchewan seems to maybe be a little more open to this kind of stuff. So a lot of it is still embroiled in battle, if I can cut that short.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you very much. You've been very forthcoming. We've got a lot of great information and I just wanted to have a little bit of dialogue. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Any other questions? Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — You had mentioned Manitoba and their accident rates going down. Do you know what Manitoba has done? You mentioned briefly training, but what has Manitoba done to decrease accident rates?

**Ms. Cwynar:** — I can answer that. They've actually brought in a very strict learner's program in Manitoba much like the one we're proposing here, where you cannot get a learner's licence until you've taken a training course, whether that be how to ride your bike or a safety course. It's also tiered in the sense that you can't hold on to that learner's licence for very long. You have to take the full licence after a certain period of time. So they have already implemented a lot of what we're proposing, as have other provinces.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you for that.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess, thank you for your presentation and just sharing some information with the committee. But also, you know, I guess it's up to you as individuals, an organization, individual members' group — it sounds like you're a large group — and something woke you up and I'm glad to see you've woke up and you guys are advocating for your members, and I commend what you're doing and the report in itself and bringing the information forward. And you're adding ways, you know, to the committee to look at options. When we look at a learner's licence for operating a motorcycle, clearly you identified some serious challenges from what I can see in your presentation that's out there, that your members are feeling . . . And obviously you got the information from somewhere so it's not just, you woke up yesterday and wrote this. So obviously you've got some good information, and I would again suggest you also, you know, the committee here will make its recommendations and hopefully it will go forward that way as well.

Danielle mentioned about SGI being here. They're going to come back. I think there's an opportunity for us too. And I think the Chair has said we can voice some of the, you know, the

issues you raised and the challenges. And I think that's good. But also, as an organization, to make sure your report gets to SGI and you keep working and lobbying them. Whether this recommendation comes from this committee and goes forward, you can do a lot of work. And I would commend and recommend and commend on what you guys are doing and recommend that you go further with SGI too, because I think it has definitely some areas where that could reduce fatalities in our province. So thank you for your report.

**Mr. Fuller:** — Thanks for the input.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Parent.

**Mr. Parent:** — Yes. Thank you for your stuff. My last question I have is, if you don't have a driver's licence, you've got that learner's permit, can you actually register a motorbike?

**Ms. Cwynar:** — You sure can. You can get a full class M licence on a learner's driver's licence.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay. Would these changes, would the changes that you've recommended and that, would that change the outcome of that?

**Mr. Fuller:** — Actually, no. You could still own and register a motorcycle, but you couldn't drive it anywhere.

**Mr. Parent:** — That was kind of where I was going with that.

**Mr. Fuller:** — Until you pass that first level of endorsement.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay, thank you.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — SGI had mentioned briefly this morning — we didn't have an opportunity for questions — but I believe in 2011 they said they brought in a graduated motorcycle licence. So tell us, can you tell us a little bit about that?

**Mr. Fuller:** — There hasn't been enough time for them to gather statistics yet, so they have no idea yet what the effect has. But they're very minimal. Even the graduation doesn't take it far enough. I'm sure it will help, but it doesn't take it far enough to have a real effect.

**Ms. Chartier:** — It's interesting that under the old licensing program for the learner's licence, it was actually more restrictive than this new graduated licence is. Under the old learner's licence, you couldn't travel more than — what was it — 100 kilometres?

**Mr. Fuller:** — Sixty, I think, to begin with.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Away from your home. Now you can travel anywhere in Saskatchewan on a learner's. So it makes it, if you're not familiar with the roads where you're riding, if you're inexperienced riding, it just . . . yes.

[15:45]

**Mr. Fuller:** — One of the pieces that was missing — and I

didn't bring it up here — is the restrictions were that you couldn't ride a motorcycle one hour after sunset, and you couldn't start until one hour before sunrise. And those are the two most dangerous times to drive. So we've got recommendations — and you haven't seen them here — is that you don't get to operate a motorcycle until one hour after sunrise, and you have to be off your motorcycle one hour before sunset. That twilight time is when huge number of four- and two-wheel vehicles . . . And of course the wildlife comes out on to the highways at that time, as the people in the North will know.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Are you tabling the report that you had made to the . . . or the presentation that you . . . Is there anything further than this that you gave to the rate review panel?

**Ms. Cwynar:** — There's a whole background report. This isn't what we gave to the rate review panel; it's a portion from the safety side of it. But we do have a whole background piece that I can give, and it has all the documentation in it and the bibliography of all of the reports that we pulled for all of our data.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. I do have a question then. If you can table that, that would be nice — the bibliography, especially more so.

SGI this morning didn't break out vehicle types and accidents and deaths. Do you know or have you studied . . . Do you have numbers for us on the fatalities of motorcyclists for the last . . . since 2008? Would you have those numbers for us?

**Ms. Cwynar:** — I can give you an average. On average it's five a year.

**The Chair:** — Five a year. Okay. Thank you. Then on that point, do you know the precipitating factor to the fatality? Was there impaired driving on behalf of the motorist? Was there impaired driving on behalf of the motorcycle driver? No, you don't have that. Okay.

**Ms. Cwynar:** — We know up until 2010 because that's public data. We don't know anything past that. In 2010, of the five that were killed, I think alcohol was a factor in a vehicle that hit them, twice, and the rest was road conditions and experience.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. We can ask SGI for that further clarification when they return again. So any more questions from the committee members? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation, and thank you for providing the additional information to the committee for us. And I guess the thing for us to do is just to get the information, look at it all, and we'll be making recommendations at the end of the June, I guess, is where we are going to be going. So thank you so much.

**Mr. Fuller:** — End of June is your timeline?

**The Chair:** — End of June we're going to be looking at to get together as a group to make final recommendations, yes on the entire report.

**Mr. Fuller:** — And where does it go from there?

**The Chair:** — The report gets tabled with the Legislative Assembly after that. So it stays as a public document moving forward. So you may or may not see recommendations you like. But you may see something that you approve of. That's just . . . The committee will have to sit down over many long hours and do what's in the best interests for public policy for the province. So that's the importance.

We will be taking a short recess for five minutes, and then we will reconvene.

**Ms. Cwynar:** — People that are asking me, they can still submit written responses until June 5th, right?

**The Chair:** — June the 6th. Written submissions are, yes, until June 6th.

**Ms. Cwynar:** — Okay. Perfect.

**The Chair:** — Yes. Great. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

**The Chair:** — Welcome back, everybody, after a brief recess. We now have our 4 p.m. presenter which will start out early. As you can see, the RM of Cupar, we have Reeve Ray Orb. Good to see you again, sir, as always. It's good to have another presence from the rural ridings and rural areas of the province to come and talk to us about their concerns. Just a quick brief to you, sir. Witnesses can't ask us questions, nor will we debate with the witness, but we will be able to have a question-and-answer back and forth after your presentation. So we've got about an hour scheduled, so the floor is yours. Feel free to start.

**Presenter: RM of Cupar No. 218**

**Mr. Orb:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Ray Orb and I live in Cupar, Saskatchewan. First of all, I'd just like to say I think the creation of this committee is a great idea since I think the discussion on traffic safety is somewhat overdue. And I hope the recommendations from the committee to the province will make a difference, and I hope I can contribute as well by being here today.

I am a grain farmer in the Cupar area, which is 80 kilometres north of here. And I was born and raised and lived in the area most of my life. And when I was 18 years old, I was accepted into the University of Saskatchewan to be enrolled into the College of Agriculture. And around that time, I was a passenger in a vehicle that was rear-ended by another vehicle. And the driver of the other car was never charged since he left the scene of an accident. All of the injuries I sustained were severe. The accident did change my life, and I did miss attending university, something that I still regret. I believe I am extremely fortunate to be able to be here today to tell the story.

I have served on municipal council as both the councillor and the reeve with the rural municipality of Cupar, no. 218, for 26 years. Over that time I have witnessed many changes as the province's economy moved ahead of the rest of the country.

Many of our children have moved home and, more importantly, others have decided to remain here. In light of this, something else has happened — increased economic activity and increased road traffic.

My municipality contains several valuable natural resources beyond the farm land that produces a variety of grains and livestock. We have known reserves of potash and natural gas, and we also possess reserves of aggregate, sand, and gravel, which are in high demand and are mostly destined for the city of Regina.

In 2011 we had so much truck traffic that we couldn't keep up with the road repairs and maintenance. Due to the large volume and speed of truck traffic, we contacted the Highway Traffic Board, but we were told they didn't have the staff to help us and that the rural roads were not a priority for them. The local RCMP detachment apologized that they couldn't help for the same reasons.

Due to our local concerns with the increased truck traffic affecting road safety, this year we hired a bylaw enforcement officer to at least have someone to report to us and to work in collaboration with the RCMP. Our goal is to someday be able to upgrade the BEO [bylaw enforcement officer] to the status of a special constable and to be able to enforce the traffic Act regulations ourselves.

Some municipalities like ours are discussing hiring their own RCMP officers to serve on a regional basis. There's no doubt that we need more police in the areas that are experiencing increased economic activity. However we cannot afford them on our own, so they must be cost shared with the province. We also believe that RMs should be able to acquire some of the revenue that is generated from fines, the same as some of our urban counterparts.

Highway traffic speed seems to be ever-increasing wherever you go. Motorists don't seem to slow down, in spite of warnings and increased fines. And seeing drivers on cellphones is still commonplace in spite of the provincial-wide ban.

While more police officers are needed, perhaps more effective driver education should also be mandatory. It seems there are still drivers who don't drive according to weather conditions, especially in the winter months. On several occasions I have seen motorists out of control on icy roads and many that ended up in the ditch simply because they wouldn't slow down.

Other drivers still are ignoring the orange zone signs. This spring there were two bridges that were repaired on the No. 6 Highway north of Regina. It was after the projects were completed, on two separate occasions, that I witnessed drivers passing others that were slowing down for the 60-kilometre signs. Ignoring these signs is very dangerous as oncoming drivers aren't expecting this to happen.

I am pleased to hear that the Ministry of Highways is in the process of installing passing lanes on the No. 10 Highway from Balgonie to Yorkton, since this is an extremely busy highway. I have heard mention of passing lanes for the No. 6 Highway south of Regina and think this also would be a wise decision. Even though the province is spending record amounts on our

highways, we cannot forget that we have more vehicle traffic than ever before.

Another problem is the speed that many of the large semis are travelling and the fact that some seem to follow too close to passenger vehicles. Although both the Canadian and American trucking associations are trying to reduce the truck stopping distances, the sheer size and weight of an 80,000-pound truck does not allow it to stop as quickly as a 2,900-pound car travelling at the same speed.

Some of the recommendations that I think are important, that are of value I think, more RCMP officers, both dedicated to highways and areas of increased economic activity; develop a new fine revenue-sharing model for rural municipalities; increase the presence of highway traffic enforcement officers; more effective driver education, especially related to driving under adverse weather conditions, and I believe this should apply to all drivers; better monitoring of orange zones with a combination of increased police and traffic camera presence; and more passing lanes on busy, two-lane highways. In closing, I would like to thank the committee for listening to my concerns and for taking my recommendations into consideration. Thank you.

[16:00]

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Orb. Are there any questions from the committee members right now? I have just I guess a question for you, sir, then to start off. I know that in 2012 at the SARM convention, the Ministry of Policing, on request of SARM, put together a presentation on bylaw enforcement, special constable status, and the such. What was the outcome of that, if I can ask you? Because I think there was some work in progress about looking at having multiple RMs share resources to pay for bylaw enforcement and/or special constable status officers to enforce bylaws and speeds. Am I wrong to assume that?

**Mr. Orb:** — No I don't think you're wrong. I think that that discussion is still ongoing, and I think they are working in collaboration with the ministries — I believe it's Justice, the RCMP, Municipal Affairs, I believe. And I think they're trying to come up with some I think some common solutions. I know there are groups . . . As I mentioned, there are groups of municipalities that are interested in this. Ours is one.

Actually, we have a group of municipalities. We have both urbans and rurals working together on different issues. But this is one of the issues that we think is important, is to, you know, have a bylaw officer working for us. We have one working for us now on a part-time basis, and the municipalities that we're involved with share this individual. And of course they don't have the authority right now to do traffic enforcement. It'd be just our bylaws. But that would be the next step. As I mentioned, we hope that we could, if the province agrees. I think they're looking at different training methodology and training programs to be able to do that.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Yes I think they're looking at what . . . Couple of things. They want to make sure that the people that are selected for the job are the right individual fit for the job that's asked of them. And of course the ongoing training

that has to take place versus just putting them into a vehicle. I understand that from something I read.

Another thing I noticed that we . . . Again it goes to the members of the committee. SARM did give a letter to us, which is in the portal. Within part of the letter they ask about . . . They're possibly looking at Ministry of Government Relations approving bylaws that would reduce speeds for heavy truck traffic in rural, on rural gravel roads. Just as a reeve of your RM, are you in support of that? And that would tie into the issue of enforcement as well. I understand that. But I remember years ago being a very small guy in my uncle's area, around Melville area, and they used to have that, where it was . . . Trucks were supposed to have a reduced speed on gravel roads, I believe. Is that what we're talking about again, from the SARM letter?

**Mr. Orb:** — Yes. I guess I'm representing my municipality today, but of course we're a member of SARM. And I think that's what maybe some of the municipalities are looking at. I think that would be a value to my municipality to be able to actually slow those trucks down, to have a different speed zone. I remember — I don't want to date myself — but highways at one time had different speed limits for trucks than it did for cars, and they may have had it for gravel. I'm not too sure. But they may have had it for the rural areas as well. I think that would be a valuable thing.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Mr. Vermette, you had a question?

**Mr. Vermette:** — Well I just want to . . . You talk about a new fine revenue sharing with municipalities or whether it's to deal with . . . What exactly are you proposing in there so I understand? Because I know there are a formula that's being used currently and I think . . . So if you can explain what your . . . just so I have an understanding where you're going with it. Because we kind of have a little of the information today about the way fines are and the way the revenue is shared with the province and municipalities.

**Mr. Orb:** — The way that the fine that is generated from tickets, that'd be traffic tickets or any kind of ticket I guess in that manner, are shared with the municipalities that have populations over 500. So in the small towns and villages. The RMs do not get any of the fine revenue at all even though there are tickets that are handed out in those municipalities.

And so I know that's one thing that we have lobbied through SARM for, is to be able to sit down with the province and be able to actually devise a different kind of a policy where we would get some of that fine revenue. Because we believe that because we are paying part of the policing costs, that we should get some of the fine revenue as well. That would kind of help offset our costs.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — We have Mr. Parent and then Ms. Wilson.

**Mr. Parent:** — When you were talking about this fine sharing, we were told that municipals do share in it, and we didn't know the size, but also that RCMP fines, that money goes to the province. Now I'm sure that's what I heard. Is that what I

heard?

**The Chair:** — Yes.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay. So that's what you're asking to change, that part?

**Mr. Orb:** — That's right.

**Mr. Parent:** — Secondly, I also remember different speeds. I mean at night . . . Daytime speeds used to be different than nighttime speeds on highways.

**Mr. Orb:** — Yes. I think that's actually what I was referring to.

**Mr. Parent:** — That's for us old guys.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Ms. Wilson.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. This was a very good presentation, Roy. Ray?

**Mr. Orb:** — Ray.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Raymond?

**Mr. Orb:** — Actually, it is Raymond but I go by Ray.

**Ms. Wilson:** — How many RMs are there in the province? How many RMs would use this? And then how many extra RCMP officers do you think we would need if we would like to utilize your recommendation?

**Mr. Orb:** — Well there are 296 rural municipalities in the province. And I'm not sure how many would actually be wanting to do something different, but I know that the municipalities, the rural municipalities that are affected in the high growth areas, and that is also true I think of the oil and gas sector, potash, probably, you know, the high concentrated grain areas where there's lots of truck traffic where they've taken out some of the rail lines, municipalities like ours that are around cities are largely affected by the aggregate that I mentioned — I think a lot of those municipalities would be willing to look at this.

We're not saying that we want this to be downloaded on us. We're not saying that we want to pay for these police officers ourselves, but we want to look . . . I think we were looking for a different kind of a system where we can have police that are more maybe directly responsible to us, that kind of work with us. Ideally a bylaw enforcement officer is good to have because we have lots of bylaws that we can't really enforce ourselves. We don't have the wherewithal to be able to do that, so we need some staff to do that.

But I think really the ideal situation for us is for someone like our bylaw enforcement officer to work with the RCMP. And actually we've contacted the local RCMP in our area are really in favour of this because it makes their job a lot easier and they can actually work together. The RCMP can enforce the traffic regulations and our local bylaw officer can look after the bylaw infringement. It could be things like tarping bylaws and things like we have. Buildings, you know, too close to the roads and

things like that. So I think it's kind of a new model and I know that, you know, obviously SARM is looking at that, and of course we're willing to work with them on that.

**The Chair:** — Any other questions, committee members? Well I guess thanks, Mr. Orb, for your presentation. It was a nice story and, you know, it was one of those kind of stories that hits home because, you know, we've . . . It's good to have that personal perspective as to what happened in your life and what you see in your community's municipality for sure. I will respect the fact you're here as the RM [rural municipality] reeve, not just a member of SARM, but you are part of the SARM organization, I know that.

I guess on that note, thank you. We'll stand adjourned for the day and the committee will reconvene tomorrow at 9 o'clock in the morning. And we need an adjournment motion from one of the members, please. Mr. Cox. All in favour? Agreed. And we'll reconvene tomorrow at 9 o'clock.

[The committee adjourned at 16:08.]