



# **SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC SAFETY**

**Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 12 – June 26, 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 13:02.]

**The Chair:** — Welcome, everybody, and it's good to be back in Regina on this day, June 26th, as we come to the final meeting to look at recommendations from SGI [Saskatchewan Government Insurance] for the all-party Traffic Safety Committee. I just want to say that committee members here today are Mr. Steinley, Mr. Cox, Mr. Parent. Ms. Wilson will join us shortly. She got stuck in a meeting in Prince Albert. And we have Mr. Vermette and Ms. Chartier as well, and SGI officials.

So the usual rules apply. First time at the mike, please tell us who you are. And what we'll do is that after each of your recommendations I'll ask you to stop, and we'll have a fruitful discussion period so members can take notes. And at the very end of your presentation today, all the recommendations, we may have another open discussion area time just in case somebody had forgot something. And I think we'll have a . . . From that point it's been a good session.

We've had good meetings across the province. We want to thank all the stakeholders that have come out to present, and have written, put in written submissions as well. And once we conclude the recommendation session today from SGI, the committee will go in camera and we will start working on that area until we need to stop, to hammer out recommendations in accordance with the guidelines that were established for the committee.

So having said that, thank you, SGI officials, and we'll turn it over to you. Oh sorry, we have to table some documents first. TSC 2/27(26), TSC 44/27(2), TSC 66/27 through to TSC 74/27 inclusive. My apologies. Thank you very much for that. And now the officials.

**Presenter: Saskatchewan Government Insurance**

**Mr. Cameron:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm Earl Cameron from the Auto Fund. I'd like to introduce the other officials that are here with me today. I have to my left, Dr. Kwei Quaye, AVP [assistant vice-president] of traffic safety. I have behind me Chelsea Janis, the manager of corporate affairs. And I am proud to say I have today Arlene Wiks, the chairman of the SGI board, here today. So thank you, and thanks for having us back. We look forward to presenting our submission and finalizing it. And Kwei is going to start taking us through that right very quickly, and we'll try and answer all the questions we can.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Thanks a lot. Thank you again, Mr. Chair. We're glad to be back to present our recommendations as a follow-up to our initial set of presentations. As we explained the last time we were here . . . We'll briefly begin with a recap of some of the issues we identified last time as well as some of the statistics that were associated with the issues. I think that will present a nice backdrop when we move into our recommendations.

As we indicated the last time, we at SGI apply a safe system framework when we are addressing road safety issues. This requires four primary variables: strong legislation; adequate and visible enforcement; timely and targeted education; and good

engineering of roads, vehicles, and related infrastructure. Without all these four variables, it becomes very challenging to achieve long-term traffic safety benefits. It is important to emphasize that we do not believe at SGI that we can just advertise our way to road safety or just introduce strong legislation and sit back without the other remaining elements and be able to achieve good road safety results. So it is important as we go forward for us to think about all these elements in concert.

The safe systems approach, like we indicated last time, admits that humans, we as humans will make mistakes, and therefore we need other elements — safer roads, safer infrastructure, and all the important things that are . . . safer vehicles — to ensure that the consequences of one incident, if it takes place, are mitigated. Historically our focus has been on strong legislation and timely and targeted education, and these components are components within our realm of control, so we've been focusing on that.

We work with law enforcement across the province because we did realize that without their contribution most of our investments quickly go to zero. We have limited influence over law enforcement. Fortunately here in Saskatchewan we've been able to build a very strong and nice collaboration between Saskatchewan law enforcement, so we've been able to make some gains with their contribution.

The effectiveness of any road safety initiative, even within the safe systems approach, is driven by the three elements that we've indicated on this slide: severity of the program that has been introduced, the certainty of the impact of the program, and the speed or the swiftness with which the program can be introduced. Thus the last time we indicated that there are a number of key elements that, based on our analysis of the data, contribute most to the fatalities we see in this province and some of the serious injuries we see in this province, and also contribute significantly in terms of dollars and numbers to the number of property damage crashes that we see in the province.

Impaired driving is at the top of the list, literally. It is the main contributor to fatal collisions in Saskatchewan. And with our data from 2000 to 2012, we indicated last time it contributes about 41 per cent of the fatalities that we see in this province. Additionally, when we look across Canada and compare Saskatchewan to the other provinces and territories, we do not fare very well when it comes to impaired driving fatalities.

Distracted driving and driver inattention is the most cited contributive factor in collisions in Saskatchewan. It accounts for about 25 per cent as the contributive factor in collisions. In fatal collisions it contributes about close to, contributed about 37 per cent in 2012. 2012 was a year in which it came very close to matching the stats that we see for impaired driving.

We identified excessive speed as an issue contributing about 31 per cent of fatalities. Intersection safety — 25 per cent of fatal collisions occur at these locations; 57 per cent of injury collisions occur at intersections; and 40 per cent of property-damage-only collisions occur at intersections.

Seat belt use or non-use of seat belts or improper use of seat

belts, we see also contributes significantly to the fatalities that we see in this province. On our rural roads, we see as much as 60 per cent of the people who die on our rural roads were not buckled. And most of — in many years, 100 per cent of — people who die on First Nations roads were unbuckled.

Wildlife collisions, also very important, important especially from the property damage perspective. These are collisions that principally take place on our provincial highway network. It contributed, from 2007 to 2012, 22 people were killed; about 2,000 people were injured as a result of wildlife crashes. And on average, on a yearly basis, the claims cost associated with wildlife crashes is at least \$40 million.

Possible solutions. Before we start talking about the possible solutions, we'd like to indicate that we at SGI, in collaboration with other agencies, have given a fair amount of thinking to the recommendations that we're bringing forward to the committee today. We've asked ourselves, of all the things that we can do, what are some of the key ones that could give us some kind of jump-start or help us make a big difference going forward? And these will be reflected in the recommendations that we present to you today.

We believe that these recommendations, each of the elements in these recommendations are very important. We also believe that if these recommendations are watered down one way or the other, it also would have implications in terms of the impact that we will see from the road safety perspective.

The first recommendation is geared at enforcement. We've said over and over again that one of the elements that ties together almost all the programming that we do at SGI and almost all the initiatives that were recommended with respect to trying to change driver behaviour is held together by traffic enforcement. Without traffic enforcement, most of the other elements go very quickly, like we said before, to zero. We are proposing that we increase the number of traffic enforcement on our roads.

In the 1990s there were 200 RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police] highway patrol resources in Saskatchewan. Today there are about 63 RCMP officers dedicated to traffic enforcement in Saskatchewan and only 48 are on road enforcement positions as indicated by the RCMP. When you take into consideration leave time and sick time, etc., etc., we dare say that anecdotally we've heard that on many days here in Saskatchewan, there's virtually no RCMP on our roads; there is virtually no enforcement law on our roads.

In addition to regular RCMP complement that is present in a province such as British Columbia, they have additional 170 RCMP officers dedicated to traffic enforcement. Alberta has 178 RCMP officers dedicated to traffic enforcement in their traffic services area. And in addition to that, they introduced as part of their road safety plan 107 traffic sheriffs dedicated to traffic enforcement.

Additional enforcement we believe will increase the perception and reality of violator apprehension, and this is the certainty aspect of the three elements that we spoke about. And this we believe, in concert with some of the other legislative initiatives that we are proposing, other programming initiatives that we are proposing, will go a long way to help change driver behaviour,

reduce the number of deaths that we see on our roads, and reduce the number of injuries.

We worked closely with our colleagues in law enforcement, RCMP, and our colleagues from Justice and the policing department of Justice. And our analysis indicated that at a minimum we need an additional 120 RCMP positions dedicated to traffic enforcement, which we believe could be added — based on the work that we did with enforcement — could be added over four phases. Increased enforcement can impact almost every issue causing injuries and fatalities on Saskatchewan roads. Seat belts and impaired driving, driver distraction — just name it. It will have a huge impact on all these areas. And this will go a long way to make our roads safer. Roughly . . .

**The Chair:** — Thanks. Okay. So on the point of additional police officers, would you just . . . Are you finished with your comments on additional police officers, Kwei?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. I have a couple more comments on this slide and that will be it.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Then what we'll do is we'll go into a discussion mode, okay? Thanks.

[13:15]

**Mr. Quaye:** — Roughly 73 per cent of rural traffic injuries and deaths occur on about 20 principal highways here in Saskatchewan. And doing our analysis, we recommend that these highways be the focus of the program, the application of these additional enforcement officers.

The phased approach allows for a gradual increase in the number of officers to ensure that the supply can be actually met and will provide an opportunity for us to assess the effectiveness of the program as we go forward prior to full implementation. We estimate that the annual cost of adding these officers will be about 3.5 million in phase 1; 7.5 in phase 2; 11.5 in phase 3; and 15.6, thereabouts, in phase 4. We also believe, based on analysis, that this will reduce the number of injuries and deaths on our roads by 11 per cent and property damage crashes by 21 per cent and generate, just from the cost side, annual claims savings of about 24 million.

So these are based on the preliminary analysis that we did on this particular recommendation. We have not calculated necessarily the costs, societal costs related to pain and suffering and the loss of life, the impacts of a loss of life on families, and so on and so forth. These are just the raw claims costs that we believe could be achieved by doing that. So that's the end of the first recommendation, and we are ready for any questions.

**The Chair:** — Great. Well thank you very much for that. I think if the committee doesn't mind, I'll ask the first question, if you don't mind.

Thank you for your presentation. This one, this is really important that we start off because we do recognize, as a body — Traffic Safety Committee — we've heard through meetings with stakeholders that we're seeing a general consensus that more enforcement is needed throughout the province, along

with public awareness and education and a little more punitive measures and more deterrence through that.

So on the issue of traffic enforcement and law enforcement officers added to the complement already paid for by the province of Saskatchewan, is SGI saying with this recommendation that they will fully fund these positions? Or are they saying it has to come out of the General Revenue Fund as part of the Ministry of Policing's annual request to go into their provincially funded spots?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Our position is that if we were to do this as laid out here, that we would provide that funding because the return on this investment would be far greater. We'd actually have a reduction in what we'd require for premiums then.

**The Chair:** — Thank you very much for that. If I can, one more question. The Ministry of Policing presented to us a proposal, in fact, which was a different phased-in approach. They talked about 30 new officers — and if I'm wrong, please correct me, members — and redeploying another 30 officers within the province, currently funded, for initial project and then have that studied along with a recommendation to have analysts look at that situation in the province and where to target these officers. Why do you think 120 dedicated to the rural enforcement — I heard what you said for stats — would be better than what the Ministry of Policing was saying for only having 30 new officers and redeploying 30 that are already currently funded?

**Mr. Quaye:** — I haven't seen the analysis so I cannot really comment on where they are coming from. What I know is that these proposals that are in our recommendations here were proposals that we jointly discussed with the policing side of Justice. So they are fully aware of this analysis, as well as the RCMP because we were jointly in a meeting where we discussed the way these were going to be deployed.

In terms of the numbers, I recall that the numbers, in terms of numbers that should be deployed over time, were probably similar to the numbers that you just indicated because we realize that from an RCMP perspective for instance, the number of officers that we can generate, because these are net new numbers, will be dependent on how many they can actually produce from depot or deploy from somewhere else. So the 120 was staged over a number of years, where — I don't remember — I think it's 30, 30, over time. Around that. But I haven't seen the details of their proposal.

The goal though is the point that what we need is new officers on the road. I think we jointly agree that just shifting around what we have today won't work. There are just not enough bodies out there. And the place where people are being killed and people are dying are on our highways and rural roads and probably rural communities adjacent to those highways and rural roads, and we need new bodies out there.

**The Chair:** — Thank you very much. That's the most critical part I wanted to hear in the end, was the analysis based on the data showing . . . Because I recall a document that's been tabled showing the highest death fatality rates are on rural roads and highways versus urban centres. So thank you for that. Ms. Chartier, you're up.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you very much for being here today. Just some clarifications on numbers. So phase 1, 2, 3, 4, is that an annual? Do you see each phase as being an annual increase?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Phases 1 and 2 at least will be annually. And the initial approach that we discussed, like I indicated, phase 1 and phase 2 will give us enough bodies out there to allow us to examine how it is working, how the redeployment is working prior to entering into phases 3 and 4. So there will be a gap between phases 1 and 2 to allow us to assess whether the deployment is working the way it's supposed to be working before we add new bodies, new enforcement bodies.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. Thank you for that. And just a quick clarification here too. You'd said your analysis . . . This would reduce injuries and death by 11 per cent, but I missed the cost number that you had said.

**Mr. Quaye:** — The cost in terms of how much it's going to cost to deploy or the savings?

**Ms. Chartier:** — No, in savings.

**Mr. Quaye:** — The claims cost savings annually is about \$24 million, I estimate, once all these officers are fully deployed.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. Thank you very much. That's all.

**The Chair:** — Great. Okay. We'll go to Mr. Cox now.

**Mr. Cox:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. And great to see you back again, and thank you for all you've put into this and the questions you answered. I'm assuming the officers that you're asking to put on the highway, you're talking RCMP officers?

**Mr. Quaye:** — We went back and forth on this with respect to how best we can have, you know, create this enforcement process. We look at Alberta. They have the sheriffs. We look at BC [British Columbia]. They have a mix of RCMP and other enforcement agencies in their dedicated traffic unit. And we had several discussions with the RCMP. They made it clear to us that the problem is, I'll call it an RCMP jurisdiction problem in a way because it's mainly on rural highways and our provincial highway system. And we came to the conclusion that the best way to quickly arrive at being able to add additional officers with the right oversight to ensure that the bodies are there, they have the training and so on and so forth, is to go through the RCMP route. So our recommendations are based on an RCMP-based recommendation. But this is based on the initial, you know, analysis of how best to deploy these officers.

**Mr. Cox:** — When you did your analysis, was there any . . . Did you get into cost savings that would . . . I'm thinking, would it be more economical if we had our sheriffs department similar to what Alberta has? Is there any savings that way?

**Mr. Quaye:** — With the sheriffs, I think again based on our discussions, we at SGI, we are not law enforcement people. So we go to where, you know, the law enforcement people are and say well this is the problem that we have: we want more bodies; how best do we do it? So they discuss it back and forth, and so do we do the sheriff route. You have to build a new police agency with the oversight and so on. There will be

administrative overheads and so on and so forth. Or do you embed it in an agency that's already doing policing in those areas and add to the complement, but try — and I emphasize on try — in our discussions, well these are dedicated to traffic enforcement to ensure that that point goes across.

And I think the conclusion at the end of the day is that the RCMP approach is the most efficient. There might be other agencies that disagree, but that is the conclusion we came to, working with the officials from Justice as well as the RCMP.

**Mr. Cox:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Going to Mr. Steinley, then Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Steinley:** — Thank you very much for your presentation. Appreciate you guys coming back again. A couple questions I have. My first one is, on the map with the dedicated road traffic enforcement, on Saskatchewan, we have that out of the 63 there's 40 on the road. I'm wondering if you have those same numbers for Alberta and BC. Like out of those 170 RCMP and 107 sheriffs, there's probably a fair bit of administrative work going on there. I'm wondering how many of those are actually dedicated to the road, and same with the 170 in BC. Would you guys have that number or no?

**Mr. Quaye:** — I don't have those numbers here, but we can get those numbers for you. I don't know what those numbers are.

**Mr. Steinley:** — Okay.

**Mr. Quaye:** — We discussed the administrative overhead required to manage and these are like, you know, an officer. Like a sergeant who does oversight stuff is not actually on the road but has to do the administration of the new added, newly added enforcement officers, as well as administrative staff needed to manage them.

I think the RCMP has a ratio with which they work. I don't remember the ratios, but we can get that for you. All that was taken into consideration to ensure that we have the right number of officers on the road on these highways.

**Mr. Steinley:** — And that's another question. A follow-up question is, with the RCMP members on the road in rural Saskatchewan . . . I grew up in rural Saskatchewan, so I know a bit about it, is that they spend a lot of time doing administrative work as well. Do you guys look into having administrative help in the RCMP detachments in rural Saskatchewan so those officers could spend more time on the road and thus be able to enforce the legislation, the rules that are there more thoroughly already?

**Mr. Quaye:** — You're asking if that was a separate approach that we've looked at.

**Mr. Steinley:** — Yes.

**Mr. Quaye:** — No, we haven't looked at that. I know, based on work that we've done through the report impaired drivers program and enforcement Overdrive where we pay for overtime hours, there're just not enough bodies out there to do the work. It is not a question of getting one administrative person out

there to allow the individual to go out but there is just not enough. And like I said before, if we try to slice and dice what we have today to make it work, we will be still talking about the same number of lives lost, you know, maybe a few years down the line. Just not enough.

**Mr. Steinley:** — Okay, and a final question. I know with the RCMP, I think, I believe that municipalities pay a bit of the policing costs for the RCMP when they're in that area. Has there been any discussions with the municipalities about increasing the number of officers? Therefore that would increase their policing budget as well, because those conversations might have to take place before.

**Mr. Quaye:** — I think the answer to your question is no, we haven't spoken to municipalities about this. I think our focus has been on the highway system itself. So we are not talking about detachment officers per se. We're talking about how many officers are dedicated to traffic enforcement on the highway. Detachment people might do some traffic enforcement here and there, but primarily their responsibility, I understand, is to ensure safety within those communities in which they police.

So if they're doing . . . RCMP is dedicated to policing in a certain community. They might be interested in road safety on the roads within the community and slightly outside the community, but the fatalities we're seeing is on the system in between communities and on our grid roads, rural grid roads.

So we haven't approached municipalities that use the RCMP to ask them if they would be interested in increasing their budgets. We've been principally interested in looking at where people are dying and saying, what else can we do to try to manage it?

**Mr. Steinley:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Vermette:** — I guess again in your analysis, in the research you guys did, obviously you're talking about highways, clearly. You're not talking about municipal policing and the boundary. You're talking about fatalities on the highway, to lessen the costs and saving. And I want to be clear. You're putting in some money and some serious dollars, phasing it in over four years or whatever time limit it's going to be phased in. You're committing to say you're willing to pay that. But it's strictly to deal with fatalities on highways, and that's where you want those officers dedicated, to lessen the fatalities and injuries. And I want to be clear. That's what I'm hearing, and it isn't getting into jurisdictions of municipalities and policing, of municipal policing. It's talking about highway safety, fatalities, and saving. In the end, there would be savings to SGI and to the people of the province. Would that be correct?

**Mr. Quaye:** — That's correct.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. Having said that, would there be a way or have you in your recommendations, is there any way that you're seeing where those officers that would be phased in over those, phase 1, 2, 3, and 4, would they make sure that they are dedicated to highway traffic safety and not all of a sudden being veered away to . . . All of a sudden, you look at it one day

and you guys do some, ask for some research from RCMP and you find out, well we're paying, or the good people of the province who pay SGI in rates, and you're using that to lessen the cost to them and fatalities and injuries. All of a sudden those officers are being utilized somewhere else. Have you thought about and is there any . . . There has to be something. I'm assuming there's some kind of agreement where that can happen. Because I mean I think that is a real concern for me if that would be allowed. And I don't know if you have looked at that.

[13:30]

**Mr. Cameron:** — I can try and address that concern. That's a very big concern to us because we know there will be pressure on resources. If you have resources, there's pressure; there's erosion. And we would have to have, in our mind, a strong memorandum of understanding of how these funds are being used. And we do want dedicated rural traffic enforcement. We're not interested, as our mandate, to pay for other types of policing.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Thank you. I wanted to be clear on that when I was listening to your presentation, of course, some of the questions that the committee has, just to understand for clarification and for myself even. And I think you've answered that clearly. If there's a strong MOU [memorandum of understanding] or, you know, memorandum of understanding, whatever it is that says clearly, then I'm comfortable with that and I hope at the end of the day this works to lessen fatalities if that's something that goes ahead. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Parent:** — I have one question about that as well. Right now there's 48 on the road doing traffic enforcement. So if you throw in the money to do another 120, they could turn around and take that 48 out and you'd be back to 120. Is that not . . . You know what I mean?

**Mr. Quaye:** — We've had that discussion with the RCMP when we were developing this plan, and our understanding is that this is 120 in addition to the 48. We believe them.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay. Thank you. That's what I wanted to clarify.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Mr. Cameron, you have follow-up?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I want to clarify one more point about this. With the policing's presentation talking about a different number, what's important here is there's 48 officers dedicated to traffic enforcement now. Whatever more we add, significant number we add, is going to have a significant difference in those areas that we target. So not to get too hung up on what the right number is. We know and we explained last time when we were here I think a little bit about the RID [report impaired drivers] numbers. I think it was 57 per cent of the time when there was a call in to RID, there was no resource. This would be a lot more resources to respond to impaired drivers. This would be a lot more resources. Even if you take whoever's numbers, it's that many more than what's out there now.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Mr. Vermette, you have a follow-up question.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Yes. You know, seeing . . . And maybe you could explain this, and maybe you don't have an explanation, but I'm just going to put this out. Highway traffic safety . . . And you see those officers. I see them, RCMP and traffic safety, highway traffic safety, all their vehicles. They pull over trucks, cars, whatever I guess. Did you have any discussions with them on working with them, if it would be more suitable to have members doing that? And I know you talked about training. Was that something that you looked at, or was it just something you didn't look at? I'm just curious to see how that all plays out.

**Mr. Quaye:** — We've, well I would say we've chatted on and on with these people from the Ministry of Highways and Infrastructure, and they are responsible for truck and commercial vehicle enforcement. They've indicated to us in more ways than one that they don't have enough of those types of officers right now to even effectively enforce the commercial vehicle program. To move into a realm where they'd be able to stop people, you know, make a charge for impaired driving, blow into a Breathalyzer, it would be additional training for them. Again in their minds, in a way — which I think is right — it's going to take them away from even enforcing the commercial vehicle safety program that they have.

So we chatted with them, but we came to the conclusion that yes, it would be nice to do that, to be . . . Their presence on the highway could make some difference, but it won't be, it won't be effective. Their role is divided, and they are even having difficulty meeting their current mandate of being effective in enforcing commercial vehicle safety.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. Thank you very much for clarifying that. Thanks.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you. I just have a baseline . . . And you may have talked about that in your first presentation, but I don't have that in front of me. How much and how do you pay for your policing supports now through SGI, like Overdrive? What is SGI expending on police costs right now?

**Mr. Quaye:** — I have to look it up. I don't know it. I can't remember it.

**Mr. Cameron:** — We want to quote you the same number we did in the first meeting.

**Ms. Chartier:** — It's okay.

**Mr. Quaye:** — The cost for Overdrive 2012, \$483,500. In 2013 our budget for that is about \$469,000 so it's, you know, between 450 and 500,000. That's Overdrive.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes.

**Ms. Chartier:** — And is there any other way in which SGI

supports current policing, or is it just in the Overdrive program?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Oh yes. We support them through RID. RID is separate from Overdrive. We support them through the purchase of automatic licence plate readers. We support them through training like standard field sobriety test training. We fund that. We provide vehicles for enforcement, specialized vehicles, special vehicles that they can use for enforcement purposes. So we support them in a wide variety of ways.

Apart from the readers that we buy, you know, we bought speed reader boards, jointly purchased speed reader boards for all police agencies across the province. We help them to purchase roadside screening devices, Breathalyzers in the police stations. So we support them in a wide variety of ways. And we do that, like I said before, because we believe that without their contribution, without their support, we would probably have a lot more people dying on our roads and that's, apart from the claims cost, that would be lots of lives lost and socially impactful to the province of Saskatchewan.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you. Do you have any sense of what the overall annual spending would be in all these supports? I don't know if that would be a line that you . . .

**Mr. Quaye:** — Probably Earl can reel off some of these numbers. But we can provide that number for you. We have to add them up because they are in rows here. We can sum them up and let you know how much that is.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. I'm just curious. It is 3.5 million in the first year, 7.5, 11.5, to fully operational at 15.6 million. It's quite a large commitment for SGI. I think it's, the enforcement piece, is absolutely imperative, but it is quite a large, long-term commitment for SGI to pay towards policing. Actually I'm just wondering how it matches up with what you're totally paying right now.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I can comment on that. We budget each year about 3 per cent of our premium towards traffic safety, and then we divvy it up into advertising, awareness, policing, and those sorts of things. I guess the number to remember — and it is, this is a significant number — is we might then shift some resources also and try and stay within 3 per cent. We might, you know, there might be some different things we could do.

For every \$8 million we spend, that's about 1 per cent on premium. So you and I would pay 1 per cent more for premium. Now if we can have claims reductions significantly greater than that for every dollar we invest, \$2 we save or \$3, you could end up, hopefully that's the goal is to end up having much safer roads, lots less loss of life, and without affecting the bottom line at the end of the day. You won't get that day one. That's why we wanted to do a phased approach and see if within two years we could really see that there is, with doing all the other things that this committee will recommend, that we really do see those savings both in lives and dollars. And lives translate into injuries.

You know, we don't talk a lot about injuries here. We talk about fatalities. But there's lots of people very badly injured for the rest of their lives either in care homes or hospitals that cost all of us a lot on premium.

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

**The Chair:** — Ms. Wilson, I think you have a question.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Yes. Thanks, Mr. Chair. Thank you for your report. Nice to see you again. Now can you describe or identify what you based your officer numbers on, your support information? Does it come from your agencies? And where do you get the phase report ideas from? Are these from your own resources or is it from independent?

**Mr. Quaye:** — This was in conjunction with the work we did with the RCMP. We spoke extensively to our counterparts in British Columbia and Alberta where they have similar programs. We looked at our highway network, looked at where the crashes occur on the network, the highways they occur on. We looked at the length of the road network and we looked at . . . We tried to zone around to see with one officer how much coverage can we expect from one officer only on the road, you know, covering a particular highway. So we did a fair amount of, you know, I'll call it crashes and geography-based crashes to see where they're occurring, looked at number of officers, how many officers might be hypothetically sick at any point in time. So how much effectively do we need to create that critical mass on the system to be able to make a difference? And that's how we came to conclusion that at least, looking at the . . . [inaudible] . . . jurisdictions and the problems that we have, at least 120 is a number that we will need in addition to what we have right now.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you. And one more question. In the province, do you have a region that needs more officers than possibly other regions or areas?

**Mr. Quaye:** — I wouldn't say region per se. You know, these fatalities and injuries that we are talking about take place on rural roads and provincial highway network. So what we did was to look at the network. We weren't thinking region per se, but looked at the network and looked at the locations along where we're having a lot of these crashes taking place, different types taking place.

So the goal was to do it based on the network and the manifestation of these crashes on the network. And if it happens that one particular region is overrepresented they will, by way of actually looking at where the problems are, we will be able to deal with that. So we didn't really say, well is the Saskatoon area the problem area or the P.A. [Prince Albert] area, but the question is which part of the network is a problem.

I can't tell you exactly which these regions cover in this particular diagram, but like I indicated before, we identified 20 of those highways. And we can get you a list of the numbers of these highways on the highway system where about 73 per cent of the traffic injuries and fatalities take place. And this became the zone of our focus with respect to the phasing of this program.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you very much for your comments. I appreciate it.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Vermette, follow-up question?



**Mr. Vermette:** — Yes. Just in light of, you talk . . . And I know you identify, you're going to identify for us the 20, and you'll provide that to us. I think that would be helpful to see.

You talk about the rural area where most of . . . When you talk about the rural area, did that include northern Saskatchewan in any way, any highway in northern Saskatchewan, and would it include First Nations communities? Because some of the highways travel through there. Has that been taken into account, those fatalities on-reserve? Because I know, and that was clearly I think indicated, some people maybe with seat belts . . . And so there's a lot of injuries. And if we're taking care of individuals that are injured, you know, you want to lessen fatalities and injuries. And if that is the case, have you looked at that, how you would work with First Nations where there's highways running through some of the communities?

**Mr. Quaye:** — First Nations, with respect to First Nations work, again we look at not only enforcement but, you know, programming within First Nations. We dedicate special resources and special time to dealing with First Nations issues. Some of these issues might not necessarily be dealt with through enforcement per say. It might be more education, persons of education in First Nations schools and having coordinators within First Nations communities working with the communities and working with the RCMP detachments that are within those communities. So with the First Nations work, the way we manage it is to manage it with all of these three — ongoing education, enforcement, and engineering — to look at the special problems within those communities and deal with it from a First Nations, I'll call it a First Nations sensitive approach.

So to answer your question, some of these highways might not be necessarily running through First . . . Some might be running through First Nations. And we can look into the locations and let you know. But I can assure you that our approach to dealing with First Nations fatalities, injuries, and safety is, I'll call it separate in a way from this. We pay particular special attention. We'll have people actually dedicated to doing that kind of work.

**Mr. Vermette:** — No. And just in your previous report, you had indicated with PAGC [Prince Albert Grand Council] you guys had another tribal council you guys were working . . . And I knew that, so I didn't want to take away from that. But I was thinking mainly about highways and looking at the 20 that you had named, if any First Nations . . . That's where I was going and not trying to talk about the other problems. I realize you guys are working with the tribal councils and continue doing that. I think that's good to hear, and we heard that with some of the First Nations that came before the hearings that that's good. Education's important. Thank you.

[13:45]

**Mr. Quaye:** — Okay.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Chartier, you have a follow-up question? Okay.

**Ms. Chartier:** — And I'm sure you've probably already thought about that with respect to this recommendation, which I

think is a good one, but do you think the public will have any difficulty knowing that their insurance is paying for policing?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I'm sure there'll be some that do. There's always local groups, depending. But let's be honest here. We all pay for policing through one method or another. I think it's important for us to, if we go down this road, to explain why we're doing it and what the return in investment we hope to see, and it isn't looked at just — and I'll use the photo radar example — as another cash grab or a redistribution of dollars. This will have real results. This is an investment, not an expense.

**Ms. Chartier:** — So it sounds like, rolling this out, that there would have to be some public communication around this whole notion because this is an important expenditure but obviously a departure from how we do things right now. Would there be a communication plan?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I think for . . . I don't think. For sure there would be a communication plan. You need to explain what you're paying for, and it's traffic enforcement, not for policing. It's to make our roads safer. And again back to . . . You know, I'm a firm believer this is truly is an investment, and hopefully in three years or two years, we see the results. And wouldn't it be good if we say we have 10 too many traffic enforcement officers out there? Because we do see positive results.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. We have Mr. Cox has a follow-up question, I believe.

**Mr. Cox:** — Yes. Just a follow-up to Ms. Chartier's question earlier on. The figures you've given on the deck here, did that take account that some of the things that you highlighted like paying for Breathalyzers, paying for car expense, paying for those kinds of things, is that built in to the new figure as well?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. These numbers include equipping those new offices as well.

**Mr. Cox:** — Okay. That's the total cost.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes.

**Mr. Cox:** — Second question — and I probably should know this but I don't, and you sort of alluded to it — you talk about injuries. When somebody ends up being in long-term care or hospitalized for a long time, does SGI continue to pay health and social services, that expense, or does that then become an expense of the other ministries?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes. SGI pays for all traffic accident injuries health costs. So annually there is an amount of money that we write a cheque to Sask Health for, and each year that goes up as health costs go up.

**Mr. Cox:** — So that's to both ministries, Health and Social Services?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I don't think we pay any directly to Social Services. It's all to Health. I'm pretty sure we don't pay any . . .

**Mr. Cox:** — So those are ongoing expenses?

**Mr. Cameron:** — But it's all Health. And it's a large number.

**Mr. Cox:** — It's got to be.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes.

**Mr. Cox:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, members. I want to ask a couple of questions. I guess to Ms. Chartier's point about communication strategy, I do know in the tabled document you provided to us earlier on that the BCII — so the BC Institute of Insurance — and the Alberta private insurance companies, when they actually funded these new officers, these dedicated officers in their provinces, that was already out there. They had a plan, and they continually fund those positions ongoing — right? — for sustainability today.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. ICBC [Insurance Corporation of British Columbia] does on an annual basis. In BC, it's the government of . . . Sorry. In Alberta, it's the Government of Alberta that funds these positions.

**The Chair:** — Okay. So I thought in Alberta though that the private insurance companies took initiatives to actually help to fund those positions. So I guess to the point, doesn't matter if it's private or if it's government because in Alberta there's not government insurance. It's private insurance. But the idea here, for any kind of communications, that there are templates already out there that have insurance companies that are paying for these positions and have demonstrated through these officers that there is reduction in fatalities and savings. Correct?

**Mr. Quaye:** — That is correct.

**Mr. Cameron:** — The public insurance companies tend to be more visible. Same in Manitoba, they're paying for some policing. They're paying for certain things. I see BC certainly does. I'm not sure how the Alberta model works from the private insurance companies paying for traffic safety. I'm sure they would support it, and there might be some dollars, but I don't know what the magnitude of that is.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. And then I guess the next question I have is, these officers, if the committee does decide to make recommendations to this effect — and it would be no different if we recommended for municipal policing either as well — there's going to be capital costs. And I know that the RCMP would have to make brand new detachments and brand new offices for dedicated traffic enforcement officers because they haven't got the space in the province in their detachments right now. Who would pay for those capital costs? Do you have a discussion with the RCMP about the federal government assuming those new costs, or would it again be a burden on the province of Saskatchewan to pay a portion of that?

**Mr. Quaye:** — In our discussions with the RCMP our understanding was that there is a cost-matching formula between the federal government and the provincial government when new RCMP positions are being created. And that will kick . . . You know, that will also assist in funding these new

positions.

The discussion of new buildings, you know, came up and it wasn't a big issue for them. They weren't worried about the ability to accommodate these new people in the existing facilities. That wasn't such a big issue. I think they raised that as a potential issue, but they said it can be, it is something that they can accommodate, especially as these things are being phased, being brought in a phased approach as it were.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Thank you. Ms. Chartier, I think you had another question?

**Ms. Chartier:** — Yes. Just in terms of the lay of the land with respect to Manitoba and BC then, do you have any idea, a comparison to how much those public insurers are paying for traffic safety officers?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Oh I don't . . . Well BC very much so. Manitoba is currently, you know, has the overtime approach that we have been using, like an Overdrive type of approach. But BC has been dedicating a significant amount of dollars — I don't have the numbers, or we can get the numbers for you — but big and I mean significant in terms of the dollars that they invest in enforcement.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Any sense of . . . You gave us the BC numbers, 170 RCMP officers dedicated to traffic enforcement. Any idea of the percentage of how many of those are paid for through the insurance company?

**Mr. Quaye:** — I don't know off the . . . We can get those numbers for you. In BC what they've created in addition to that is something called the . . . It's a specialized traffic enforcement unit, and it comprises of officers from different municipal forces, RCMP, all joined into one, into this specialized traffic enforcement unit. And that is what is funded by ICBC, but I will have to get the number of officers in that group for you as well as the dollars that they put in.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I don't have the exact numbers, but I know the number is over 100.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Of those officers.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I want to guess that yes, it was more than 100, and I can't remember because it was huge. I was actually shocked when they said that's what they were paying for annually.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Yes. And so BC has a dedicated traffic safety unit then, funded through the insurance, through their BCIB?

**Mr. Quaye:** — That's correct. ICBC.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Oh my goodness. Thank you for that. Do you see these officers then? Again as I think you've explained that they would work out of some of the high risk or the trouble spots out of just the regular RCMP detachments, so they wouldn't be a special unit unto themselves. They are simply dedicated to traffic enforcement.

**Mr. Quaye:** — They are dedicated to traffic enforcement. In

terms of organization, as to whether they are within, under the jurisdiction of the RCMP, I think it's a separate unit of its own, well you know, like I said, contributing from different policing agencies. But it manages itself. It's sole role is traffic enforcement within British Columbia.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — I do have I guess a follow-up then to that point. I would say that the recommendation that we would probably look at or SGI would want to see would be that this is a solely dedicated set of officers that are dedicated as a lot to traffic enforcements through the MOU, that these new dedicated positions would be housed within specialized units. Therefore that would tie the RCMP's hands then where they couldn't move those officers out, and we'd fund a position. And so if they run vacancies like they've been known to do the past — because I remember my days with the Saskatchewan Federation of Police Officers — they would have to have a priority to fund those because we're funding those positions, to hire those positions first.

Now they'd also have the hierarchy too with an inspector or staff sergeants and sergeants as well. So they'd have admin support teams within their own dedicated units. So that's not a bad thing. But I guess it's what the MOU would have to indicate. Therefore it holds them accountable then so they can't say that those positions are now merged into a detachment duty, which I think we'd all want to see that. Can SGI guarantee that that would be the outcome of a recommendation for these 120 officers?

**Mr. Quaye:** — I think we can't really speak for the RCMP. What we do know is we want additional officers that are dedicated to traffic enforcement. In terms of the mechanics on how that is going to work, like I prefaced earlier on, Earl and I, we know very little about policing. We have to go to the Justice side of policing to talk to them to get the requisite assistance to help us move in a direction that . . . We know what we want. We want more officers dedicated to traffic.

**The Chair:** — Right. Okay. Ms. Chartier, you had a follow-up. Oh sorry.

**Mr. Cameron:** — We can guarantee we'd make every effort so that erosion does not happen. And Kwei's right; we're not the experts. We need the Ministry of Policing to add to this and work with them on it because what . . . A certain circumstance on dedicated traffic enforcement in Estevan might look a lot different in Swift Current. Or you know, how that would look and what's the most efficient way, they would have to tell us. But what we want to do when we're writing the cheque each year is know that we got \$100 worth of dedicated traffic police enforcement for every \$100 we spend.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Ms. Chartier, another follow-up?

**Ms. Chartier:** — Do you think that there'll be legislative changes required right now to *The Police Act* to make this happen?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Again we're not the experts on that, but I would think not from our end. But we shouldn't comment on

*The Police Act*. Sorry.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. So there is the possibility because I know *The Police Act* says that the province is to provide policing. So there may . . . We don't know that answer. So that's okay. Thank you. Something to think about.

**The Chair:** — I can answer that question. The Act doesn't have to be amended. It's a very general Act definition so this would be . . . This would augment what's already in place. So it's fine. It would never have to be amended. It's just a new . . . It's just additional officers we pay for. And within that funding formula, it just has to happen within that realm. So it's not a big deal. So we're fine there. Okay. So any more questions from members on the officers, dedicated officers? Seeing . . . Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Just thinking about . . . And of course the committee and I appreciate this. And I'm just really, whether the committee was to . . . And we support it as a recommendation. Let's say we weren't to support it for whatever reason. It didn't . . . And I'm not saying it wouldn't, the committee wouldn't, but if the committee for some reason chose not to support one of your recommendations or something that we'd move forward, this is something — and I want to be clear — you could because you've done other programs with police enforcements and different programs that you run within SGI in a partnership, you could actually manage to negotiate this too. Would that be correct, or am I . . . I just want to be clear on that one.

**Mr. Quaye:** — I don't understand what you mean by negotiate.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Well I guess right now you have certain programs you run with the PAGC. You allow certain dollars and you run programs. If for some reason it wasn't working out that it's the recommendation that this committee felt supporting at this time for whatever reason — I'm not saying they're not — if they weren't, could you negotiate to have more officers with whatever agency you have to or group you have to, whether it's RCMP, to facilitate more traffic safety officers out there? I'm just trying to make that clear. If you could do that, as SGI on its own, could you . . . You run special programs because that's an area where you could just say we would like to work with them to have more traffic safety officers. I'm just trying to, one way or the other, find out if that's possible.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I can try to speak to that. It's certainly an option, but it would be probably no different than what you would see in this recommendation. A change that significant would go through our board, through CIC [Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan] board, and over to cabinet and legislature because that would be a significant difference in what we're paying now for traffic safety. So we would need approval.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay, thank you.

[14:00]

**The Chair:** — All I can say to the board, to the members of the committee, is that the minister in charge of Policing and the Minister of SGI were looking at these prior to the Premier appointing the committee. So everything's been put on hold

pending our outcome of our recommendations. I can sincerely say that ministers and the Crowns are all waiting for these recommendations to come forward. If they were to feel that we were not significant enough in our recommendations, they would still take this committee's report as a founding document and then move forward from that.

That's one of those things with this committee. We can make recommendations to start and we can make recommendations where we'd like to see it, but they may in fact, once we're all finished this committee, they may in fact see more officers needed if in fact there is a new analysis done. And they would again have to go back to the minister, go to the CIC board, and those things.

So what we're going to do as a committee, we'll make recommendations for sure, but at the end of every recommendation, as the Chair I will make a caveat that at the discretion of the ministers and Crowns, working through analysis into the future as well, so they have the option to add or take away in case analysis shows that maybe these officers need to be redeployed somewhere else as well for other things. We did the same thing for the officers for ICE [Internet child exploitation] units, CFSEU [combined forces special enforcement unit]. There is a standing order that if they need to be redeployed for other measures, they can be, by the government. So that pretty much covers that off.

Thank you. We'll move on now to your next set of recommendations please, which I believe are tougher drinking and driving countermeasures. And what I would like to do and ask the SGI members, would you please stop after your graduated driver's licensing issue recommendations, and we're going to have a discussion around that solely. Then we'll move on to the post-GDL [graduated driver's licensing] and the other issues for that in regards to the BAC [blood alcohol concentration] levels and sanctions. I think that's going to be significant for us as members of this committee to ponder and look at some ideas. So thank you. We'll move it back to you.

**Mr. Quaye:** — By the graduated driver licensing issue, which one do you specifically mean?

**The Chair:** — Low BACs from .04 to .08. We'll stop after that.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Oh, .04 to .08. Oh, okay, all right. Okay. Okay, then I'll quickly go through what we have on our list here. The first one is to expand zero tolerance to drivers 21 years of age and under. And I believe we provided some stats previously on the chart that did indicate that this age group is highly overrepresented in alcohol-related fatalities and crashes and that most jurisdictions have moved in this direction to help alleviate or manage the problem.

The second one is to increase roadside suspensions for new drivers — and new drivers are drivers in the GDL or graduated driver's licence program — who fail a drug test. And currently for a driver who is in the GDL program, if you're caught for the first time on an alcohol-related incident, you have a 30-day suspension. If it's a drug-related incident, you get a 24-hour suspension. And we are seeing, like I indicated last time in our presentation, 50 per cent of drivers fatally injured have some type of presence of drugs in their system. Not necessarily

saying that the drugs contributed to the fatality, but what's being seen right now across the country is the creep-up of drug-related issues in fatalities. So this is a way of tightening or making a lot more tougher, in terms of the severity side, the consequences of drug-related driving incidents.

The third one deals with addiction screening. Addiction screening is embedded in different stages of the impaired driving management program, both for drivers caught on a low BAC and drivers who are caught at the Criminal Code level for impaired driving or over .08 incidents. Currently SGI pays for this addiction screening program. Saskatchewan is one of three jurisdictions in the country that pay for addiction screening, and we want to make drinking drivers accountable for their behaviour. So we are proposing that we move to a regime where addiction screening is paid by the offending driver.

The next one is vehicle impoundments. Introduce mandatory vehicle impoundment and increasing roadside suspensions for multiple offenders. The next one deals with the introduction of mandatory ignition interlock program, as against our current voluntary program that we run in the province right now. And the last but not the least is to increase the number of points associated with the safe driver recognition program for repeat offenders.

This slide deals with the drivers in the .04 to .08 range. So the previous slide is more general in terms of some of the initiatives that we would like to see with respect to managing drinking and driving. For drivers .04 to .08 range, we want a zero tolerance for alcohol for drivers 21 years of age and under and of course in all GDL drivers. The associated suspension period for drivers who are caught — and I would like you to focus on the third column which is proposed — is a minimum 30-day roadside suspension.

The next one is the vehicle impoundment requirement for drivers in the .04 to .08 range who are caught for second and subsequent offences, and the length of the impoundment that we are proposing is seven days. Ignition interlock requirement for drivers who are caught for third and subsequent offences in the .04 to .08 range, we are proposing that they stay on the ignition interlock for a period of one year.

For drug-impaired driving, first and subsequent incidents, we are proposing an immediate 30-day roadside suspension for drivers in the GDL program. These are new drivers.

Our next recommendation pertains to the SDR [Safe Driver Recognition] program. Currently if you are caught in the .04 to .08 range, you get four points against you whether it's a first offence, second offence, and so on and so forth. We are proposing that for drivers who are caught for a second offence, the number of points that we assign to them with respect to demerits for the SDR program be such that they move to minus 12 in the penalty zone. It doesn't matter where they are. If they are presumably a good driver with positive 20 points for instance in the safe driver recognition program and they are caught for a second offence, of course they won't be at 20, they will move down a bit. But we are proposing that not first offence but second offence moves you to minus 12, and that is associated with a \$300, call it a surcharge of . . . It's not a fine. It was a \$300 fee as it were.

If they are already in the penalty zone of the SDR program, they just move down an additional 12 points within that zone and pay the corresponding charge that is associated with the allocation. For a driver who is involved in a third offence — so three or more offences — they move to minus 18 in the penalty zone. And if they are already in a penalty zone, they move an additional 18 points in the SDR program.

The last recommendation pertaining to .04, .08 is the addiction screening. We are proposing that SGI stop paying for addiction screening for drinking drivers and that drinking drivers become responsible for paying for their own screening program. So we want to move to a user-pay program similar to almost all jurisdictions in the country at this time. So these are a summary of our recommendations, and we'll pause here for questions.

One point I would like to mention before we take questions, you remember we had a slide that said 1 in 2,000 and 1 in 500 in terms of the number of events before somebody could actually come to the attention of police officers. I'd like you to interpret second offender or even the first offender in that sense. The first offender is not a first offender. It is at least the 500th time or the 2,000th time that a person has been driving before they've been identified by police. But we are recommending a little bit of leeway here to say, well give the person the benefit of the doubt and call that their first event. But if the person shows up again, the chances of showing up again is so, so small, that it is more likely that this person might have some type of problem and is more than a repeat offender.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. We'll go Mr. Vermette, then Mr. Steinley, and Ms. Chartier.

**Mr. Vermette:** — I'm going to pass for now and come back.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Steinley.

**Mr. Steinley:** — I've heard that number 2,000 times before they've been caught. I would love to know where that number comes from. How do you get that number? That's pretty hypothetical I would think. I would love to know how you get that number.

**Mr. Quaye:** — I didn't make up that number. Many, many years ago the federal government was looking at making some enhancements to the Criminal Code of Canada so they set up a committee just like this, the federal government committee of parliamentarians to — I think it was a Justice committee — to hear presentations from a wide variety of organizations, MADD [Mothers Against Drunk Driving], SADD [Students Against Drinking and Driving], what have you. Everybody was there to talk about what to do with the Criminal Code. And Professor Nadeau from the, I think she's from the University of Montreal, a renowned researcher in impaired driving, made a presentation to the committee.

And the committee's report, and we can probably send you a copy of the committee's report, they referenced this work by Professor Nadeau where she indicated that the chances of being caught for drinking and driving is so, so slim. And the research indicates that it's between 1 over 2,000 and 1 over 500 with respect to the chances of being caught. So this is not a number made up by SGI. This is a number that is borne from research

done people who are well versed in the field of drinking and driving. But we will make a copy of the Justice committee's report available to this committee, and I'll reference you to the appropriate page where Professor Nadeau is quoted.

**Mr. Steinley:** — Just a quick math, do you divide that by 365 days? You'd have to be drunk and driving 5.5 years straight for that to be 2,000 times when you're drinking and driving. That's quite astonishing by my short calculations. I have more questions but Doyle can go ahead.

**The Chair:** — Okay. At this point I think this is going to be a pretty heavily loaded question area, so I'll ask members to ask at the most two questions, and we'll go back and forth. Okay? So, Ms. Chartier, you're up.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you. I'm curious about the vehicle impoundment recommendation. I believe BC and Alberta both on first offence have three-day impoundments. And just in light of your comments about your first offence really isn't your first offence, why you would go with your second offence and a longer impoundment? So I'm curious about the logic behind that rather than following the BC and Alberta model of first offence and three-day impoundment.

**Mr. Cameron:** — We've had much discussion both internally, externally with our board about what the right penalty is on that. The idea of this was these were the low blood alcohol readings we're talking about here, that you would be somewhat more lenient on impoundment than what the BC approach was. And that was at the time that was the consensus of the decision makers within SGI and our board, that that was a concern about taking away someone's vehicle at .04 on a very first offence.

And it goes back to I think the presumption of innocence. You haven't been convicted of anything yet, and you're losing your vehicle for a significant period of time. So I think there was some concern, and there was lots of discussion around that, what the right penalty is. BC certainly has taken the hard approach.

**Ms. Chartier:** — And Alberta.

**Mr. Cameron:** — And now Alberta followed right after that. It wasn't without very, very lengthy discussions amongst our groups.

**Ms. Chartier:** — From other stakeholders who we've heard present, we've heard the numbers of impaired drivers drop in BC, so their tough approach on impoundment for three days . . . And Alberta, I know Mr. Muire from MADD has said the numbers aren't officially out, but they've seen a 40 per cent drop I believe in Alberta. I don't have it in front of me, but it's just interesting to me. And you've given us your logic here, but it's an interesting departure from the other two provinces who've had some success.

I do have more questions, but they're on other topics, so I'll let someone else have the floor.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. We'll go to Mr. Parent and then Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Parent:** — Can a person have a driver's licence back before they take the addiction screening?

**Mr. Quaye:** — No. The addiction screening is a requirement for getting your licence back. So you have to . . . Whether it's a low BAC or a high BAC, once you've committed the offence, and the regime requires you to go through screening to see whether you need to go through education or to go for further treatment on the alcohol route, you need to complete that before you can get your licence back.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay, thank you.

[14:15]

**The Chair:** — Okay. We'll go to Ms. Chartier again for two and then, if it's okay, we'll go back to . . . Oh sorry, Mr. Vermette, then Ms. Chartier, then me.

**Mr. Vermette:** — I'm glad my colleague mentioned it because I actually, to be honest with you, just sitting here when I first opened this up and looked at that, and honestly I just . . . I'm having trouble with it to be honest with you. From what I heard from others giving report, first time offender, if we're saying zero tolerance for graduated drivers, to me you want to send a message. And a clear message should be sent. It's almost like you want to call it education, but it's clear. If it's zero tolerance, it's zero tolerance.

So I'm having a little trouble with that I'm just going to say. I mean I realize it's your recommendations and that's fine. I accept that. I accept that. But I have trouble with it right now. It's sitting . . . I'm not comfortable with it. So anyway, having said that . . .

**The Chair:** — Thank you. If I can just jump in, that's fine. And I would just appreciate the members respect that members of the ministries and Crowns are here to give us their recommendations — we're not here to be argumentative with them — to be respectful of their position. Remember we go in camera, and we have all the authority to make our own recommendations. So please take that into consideration. And to the presenters, we're not going to engage in arguments with you. And I'll tell that again to the committee members. So if you don't like what's there, ask why it was made, and move on, please.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. And I want to be clear. I wasn't and in no way do I want to come across how I do . . . But what I heard — and that's what I'm saying — what I've heard so far by people that were presenting in the hearings I think, and that was . . . [inaudible] . . . So it was a little overwhelming to me to see. And I'm not trying to say . . . I understand it's your recommendation, and I appreciate your recommendation.

But having said that, I'll go back to the next part of it where you talk about addictions screening, and you want the user to pay. And I have a problem with that. And I'm going to tell you why I think . . . And you can explain why you think it's okay, and you can justify your recommendation. That's fine.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Vermette, sorry, if I can interject again, I would rather you not give us in this open format your rationale

for that. Keep that to yourself for our recommendations tonight in which we'll have a healthy debate back and forth. You're free to ask the members presenting where they came up with that analysis to present to the committee. Because I will promise you this: tonight when we go in camera, we will all have our time back and forth to ask. And we will make recommendations, I'm sure, which will go against what some stakeholders and presenters have given to us. So please, if you like, just ask why they came to that point. I'd really appreciate that, and I won't have to cut you off again.

**Mr. Vermette:** — No. And I appreciate that, and I'm not trying to . . . And I guess I'll word it in a different way so it doesn't feel like . . . You've made a recommendation then that you think the user at the end of the day should pay. Can you explain to me why that is?

Because when I heard other people presenting, you hear about the challenges with individuals that maybe don't have the money, some individuals who maybe live in poverty. Yes they drive. They're making minimum wage. They go to jobs. They made a decision to drive. I mean we talk about that. If, in order for them to have their driver's back and to get the addictions treatment — screening, whatever it is — they have to pay it out of their pocket, they may never be able to have the money to do that. So they may not get their driver's again, so they may not go back to their job. So when I look at people living . . . And that's some of the areas where I'm wondering how you guys looked at that and if you could explain that to me as your recommendation.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Well we looked at, if you look across Canada, look at BC . . . And I'll name the exceptions. PEI [Prince Edward Island] where I think the government pays, PEI, I think the government pays 95 per cent and the offender pays 5 per cent. And I think Nova Scotia is government funded. I'll cross-check but I think those are the two jurisdictions that may have it the wrong way around. Everywhere else — BC, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick — everywhere else that you go, the offender pays for the screening program. The offender, the drinking and driving offender, is not subsidized by the rest of the motoring public to pay for any of the programs that involve him.

If it's a vehicle impoundment program, the offender pays for the program. If an ignition interlock program, the offender pays for the program. If there is a fine associated with a drinking and driving event, the offender pays for the program. And we looked at what's been happening across . . . [inaudible] . . . and, you know, we pay I think close to \$3 million each year for this program. And we believe we could use that program to engage in, you know, further education and some other road safety programs that could go a long way to make a big difference with respect to drinking and driving on our traffic safety initiatives.

So that is the rationale that we had for, you know, deciding to make this shift from having SGI pay for this program rather than getting the user, well not the user anyways, the offender in this sense to pay for the program. That's our rationale.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Then looking at that and I guess my last question on this, and I'll come back later, but if you're dealing

with that and I guess you guys must've looked at or maybe you didn't or maybe you can suggest how you guys looked at it or information, you referred to some provinces that do things a certain way so you go that way. You have other provinces who go a certain way and then you're saying, you'd . . . not going that way. So when you make your decision, it's based on obviously . . . I don't know. So how did you get to the point to look at addictions? And I say this. Because if somebody has an addiction problem and they need treatment, how do we assist that person? And I'm going to say, maybe not all people can afford to pay for that, to do the treatment, the assessment, and yes if they want to drive, there's other things that, you know, I understand you're going to make them pay for, and which makes sense.

When I look at the addictions and the treatment side of it and doing the assessment, it really . . . Now I don't know if it should be Health or if there should be some other way. Did you guys look at any other ministries, assistant individuals who couldn't afford? Maybe they don't have the resources and could prove they don't have the resources. Did you look at or were there any options looked at, are there other ministries or other ways you could support those individuals to make sure that if they want to come back and drive and they want to, you know, and require these treatment or addiction assessment, is there any . . . Did you guys look at any ways of assisting them or any other way of helping them to get there?

**Mr. Quaye:** — I think the principle here is a user-pay principle where the offender is going to pay for the screening that is required to steer them into DWI [driving without impairment] or that's driving without impairment education or treatment. That said, based on the program that we have fully developed and designed in a way, if you look at other programs that we run that require . . . that might involve a user having to pay us an amount that he owed to us or having to pay us, reimburse us for an amount that they've incurred on one of our programs, we do have programs, ways and means in which we look at the needs of that particular individual.

So although we have programs that in the general principle will require an individual to pay us a certain amount before they can get their licence back, there are situations where we do an assessment and we can get the individual to pay the small amounts back, or we can even find ways and means of waiving the fee that's associated with the program to make it work.

But what we are communicating here is more of a principle that it's a user-pay program. It doesn't preclude our ability to, in situations where the situations warrant, look at ways in which we can work with the individual to help them get their licence back.

We're very interested in people driving with a licence than people driving without a licence. And I can assure you that we have numerous programs where we go to jails or we'll go to communities and where we actually reach out and work with people to help them get that driver's licence back in spite of things, money that they might be owing to us.

But what we are projecting here is a principle. The principle is that if addiction screening is required, it's a user-pay program, and there might be exceptions under that.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. Thank you. I'm done for now.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Ms. Chartier, a couple of questions and then we'll go to Mr. Parent.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you. My questions are not dissimilar from Mr. Vermette's. I was just wondering in terms of the addiction screening, you said it cost about 3 million annually. How much does it cost individually, per individual who goes through addictions screening?

**Mr. Quaye:** — I don't remember the number. I don't want to give you a number that is incorrect. I would say in the order of maybe 400, \$400 thereabouts. I would say, 4 or \$500.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay.

**Mr. Quaye:** — But we will reconfirm the number and give you the right number.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you. I know we had an opportunity to hear from the medical health officer in the North. And he was supportive of mandatory interlock programs, but obviously again, Mr. Vermette's point, that there you have to use a socio-economic lens on the policy. So I appreciate your comments about the principle for sure.

I'm wondering if there's any jurisdictions who have things like mandatory interlock or addictions screening where it's user-pay that have other supports in place with that socio-economic lens in place recognizing that not everybody is at . . . not every offender is at the same place.

**Mr. Quaye:** — I'm not aware of that. Again we'll have to look into that. The only thing I know is that Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia and PEI provide some type of payment and everywhere else, you have to pay for the program. But we can . . . We'll poll sister jurisdictions and find out if there is any jurisdictions that do that. Like I said before, you know, we're very sensitive in that area. I say we would rather have somebody drive with their licence than drive without their licence.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. I appreciate your comments about that. And then this is a broad principle that you're providing here, but making sure that people have the opportunity to be able to drive legally is I think very important in any recommendation that we come up with. So thank you. I think you answered my questions.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. We'll go to Mr. Parent, please.

**Mr. Parent:** — My question is to the screening locations. Like is there locations all throughout the province or do they have to go to specific places and is that added into the cost of getting the screening done if you lose your licence and are . . .

**Mr. Quaye:** — The screening right now is managed through the health districts. The health districts run the screening programs for us. So it's dispersed by all the health districts and at the end of the year, they tell us how many people they've screened and then we pay them. So it's run through the Ministry of Health. That's the engine for running the screening program for us.

There are places where there are backlogs when people cannot get in, but it's more a function of the availability of screenings in those health districts than in anything else. We fund . . . They tell us the number and we pay for it.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay, thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Okay, I'll take a turn now. Thank you, members. I do have a couple of questions. I want to reiterate what Ms. Chartier said about MADD indicating impoundment seemed to be the deterrent punishment model that seemed to work in BC and Alberta, and we'll be talking about that this evening for sure. Can I ask, on the safe driver recognition program, your proposal for a second offence for the .04 to .08, you go to a minus 12 penalty zone. Why would we not — because this question's all about the new, looking at a proposal for a new age limit for a GDL for zero tolerance — why would we not again look at a first offence demerit point system versus a second offence? Can you tell the members of the committee and myself . . . and I hate to tell you this, but if you get .04 to .08, the police officers have taken a reading, so they have . . . The person's guilty by that reading on a roadside device. So why would you not go to a first offence demerit system? Why would you go to a second offence demerit system of minus 12?

**Mr. Quaye:** — There is a first offence demerit system in place already. You know, I think the comparisons that we have here, it's showing what happens for second offence and third offence. Today it doesn't matter whether you're first, second, third, fourth, or fifth — you get minus four points.

**The Chair:** — Okay.

**Mr. Quaye:** — So there is minus four there already. But what we are saying is instead of minus four, minus four, minus four, and so on and so forth, we go minus four, minus 12, and it increases that way.

**The Chair:** — Okay, thank you. That clarifies my question.

Second question is this: removing the GDL and the whole issue about age of drivers, for a regular driver I don't see a recommendation on moving from a 24-hour suspension for a .04 to .08 to a higher level — 72 hours, three days. We did see some data on that. Can I ask, has SGI thought about moving from a 24-hour suspension to a different level of suspension for .04 to .08 for regular drivers as a measure of deterrence and punitive measures as well that would be more likely to have a guilty driver having to be put out per se by having a licence taken for three days versus one day? Has SGI ever looked at that?

[14:30]

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. And I would like to reiterate Mr. Cameron's comments earlier on, that this issue of whether we impound first offence or we impound second offence and whether we look at BC and Alberta and so on, yes we have. We've had very, very extensive debates within the organization. These recommendations are reflective of recommendations that have been approved after several, numerous debates, not at . . . at the safety level, at the executive level, and throughout the

board level, and it's reflective of the recommendations of the organization. So we have looked at it.

Again there is a certain degree of giving the benefit of the doubt to the first offender. We have presented to you what the data indicates with respect to, you know, what a first offence means, and what it really means. But these are recommendations that are reflective of approvals through our organization.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Okay, Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — I just want to make sure that I'm reading this correctly, the drug-impaired driving here. So we have right . . . currently a 24-hour roadside suspension. But your recommendation is, for your first and subsequent offence, is just pertaining to those who have a graduated driver's licence?

**Mr. Quaye:** — It's GDL, yes.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Yes. And right now, the 24-hour roadside suspension applies to everybody. Yes?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes.

**Ms. Chartier:** — I'm just wondering why you've only chosen to provide a suspension here, or recommendation to suspend those in the graduated driver's licence for drug-impaired driving.

**Mr. Quaye:** — I think what we . . . The rationale behind is we're looking at those initiatives that we think will have a huge impact to start with. GDL drivers are drivers who are learning how to drive. They really can't drive yet. They, you know, they have to gain experience in low-risk situations.

Another reason why, for a GDL driver, for instance for the first, if you're caught for the first time, zero tolerance, you have a 30-day suspension. An experienced driver, you get a 24-hour suspension. And a GDL driver, you're caught for the second time, you have a 90-day suspension. Experienced driver, you're caught for the second time, you have a 15-day suspension because, you know, we want to limit the risk associated with this. And the police indicated to us, you know, they keep seeing, coming across more and more young drivers who are trying, experimenting with drugs instead of alcohol because they, you know, zero tolerance for alcohol. And they think they can get away with just a 24-hour suspension.

So this recommendation is reflective of that, to minimize, putting something additional to minimize the risk that we know is associated with those people who are learning how to drive, in the first 27 months, as it were, of their driving life, you know, as it were. So that is the reason why we zoomed in on the GDL group, because of the particular risks associated with that group.

**Ms. Chartier:** — I think one of the recommendations we've heard from another presenter was that drug-impaired driving, the sanctions should be the same as alcohol-impaired sanctions. And I could be mistaken, but my overall impression is that we're in a bit of a policy vacuum around drug-impaired driving, that jurisdictions haven't really known what to do.

Is there anything else? I know these are your recommendations



here, but I'm looking for some direction on what else we could do. So you're focusing on a target group that is showing to use drugs and drive instead of alcohol. Now there's been that switch in that younger age group. But is there anything . . . You don't think there should be anything else we should be doing around dissuading other drivers from drug use while driving?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Well let's say at the minimum what we'd like to see is this recommendation applying to GDL drivers because of their particular circumstances.

Drug-impaired driving is still . . . A knowledge of drug-impaired driving, how to deal with it, is still evolving. We don't have an instrument per se that can tell us whether somebody's impaired by, you know, by drugs at a certain level. They have to go through the standard field sobriety test and the drug recognition expert analysis, you know, a long program that's established by the federal Criminal Code.

And the best that we can do right now is to train more officers to be able to do that. We believe that starting at a minimum with GDL drivers will go a long way to hit a group that cannot really drive yet and that pose a high risk to us and that, at least from what we see, are highly overrepresented in alcohol-related crashes, as it were.

**Ms. Chartier:** — I know one thing that we heard, and I can't remember the comparisons, but the drug recognition experts, apparently we have very few of them here in Saskatchewan. So I'm wondering why there isn't a recommendation from SGI around the increased training. You just mentioned increased training of those who can identify drug use. So I'm just wondering why there isn't a recommendation on that particular . . .

**Mr. Quaye:** — We invest in training with the police. It's something that we budget for every year. And when we talk to them, they come to us, they establish a program, we pay for it. So I would say it's not a money supply problem. It might be a demand problem from the police side having enough resources to make people available to go through its training. It comes back again to our initial recommendation.

If we have more officers on the road available, we can make more money available, train more people out there to be driver recognition experts and there will be, you know, the certainty aspect with respect to the ability to identify these drivers is going to go up.

So like I said, all these recommendations go hand in hand. But training, we don't do . . . Training is a given for us. We know it's something we need to invest in to ensure that there's a sustained presence out there and the right expertise out there.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Is SGI paying for any training for drug recognition experts?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes we do.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Yes. Are you the sole funder of that?

**Mr. Quaye:** — To be best of my knowledge, yes we are the main funder of that. When they put together a program, we are

the organization that they approach and say, we have a program; we need it funded. And we're always there because we believe it helps make a difference.

**Ms. Chartier:** — In terms of the supply program, so hypothetically in five years from now we've rolled out 120 new traffic enforcement officers. Obviously, as you said, they go hand in hand. A recommendation to be . . . And maybe not necessarily from SGI. You're already ponying up in your recommendation \$15.6 million. It might be beneficial for the government to think about expending some more resources on training of drug recognition experts if you're the sole funder right now and there's a need for it.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Like Earl indicated, Mr. Cameron indicated early on, this is good business for us. Taking drug-impaired drivers off the road will save a claim, save a life, save an injury. It just makes good business sense for us, and it's something that we believe we are committed to doing.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Have you done any analysis on what would be a good number here for our population to have, how many drug recognition experts comparatively to the rest of Canada? Where should we be at?

**Mr. Quaye:** — If we are able to train all of them to be drug recognition experts because we don't know where that person's going to pop up, I think it's going to make a big difference. So if we have 100 people and they all want to be trained, we're going to invest in getting them all trained and making sure that they have the ability to do it.

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

**The Chair:** — We'll go to Mr. Vermette, and then if there's no more questions after that, we'll take a bit of a recess. So Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Vermette:** — You're talking about and I know you're looking at individuals and GDL drivers and . . .

**Mr. Quaye:** — No. These drivers are drivers who are caught driving between .04 and .08. It overlaps GDL drivers. GDL drivers are zero tolerance. Like they're zero.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. I'm talking about the drug. I want to go to the drug part of it, where your recommendation . . .

**Mr. Quaye:** — Oh, the drug. Yes. Okay.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Yes. Your recommendation is . . . A 24-hour suspension is what they used to give. You're recommending now it goes a little different, a 30-day suspension. And you're only . . . And I think my colleague asked that question. And what I'm having . . . Is there a reason why you've switched to go strictly — and I know you've explained that and I'm just trying to understand — why you've switched to going to . . . Is it because of the age group that we're looking at that might be . . . And we heard some numbers previous on young people that, under the influence of drug, do a lot of the driving and that some of the numbers I can remember from one of the individuals who gave a report, it's pretty high what they're suspecting. So maybe they're not drinking and driving, but

they're sure under the influence of drugs and driving. And it's a younger age group, if I remember correctly. Is that why you're focusing in that area? Or it's almost like . . . And I'm not saying you're going away from it, but can you explain that recommendation? And I know you . . .

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. I said at a minimum we would like to see this for the GDL drivers because GDL drivers . . . And it's not age-based for GDL. GDL can be any age at all if you're new, you're a new driver. You're driving for the first time. You don't know how to drive. Research has indicated it takes about three years to be comfortable with how to manoeuvre on the road, how to know how to lane keep, how to keep the appropriate distance and so on and so forth, and during that time, a lot of crashes. We find lots of crashes associated with new drivers.

So adding drugs to an inability to drive just creates additional danger for everybody. And the police have indicated to us, because we have a zero tolerance for new drivers, what they are seeing increasingly is that they're switching from . . . They know if they use alcohol, they could be caught for alcohol. So they're finding other means of, you know, of impairment to drive.

And they know that if they are caught for drugs, they fail the SFST [standard field sobriety test], all that they're going to get is a 24-hour suspension. And it's becoming increasingly frustrating for police. So they've been communicating this to us. This is what they are seeing on the road. And that's the rationale for this particular recommendation.

And like I said, at a minimum, if we can't get anything at all, let's get something for the GDL group. If it is extended to all our drivers, that's a plus. That's a bonus. You'll have more safety out there. But this is the area that we see the highest risk and is an area that we think needs urgent and immediate action.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. And I appreciate that because that explains it to me. This is where you're coming at it. And that's good.

Now in your research or in talking with any groups that you guys consulted with, and whether it's doctors, police enforcement, I don't care which groups, as you're making recommendations, was there any discussions or can you give us any information that maybe where you're finding individuals that are actually . . . it's worse when they're drinking and mixing drugs? Did you guys get any information on that?

**Mr. Quaye:** — The information that we have is based more on a national study that is done. And this study involves looking at people who've died from traffic crashes and doing the coroner's examination of what they may have in their system. Of course there's situations where it's only alcohol, but sometimes with the drugs.

But the situation is, where there's a mix of alcohol and drugs, I don't know what the numbers are. I can't give you numbers, you know, off the top of my head. But we can locate those pieces of research and share with the committee so we have a sense of what's been found out there. What has been reported to us is a lot of mixing of alcohol and drugs that they've found inside fatal injured drivers, drivers who have died as a result of

traffic collisions. They find lots of mixing of, presence of alcohol and presence of all types of drugs in their system.

So like I said before, our knowledge and our understanding of drug-impaired driving hasn't matured to the level of alcohol-impaired driving and is still evolving with respect to that knowledge. How the alcohol mixes with the drugs and what the impact is, clearly we do not know. We know that the research indicates this is of course detrimental and leads to a worse-off driver than a driver who probably has just alcohol. But we can share that document, national document with you so that you get a sense of where Saskatchewan stands and what's been found with respect to drug-impaired driving.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. Thank you. No more questions.

[14:45]

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Seeing no more questions at this time, we'll take a 10-minute recess. So we'll reconvene at 5 minutes to 3 or 2:55. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

**The Chair:** — Thank you, members, for coming back on time to reconvene the committee as we will now move on to the next level of recommendations associated to blood alcohol contents of .08 and higher. And again we'll turn it over to the SGI members here today to present. So thank you so much.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Thank you very much. Before we move on to the .08, there's one point we would like to clarify is that the previous slide that dealt with .04 to .08 did not only deal with only drivers in the GDL program. It includes drivers who are outside a GDL program but who are caught on the roadside by an officer and blow between .04 and .08 on that approved screening device. So we would like to clarify that.

.08 — these are drivers who fail the screening device at the roadside and are in the Criminal Code range — so .08 and above, the first recommendation . . . And again, I would like you to focus on the third column which is our purpose. The second column just gives some information on what we currently have today.

The first recommendation is for the roadside suspension that is associated with people blowing above .08. We are proposing that if a driver blows between .08 to 0.15 — so this is a driver who's brought to the police station and blows within this range — he or she gets an immediate 90-day suspension. And the emphasis here is on the word immediate. Currently what happens is that if you blow above .08, you get a 24-hour suspension, and then we give you, we call it, seven days to get your affairs in order, and then you go on a 90-day suspension. We are proposing here an immediate 90-day suspension. So we get rid of the 24-hour and the seven-day grace period where you can still drive.

The second recommendation associated with roadside suspension is if the person, individual blows .16, which is two times the legal limit, the Criminal Code legal limit, he or she gets an immediate 120-day suspension.

[15:00]

The next recommendation pertains to vehicle impoundment. An individual who blows between .08 and .15 or is presumed to be impaired by an officer gets a 30-day vehicle impoundment. An individual who blows two times the legal limit and over gets a 60-day impoundment.

Ignition interlock. Ignition interlock is currently voluntary and is voluntary for people who are convicted of an impaired driving offence. You can choose to go on an interlock program as a way of getting your licence back sooner. We are proposing here that for, again the principle here you see starts with second offence, for people who are multiple offenders, for a second offence you get a one-year requirement to go on an ignition interlock program. For a third offender, three years on an ignition interlock program — this is subsequent to your conviction — and for a fourth and subsequent, five years ignition interlock.

Safe Driver Recognition, currently if you are above .08, it's a \$500 requirement. So you drop to minus 20 on the Safe Driver Recognition scale, and you are charged \$500. We are proposing that we increase this as well from .08 to .15, 1,000; .16 and over, 2,000. So 2,000 is similar to what we currently charge for people who . . . impaired driving causing bodily harm or impaired driving causing death.

Addiction screening, like we said before, is a requirement to get your licence back, user-pay principle.

And sorry, the last row is just a repeat of the first row, so you can ignore that. So these are there for emphasis, I would say, so roadside suspension is emphasized again in the last row. And these are our recommendations for the .08 and above drivers. And we'll take questions, comments.

**The Chair:** — Thank you very much for that. Any questions from the committee members?

As we went through this, this was very clear. Just for the *Hansard* though, it also says .16 over or refusal, which I like, from my previous background, because if you refuse, you are deemed to be guilty at the time and you still have to show up in court. So this is an interesting one to put in there. Thank you for that. Refusal is happening a lot these days, and they believe that they're not impaired so they say they're not going to take the test and won't blow in the instrument. And this is nice to see that in there. So thank you, SGI, for that.

Any questions from anybody? Going once. Going twice. That means you did a great job on this package. Thank you very much for that. And we'll move on to photo radar.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Photo radar. First start with some principles with regard to photo radar. I think in our earlier presentation we did, you know, emphasize the role that excessive speeding plays, and we did indicate that the traditional approach is that police use manual enforcement. It does . . . [inaudible] . . . mass to deter people from speeding. And in places where you have lots of speeding occurring, an officer can pull one vehicle off the roadside at a time, and all the others just keep speeding. So it's an inefficient way to deter speeding. And we did propose

that photo radar is one of the — or electronic enforcement it's called — is one of the ways to enhance their ability to manage speeding.

Some principles that I would like to mention in regard to photo radar. We would like the opportunity to try a photo radar pilot here in Saskatchewan just to demonstrate that the technology does actually work, and it works to save lives, to reduce injuries, and improve safety.

One of the first principles in terms of our goal from the SGI perspective is we would like to see a photo radar system that produces zero tickets and zero collisions. No tickets. We are not interested in seeing any tickets being generated by the photo radar device. We're still willing to pay for the device that produces zero tickets because we believe that the device is effective in reducing collisions, and it goes a long way to reduce the cost associated with crashes and also goes a long way to reduce injuries and fatalities and whatever is associated with it from a detrimental side.

Photo radar we believe will calm traffic, makes the road safer for all of us. And the deployment of photo radar we espouse should be done with extensive public awareness and visible signage. We want to tell you where it is, when it is, and know that it's in operation before you even enter the zone because, like I said, our goal is to not to write a single ticket from the photo radar device.

Photo radar, like we said earlier on, will increase the perceived risk of apprehension because it's there, it's working constantly, and trying to detect people who are speeding excessively. And with these principles we believe that, although there is a perception that photo radar devices are there because it's there for a cash grab, our view is that if it's used effectively, you know, with these guiding principles that we've indicated, we can achieve the goal of improved safety. And through the critical use of signage and the knowledge of where these devices are, we expect drivers to comply accordingly.

With respect to a pilot, we propose that we be given the opportunity to try the use of full radar on these high-speed corridors as well as in school zones for the safety of, you know, school children. So Circle Drive in Saskatoon, Ring Road here in Regina, and there's the Highway 1 corridor on the approach to Moose Jaw, that have been identified to us by the city of Moose Jaw and Moose Jaw police as a problematic location, as areas where we be allowed to try photo radar on a pilot basis with the guiding principles we mentioned before and also apply them in school zones, again to reduce the need for manual enforcement and to calm traffic in these locations. So I'll pause here. That's our recommendations for a photo radar pilot program for radar.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. First question to Mr. Parent, then Ms. Chartier.

**Mr. Parent:** — Two things about the photo radar. They're not going to produce tickets or anything like that and take pictures or . . . And are they portable? Like you can . . . You're going to do the pilots in this one area for now, and you could move it somewhere else. Does it tell a person what their speed is? Or like what are the principles of them?

**Mr. Quaye:** — You know, a principle of this, the photo radar pilot we're talking about, is a photo radar system that can produce tickets. The principle that I was talking about earlier on is that our goal is to not receive, get a single ticket from a photo radar device. It's capable of providing a ticket, and we have to pay the provider for the service because whenever they are there with their device, even if it doesn't write tickets, they have to be paid. So we at SGI, we're willing to do all that even if the device does not write a single ticket.

And to do that, to ensure that people are aware, we indicate one of the principles is that we clearly advertise with signage on approach to that device that photo radar is in use in this corridor. If there's need to have an advance device that shows what your speed is, we're going to use that to let you know how fast you're moving before you're approaching this photo radar zone. And the goal is to calm traffic within these corridors to ensure that we don't have crashes and collisions that will injure people or kill people.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay. This is basically the same as the red light cameras we have in Saskatoon for instance? But it's speed instead of lights?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes. It is the same principle. Red light cameras detect your presence, your egress . . . No, no, sorry, your entry in the intersection on the red and taking a picture. Photo radar is based on speed.

**Mr. Parent:** — Yes.

**Mr. Quaye:** — It detects your speed and will give you a ticket if you are a certain amount of kilometres per hour over the speed limit.

**Mr. Parent:** — Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you. In terms of looking . . . Well first of all, the cost of photo radar, I've heard that it's quite expensive. But what would the cost of one unit for the pilot project be?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I can answer it. I don't know what the cost for one unit would be. I believe the cost coming out of . . . for three units for the orange zone is somewhere in that \$250,000 range for a year.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay.

**Mr. Cameron:** — So I don't know if it would be cheaper if it's one or three.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. Can you tell us a little bit in terms of looking at other jurisdictions or other research where photo radar has been used, other places where it's been quite effective, the kind of impact that it's had? Can you tell us a little bit about a location or two where it's been quite useful?

**Mr. Quaye:** — Well it's been used here in Canada. It's used in Winnipeg, in Manitoba. It's been used in Calgary for many, many, many years. It's currently in use in Quebec. They

initially started with a pilot project, a two-year pilot project. That's about five years ago. And then they went back to their legislature who extended the use of the pilot project. So it's still ongoing in Quebec with respect to a pilot project. It's been used extensively in Europe and some places in the US [United States].

Generally the research that we have on photo radar, it was used . . . And before I go to the research, it was used in British Columbia and it was used in Ontario — emphasis on was. There were issues with respect to photo radar — more, I would say, more political issues with respect to photo radar — and there was a perception that it was a cash grab, and that led to the failure of those programs.

However the research from ICBC — I don't have the ICBC numbers here; we can provide it to you — show that, in spite of it being stopped in British Columbia, research that was done in BC on BC programs show that it resulted in huge cost savings for ICBC. And I think we shared a copy of that with the committee. It's probably on your website, the huge savings for ICBC.

With respect to ours, to backtrack a bit with respect to the research generally on photo radar, it's been shown to have over 20 to 25 percent reduction in fatalities in places where it's being used. And it's not a new technology. It's been used in Europe for decades now. It's not very common in Canada.

Our numbers, you know, we looked at this two-year pilot project, and we anticipate a 14 per cent reduction in speed-related injuries, a 25 per cent reduction in PDOs [property damage only], property damage crashes, associated with this device. And we think it's, from a claims savings perspective, we could achieve about 1.2 million savings using the device. So these are preliminary numbers that we did with some of these corridors that we're looking at.

So we, like I said, we are very hopeful that such a device can make a positive change even if it doesn't write any tickets, doesn't produce any tickets. If it does produce any tickets, it would probably just go back into running of the program or if need be, well we're even willing to make that money available to be used in health care or somewhere else. We're just not interested in the revenue being generated from a photo radar device but more in the fact that the use of the device will be a huge safety benefit in reducing injury and property damage crashes.

**Ms. Chartier:** — In comparing and contrasting say BC who, as you said, had photo radar and Quebec who extended its pilot project, how did the two programs roll out differently? Or what were some of the challenges with BC versus Quebec who has carried forward?

**Mr. Quaye:** — I think communication . . .

**The Chair:** — I'll answer. I'll answer that one. For the committee members that don't know this, in British Columbia when it first came into play is that a typical . . . The political party of the day implemented it. Another political party challenged it as a platform piece in the next election thereafter, and they won because they used that as a main point to go

against. They didn't like photo radar, and the public rallied against that.

BC may not have done the appropriate level of public awareness as the Winnipeg model did. If you look at the portal and what's on the portal from SGI in Winnipeg, they did an extensive campaign, six months I believe of public awareness and warning letters, and then when it became active they found that that was a significant reason why they got very little revenue and/or very little tickets. So I think at the time it was the . . .

The BC model was definitely politically driven. And the one in Quebec, I wouldn't be able to answer that question. But for the purpose of this committee, you should know that that's what happened to the one in British Columbia. So that just gives you the highlight for that one. But Quebec, maybe the members from SGI can give us a better idea of how come it's been rolled out and then extended as opposed to be coming a mandatory program.

[15:15]

**Mr. Quaye:** — I think they demonstrated from the initial program that it improves safety. And what they've done is to stick to some of these guiding principles that we've mentioned. It's not a secret. You know where the devices are. It's clearly advertised, clearly signed. Nobody is caught by accident in a photo radar zone because you know you're driving into a photo radar zone. And I think that's been the success of the program is that it's the transparency and the choice of the location of the radar devices. The choice of the location is based on analysis of crashes, speed-related crashes. And they are placed in zones where there's a high probability of speed-related crashes and are very difficult for law enforcement to actually enforce manually because of danger to police officers.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you for that explanation. Do you see the pilot project rolling out starting with a warning letter? Or I know you've said the principle or the ultimate goal is no crashes, no tickets in that perfect world. But I know, I think, Mr. Cameron, in conversations with you at the conference, we talked about the possibility of warning letters. Do you see the pilot project rolling out with warning letters or going straight to ticketing?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Your memory is very good, Danielle. Warning letters is the way I would like to see it go. I think you can do a lot of behavioural changes with warnings. You can show the effectiveness of that program without looking like it is punitive and a cash grab. And it's back to what Kwei said. What we're trying to do is just change the behaviour during that corridor or that intersection of the road and calm traffic. And we know if a police officer is standing there with his lights flashing, it calms it, but he can't be there 24-7 and he's likely at risk.

These types of intersections I think will be accepted by the public if they're done properly. And if they're done improperly, if you put a photo radar unit hidden in the bush somewhere and it looks like a trap, that's what people will perceive it to be even though it might be a safety thing. I think we get out in front of this. And I'm really looking forward to what's going to happen

in the Orange Zone. That will make those corridors much safer as people drive through them this summer.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — So on that point members should also be aware, if we make a recommendation to go to photo radar, we'll have to ask for a legislative change for sure because the Act doesn't allow for that for now. So that'll take time, but we can always look at those recommendations. We'll be discussing that as part of the committee work as we move on. Seeing no more questions . . . Oh, Mr. Vermette, sorry.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Seeing you're proposing a pilot and to use this, and whether you have them, you don't have them, and where they're located, how many units, I'm not sure, but you talked about the cost, and you gave some numbers for the cost. And I realize it's you want the awareness, and you want people to realize they're there. And I think that's a good thing to say, public awareness, so they understand the ideas about safety, lessening fatalities and injuries. And I realize that.

Having said that, I know some areas are using . . . And it's not the radar, but it allows for individual drivers to see how fast you're going. I think Melfort has it. I know they have a portable unit in La Ronge, and it just stays around the highway, the school zones. And as you come into it, it flashes your speed so you see your speed. Do you guys have any of those units that you send out to the communities? And are those your units that somebody uses? Because I don't believe it's La Ronge's. I was going to ask who owns it, and I'll find out from the mayor and council over there. But do you have any of those units?

**Mr. Quaye:** — We don't have units at SGI, but we purchased or co-purchased many, many units for almost all the enforcement agencies in the province. Regina, Saskatoon, P.A., RCMP — they all have one. And it was . . . I think most of them were purchased — not co-purchased — purchased by us, SGI, and we made it available to them.

And we've received rather impressive feedback from all these agencies with respect to its ability to help them to calm traffic, to convince community residents that there is no speed issue in the area because there's a lot of speeding. And originally what they would do is to send a police officer to sit there to do radar, to check whether that is actually an issue. But with this, they just send a unit. The unit collects the data. They look at the data, and the unit also calms the traffic. So we've received rather positive feedback and have even purchased additional devices for some of these agencies since then.

I don't know about the one in La Ronge. But where communities approach us and indicate there's a speeding issue and they are willing to use community members to use this device in problematic areas, we've been always willing to help them purchase these devices.

**Mr. Vermette:** — So if it would be a municipality as well, you've been approached by some of the municipalities as well to joint venture, to buy these and stuff?

**Mr. Quaye:** — It's been police agencies. But we've been approached by communities within municipalities through our

community grants program at SGI, and we've purchased some of these devices as a result of that for those community agencies to use.

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

**The Chair:** — Great. I don't see any other questions from committee members. On that point too, I know in Prince Albert we had one of those speed boards with the blue and red lights. They're very effective because they're portable. One problem is that once they're in an area too long, then the young generation decides to use them as a fun way to light up the red and blue lights at night time and we used to . . . Actually it was pretty effective because we used sit out in an unmarked car there and catch them. So if that was ever going to be utilized as a photo radar piece, that would be nice. But I don't believe the technology is there for that right now, but it's nice to have the speed board there anyway.

So we'll move on the usage-based insurance now.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Yes usage-based insurance is a new piece of technology that I think has been in the news for some weeks now. It's a new piece of technology that has been demonstrated, can help, through an insurance program, can help manage driver behaviour, allow drivers to behave or to drive in a more responsible way. It is an emerging trend in automobile insurance and is a way of charging insurance rates that are more reflective of an individual's driving behaviour and the likelihood of being involved in a collision.

The device is used to electronically transmit driving information, which includes speeding, braking, mileage, location, and time of day. And this information is captured and analyzed to develop a more accurate individualized pricing, so more reflective of the way the individual drives.

UBI [usage-based insurance] can also improve traffic safety by making drivers aware of their risky driving behaviour, providing them incentive to improve these behaviours — this is through feedback — and thus reducing collisions, injuries, and fatalities. For the best results, drivers must receive regular reports on their driving behaviour. Timely and targeted information will allow drivers to more aptly correct their behaviour.

While UBI is relatively new in Canada, initial results have shown significant claims costs reduction. The concept of introducing the UBI program in Saskatchewan is still in its infancy. It's very new. I think in the news a few weeks ago SGI announced the possibility of working with the motorcycling community to introduce UBI, but we indeed see a potential with respect to particularly new motorcycle riders, taxi fleets, and new drivers of cars in the application of these types of devices.

The conception of the way this program works is a voluntary program. It's a program that again is targeted at some of the higher risk, or higher risk-type driving and will go a long way to improve safety. But you know, I bring forward this to the committee as a technology-based approach, at least an engineering approach. I remember a safe systems concept is an engineering approach to try to change driving behaviour.

Any comments from the . . .

**The Chair:** — Yes. Ms. Chartier's got a question about this.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Yes. What has been . . . Obviously there were some . . . I don't know how long this has been in the works, but I'm wondering what kind of feedback you're getting from some of the motorcycle riders who may have . . . This could be part of the reason. I'm not being very clear here. Sorry. What kind of feedback have you had from motorcycle riders for whom insurance rates were a huge concern?

**Mr. Quaye:** — You mean with respect to UBI?

**Ms. Chartier:** — Yes.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I can try and answer that because there's mixed responses from different groups. The motorcycle review committee is just going through that now. And it's from, I guess the comments would be from the Big Brother side, you know, because it does monitor too. Maybe that can save a life. Maybe that can change behaviour. It is a very effective way of measuring what you do.

I've had one on my vehicle for a month and a half now as a pilot. And I can honestly tell you, it changes your behaviour. It creates an awareness. You can look at your email each morning on your record and see exactly how you drove, good or bad. One of the large fleets — I won't name them, but here in Saskatchewan — has it on all their vehicles including their senior people. And they get an email if they speed from Regina to Saskatoon. Theirs is immediate feedback saying, we're a safe company. We have a big safe plant, and we want you to be safe as an employee. It's an effective tool.

It isn't without its concerns, right? But this is really in the conceptual stage, the infancy stage. Can it work for people? Can it save lives? And like Kwei said, it's working in the private insurance world where it's a little bit different. I think it has huge potential if done properly in any jurisdiction.

**The Chair:** — You flagged some of the concerns. You've talked about the Big Brother aspect of it. But what other kinds of concerns specifically are you hearing?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I think one of the concerns I heard was, if I am in an accident, then the insurance company is going to look back at my driving record the last six months because it won't be just my driving record; it'll be my detailed driving. If it was a bad accident, the police could end up with that information, and there's concerns about that. I mean we're all conscious of our privacy and where we go and where we travel and how long. My personal view is that if used properly, the good far outweighs any . . . Because it really is measuring the vehicle. It doesn't know who's driving in that vehicle either. It's measuring how your vehicle is.

And as a parent — and I'll speak as a parent on this one — I wish I would have had it when my three children went through driver training once they graduated because it would be I think a positive, positive tool that a parent could volunteer and say, what parent wouldn't want to know how their vehicle's being driven once that 16th birthday comes? And maybe it would

have saved a few 16-year-olds' lives.

**Ms. Chartier:** — I'm wondering here . . . This is the only recommendation that specifically talks about motorcycle riders, I think, so I'm wondering if there's . . . You're not recommending changing the training program at all around training for riders in light of the fact that you don't need, currently, you don't even need to sit on a bike to get a learner's licence.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes. At this proposal we were not. At the motorcycle review committee that's under way, that will be, all sorts of those things are being discussed, and hopefully we'll come forward in good recommendations to address the issues that were raised there.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Quaye:** — Just a correction. This, as we've indicated on this slide, is for new drivers, new motorcycle drivers, high-risk drivers, taxis. So there's a wide variety of groups that are exposed to a high level of risk that have the potential for the application.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Just in light of the fact that when the rate increase happened — this is the only one that specifically mentions motorcycle riders — and just in light of the fact that that was flagged as a concern when rates went up, I was just curious about it not being mentioned further.

**Mr. Cameron:** — One other, one other comment on that. This is really new for motorcycles. It's been around for cars. Right now, as far as we know, there's only one vendor offering this that actually would work on a motorbike. So that's why it's a bit later being sort of as a concept of maybe being an option to help prevent crashes and lower costs.

So it is really new for motorcycles. You can say, well it hasn't been proven even yet; will it work? Will it not work on motorcycles? Because it's a different beast. It's out in the water. You know, there's different issues with motorcycles, but it does look promising, this technology, not just for motorcycles, just the fact that you can change driving behaviour if you know you're being monitored, no different than when you were a young person and your parent sat beside you. That was the monitor.

[15:30]

**Ms. Chartier:** — In terms of where it is working, you said in some places where there's private insurance, it's working well. Can you tell us a little bit about where it's rolled out positively?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Well certainly in the States you've seen them. You probably saw GEICO's [Government Employees Insurance Company] ads with Snapshot. They're a very progressive company — and speaking of that, Progressive also an insurance company — where they were putting them in cars and then measuring your driving behaviour. And then when you turned it back in after a period of time, they would say, yes, you're eligible for a discount; we want to keep you. I mean if you weren't eligible for a discount, you know, you were back to the base rate that you're always at.

The two programs that have just been implemented are in Quebec and Ontario. I can't remember the names of them. One of them's Desjardins and the other one's Industrial Alliance, I think, in Quebec. And they're showing some pretty promising results when they did their pilot and looked at it. Time will tell.

**Ms. Chartier:** — In terms of what the actual recommendation is then, so you've got a pilot in place, would you say, around usage-based insurance?

**Mr. Cameron:** — We don't have a pilot in place yet. We are hoping to have one with motorcycles, and that was what we recently have announced and discussed. And we would like to look at other areas where it might be very effective. I know there's some interest by business owners. There's some interest by parents for new drivers.

**Ms. Chartier:** — So your recommendation is to broaden usage-based insurance then, so you'll . . . the motorcycle pilot, but broadening it.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I think, right, to create that awareness with the committee that this is there. It's one of the things that . . . This isn't going to be the be-all and end-all to make Saskatchewan have no collisions. This is just one more thing that maybe can be used effectively for drivers such as new drivers, maybe for bad drivers. Maybe after you've had your fourth speeding ticket, we should have one of those on your vehicle, my vehicle. And if I have my fifth . . . Because back to that 1 in 2,000 chance of getting caught, maybe that's a better way to monitor high-risk drivers than relying on police officers. Like I say, it's very new in technology, and I think it's concerning for people right now about where technology is going with vehicles.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Steinley.

**Mr. Steinley:** — I understand that this is completely voluntary if it was to roll out. My concern — and actually I had a constituent call and ask about this very . . . they called it the little black box that goes on the motorcycle — is there around privacy. That kind of was his biggest concern: would you even see something like this being approved by even the Privacy Commissioner? Like I know there's a lot of specifically tracking all your movements was the biggest concern. Knowing that it's voluntary and that if you don't want it, you don't have to get it.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I can speak to that. If it's voluntary, that's right. It's not a privacy issue. But in Quebec and Ontario, the Privacy Commissioner is aware of it there and didn't have the problem with it. Now I don't know what their specific concerns were but they're doing it there and their Privacy Commissioner . . . And probably part of it too was because it's voluntary, and probably part of it is it doesn't track you specifically. It tracks your vehicle. Certainly if you own fleet vehicles, do you want to know where your fleet vehicle is and how fast it's being driven?

On-board recorders have been on trucks for 30 years. They just weren't very good. They are now. And like I say, a lot of big

fleets have put them on for a variety reasons including safety. The guys were talking about if, you know, like the GPS [global positioning system] that you have on your car on certain models, if your airbags go off, it phones 911. That same technology could be applicable in the black box because it's uploading to a telephone system.

**Mr. Steinley:** — And one more follow-up. With the little black box, how long would you figure the motorcycle, the user, would have to have it on their vehicle before you'd have enough detail to go and say, all right, we've got . . . your driving records says your insurance . . . I'm assuming heading down the path of your insurance can go down by this much. How long would they have to have the on-board recorder with them?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I have no way of knowing on motorbikes yet, and we're hoping to get a significant number of volunteers, build up that data to see what would be a norm. You would have 1,000 riders, say, ride for X period of time, and you would look at the curve. Who's on the extremes? And you know, that's how they do it with cars and they build a risk base. If you're over here, you're very safe. If you're over here, you're the norm, and over here . . . Right now we do it based on your experience as we gather it. That would be gathering it all the time as you drive. Or you can do it like the GEICO plan in the States where you do it for three months and show that you're a pretty good driver and they rate you accordingly.

**Mr. Steinley:** — One more quick one. Obviously collecting this data, you'll want some volunteers. The chances of bad drivers signing up to be volunteers would be slim to none, so that data is probably going to be pretty skewed.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That was taken into account on a lot of companies. That's why I think GEICO and Progressive are very smart. Guess who they got? All the good drivers wanted to come and get a discount.

**The Chair:** — I think I have a question. It's interesting you've talked about fleet vehicles. I would like to know, did you have . . . First of all, are all the SGI board members part of this voluntary or voluntold program? And after that, CVA [central vehicle agency] vehicles would be an interesting one to look at. Have you looked at that? Because those are government-purchased assets that should probably . . . could be part of a pilot project as well.

**Mr. Cameron:** — You're really putting me on the spot here, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** — Notwithstanding the person sitting behind you.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That's exactly . . . No we didn't provide any to board members. I'm sure there'd be lots of volunteers there.

**The Chair:** — Okay.

**Mr. Cameron:** — But you're right. On any fleet, if you're managing a fleet, do you want to know where your vehicle is, how bad, how good it's being driven? There's all sorts of good safety things around it, including if you need to get hold of that vehicle. And that's what the trucking industry does. They know where it is. It's more efficient for dispatching. There's all sorts

of technologies now that make it much more efficient to run your fleet.

**The Chair:** — Thank you for that. I think that's one of those points you want to keep in mind. Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Vermette:** — For these units, whether somebody comes in voluntarily to put them on or whatever, whether it'd be CVAs, board members with SGI wanting to volunteer to do it or yourself, as you said, what's the cost of these units for one of them?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I can't remember what the car one was. The vehicle or car ones are quite cheap. They just plug into your OBD [on-board diagnostics] port on your car where your diagnostics are. You plug it in yourself. You set yourself up on the computer, with the company, with a password, and away you go. I don't think they were over \$200. I don't know if anyone else knows, but they were . . . And again, based on volume. But those are pretty, pretty standard. I think the ones in the States were like 40 or 50 bucks, some of the very simple ones. Motorcycle ones, I don't what the cost will be yet.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay, thank you.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Move on now to the wildlife management section, please.

**Mr. Quaye:** — In our presentation, we did indicate that the wildlife problem here is a 40-million-plus problem and creeping up year to year. Finding cost-effective ways of managing these collisions has been a challenge for us. It's because, primarily because of the geographical spread of the problem over the highway network and the fluctuation of our animal population.

We've explored many approaches to try to handle this problem the past two decades. To date it's been a challenge to find a cost-effective solution that can be, you know, implemented on a scale that will effectively mitigate this problem. We've researched deer whistles, reflectors, larger signage on highways, hi-tech warning devices, and they've been to no avail.

We've built a fence just outside of Harris many, many years ago. It shows some good potential. I wouldn't say it's the most, the best fence that could be built in a sense that, unlike places like Banff where you have a fence which has an allowance for animals to go underground or on overpasses, our fence has sections in where, because in entering farmers' fields we had to leave a gap, and where there was a gate but it wasn't closed all the time, in spite of that, it showed some potential. We will continue to invest in fencing where there are concentrated wildlife population and there's a cost-effective, a cost benefit to introducing a fence.

However, we strongly, strongly believe that this problem is a problem with animals and vehicles being in a location, one same location at the same time. And one of the ways, because people still have to travel, maybe somebody might argue the animals still have to cross the highway, but in spite of that we think one of the ways in which this can be done is to reduce the number of wildlife in high-traffic locations by understanding where these animals are, where these crashes are taking place, and reducing the herd size.



Other than that, the problem that we have right now . . . Now it's moved from deer. It's gone to moose, and we've seen fatalities as a result of moose-related crashes. And in the absence of that, we will still continue to read about fatalities and serious injuries as a result of these crashes. And the cost of 40 million we'll still see creeping up and up and up. We can do our part. We can build a fence, work with Highways to build a fence, but we need help from other sister agencies to ensure that the size of the herd is reduced in these locations where there are high crashes.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Mr. Vermette, you have the first question.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Yes. And I realize that you have . . . Animals and moose traditionally weren't in the South the way they were in all locations. It seems like you see more signs up telling us it'll be 16 kilometres, 18 kilometres, you know. It's just a sign of warning about moose population, and I realize that whether it's deer, moose, mule deer here . . . In the North, we have whitetail; down south you have mule deer. So I mean having to deal with that . . . Then you have signs and notices, and I realize that. Have you looked at when you . . . With deer, and I know maybe you checked with engineers, experts, whoever, and I know some people have talked about the highways. Yes the signs are good, and I know there's a lot of signs, and you try to bring that awareness.

But looking at this and some of your recommendations that you guys are looking at, have you talked about ensuring that highways . . . That for deer, we know the eyes, as soon as the car light hits them, you can see. That's what warns you — their eyes. But if the grass is tall, you can't see them in there. So keeping the grass cut down on highways is a . . .

Have you looked at that, if that's anything from drivers? Did they ever see? Do you interview those drivers when they're getting in collisions, when you investigate a collision? Did they even spot the animal? Did they see eyes? Was the grass . . . Like I'm just looking at if you guys look at that type of data or information when a collision happens, why you are going to send engineers out to look at different areas.

And I have a few of those questions, whether it's moose . . . And then I guess with moose because they're such a big animal and they're coming from the North, I mean their eyes are not going to . . . You're not going to see them. They're there. They're dark. They're there. We realize that and I realize that. Having said that, have you looked into any . . . Is there anything that we can do?

And I know you talk about reducing the herds, the size of them. But some of them are not in herds and they're just, they move along as they want to move along and looking for vegetation. Or their territory where they're traditionally at, for some reason they're moving out of those areas. Have you looked at any of those areas? If I can . . . I know it's a long question, but maybe you could just give us some background on it.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I can comment a little bit on the mowing of ditches. There was a pilot project — and I can't remember how long ago it was — where Highways did try an early mow, some ditches. And I don't know if we funded, although we . . . But

anyway it wasn't that effective. I guess part of the issue is a lot of times the animal is running and it isn't just standing in the ditch. The ones that are standing in the ditch, hopefully you'll see them sometimes. The ones that are running and the ones that we see in collisions, the grass isn't the big issue. I mean it does help obviously, but that isn't the issue, and they quit doing it.

You're right about the moose. They're very hard to see. And of course because of their size, it's a very impactful collision when someone does collide with them. Short of gathering them up and taking them back up North, I think Environment has had some increased hunting licenses issued this year. Last year's winter may have played a toll on some of the animals. It likely didn't affect the moose in the South here. They're pretty hardy. And we've had another deer collision with a fatality already this year, a motorcycle.

If you have X number of animals, like Kwei said, and X number of cars going by on these busy highways . . . So maybe we do need to have — we don't have an answer — but maybe we need to have a better solution of that. You can't have wildlife remain in those high traffic locations because eventually they're going to get hit.

**Mr. Vermette:** — And I'm not sure. Like do you look at other I guess provinces or other parts of countries that have animals like we have, the way they . . . you know, whether the mule deer, white deer, moose. Do you do research on that with other companies? Have you found anything that seems to work out there, or no? It's just, you're left with, its challenging, period.

[15:45]

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes. We've looked at what other areas are doing. Other areas are looking at whether . . . It's challenging. There isn't a real good solution. I mean in Banff fences work because there's natural barriers and there's underpasses and overpasses. But they can fence off to a natural barrier.

We have, and I forget what the miles were, but we have way too many miles even in high-risk areas to fence. I know in Newfoundland right now, they're looking at culling animals because of the huge problem they had there. And you know, that's a fairly small roadway system, but those were imported moose there that have no natural enemies and have grown to a huge size. And they were talking about a major cull of animals, which lots of people don't want to see that either.

There isn't one good solution. Whoever comes up with that will be famous.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Well, I guess my last comment is that I realize I think one other ministry is looking at and you've talked about increasing the licence for moose population in certain areas. And I guess the other area is, we know that we have a large First Nations, Métis population that actually, you know, traditionally hunts for wild meat and uses that in their diet. And I think that would be important to maybe suggest that they work with those individuals too.

So anyway, I just appreciate I guess the information you could share with us. And I know it's challenging. But anyway, thank

you for the information you've shared to this point.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Chartier.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Just a quick clarification here. It's been SGI who's put up fencing. Was it solely SGI or was it Highways? Or who pays for the fencing?

**Mr. Quaye:** — We paid for the fence. Highways helped us with the design of the fence and the management of the contractor to install the fence. But we paid for it. And they do the maintenance on the fence.

**Ms. Chartier:** — How many places in Saskatchewan are there fences right now?

**Mr. Quaye:** — There's only one location that we've tried fence. It's outside the town of Harris. It's 5 kilometres long.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Great. Thank you. I guess we'll let the SGI members finish their presentation, and we will be done for the day then I think unless there's more questions after the fact. But back to the members.

**Mr. Quaye:** — The last couple of slides just provide a matrix and just lays down the show of severity, certainty, and swiftness. And it gives you a picture of how we think these recommendations that we have will touch them.

So stronger drinking and driving countermeasures will increase the severity of punishment associated with impaired driving as well as the swiftness of some of these punishments. Dedicated traffic enforcement will increase the certainty and swiftness of people in rural areas being caught and charged for violating our traffic laws. Photo radar increases certainty of being caught and charged with speeding, and UBI increases the severity they associate with risky driving behaviour by increasing the driver's insurance rates as well as the certainty and swiftness with which we deal with bad driving behaviour.

Dedicate the rural enforcement and usage-based insurance have significant potential for reducing collisions and improving traffic safety as they address the greatest amount of factors that we've indicated. Stronger drinking and driving countermeasures address only one of these factors we've seen over here but is expected to have a significant impact on collisions and road safety.

We crunched some numbers. They're still preliminary with respect to these initiatives that we've spoken about. And our initial estimates, the proposed drinking and driving countermeasures, dedicate the rural traffic enforcement program, and photo radar pilot could reduce about and prevent about 32 deaths, about 400 injuries, about 3,600 property damage crashes each year. These initiatives will cost approximately 17.3 million annually and produce over 38.3 million claims cost reduction annually. These are just preliminary numbers that we . . . where we crunched to give us an idea of whether these initiatives have potential from a cost-benefit perspective.

And Earl will give us some closing remarks, but as you see on the overhead here, the status quo is what we have right now. It's not the solution. We will still be counting bodies and counting injuries akin to what we have today. I'll pass it on to Earl to provide us some closing remarks.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Right. Thank you. Thank you, committee, for listening to our submissions the other day and today. I know they're long and I know we're fairly detailed, but we're passionate about making these recommendations and we do want change. We need positive change in Saskatchewan to driving behaviour. It's clear.

To effectively change driving behaviour — and you hear us say it again and again — we need the consequences that are severe and certain and immediate. We need to reinforce desired behaviours through strong legislation, visible enforcement, timely and targeted education, and good engineering. Bottom line, we need tougher penalties, increased enforcement, and a high level of awareness if we want to save lives on Saskatchewan roads. And that's my closing remark. And I'd just like to thank the committee again for listening to our recommendations.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. I think Mr. Vermette's got a question, and then maybe Mr. Cox wants to say something then as well.

**Mr. Cox:** — No. We've digested quite a bit from our first meeting with you and again today. And I guess I speak for myself, obviously not for the whole committee, but I think there's some recommendations here that need to be looked at very seriously, and we're going to do that. And I do thank you for the work you've put into this.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Yes. And I guess the same thing. I just wanted to close with saying again thank you for the time you've spent. And you know, I know there was a lot of work put into these and come forward. Some of them might be the minimum that you're thinking would work and, you know, if we could improve them better, then great, but at least as a minimum. You've given us something that you're saying, here is where . . . something that may help reduce fatalities. And I thank you for that and anything else that has to come forward from the committee. They'll make their recommendations and hopefully it saves lives and fatalities in our province.

**The Chair:** — Thank you to SGI members and those who participated today and were observing as well from the board. This was very informative, as the members have stated, so thank you so much. I will just say that, to the members, if you need any more additional background on what has been spoken about today, the portal has lots of information. And I'm sure we've been diligent in reviewing those documents on a daily basis, so we'll be ready to go tonight.

On that note, for the public's consumption, the public's awareness, the committee will, pursuant to rule 134(1), move to in camera to begin writing our report this evening. After the committee's adopted its final report, the report will be tabled with the Legislative Assembly and then will be made available

to the public on the Legislative Assembly website. All the public hearing testimony, written submissions, and archived video proceedings of the meetings are also available on that website at [www.legassembly.sk.ca](http://www.legassembly.sk.ca).

Having said that, for the committee members, we will reconvene tonight at 6 p.m. in camera to start talking about recommendations. So thank you, everyone, for your time today, and we'll see you back at 6 p.m. I need a member to make a motion to move it in camera. Mr. Cox. So thank you so much. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Agreed. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

[The committee continued in camera.]

**The Chair:** — I need someone to make a motion to adjourn please. Mr. Vermette, to adjourn for the evening. Coming back tomorrow at 9 o'clock. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Perfect. See you guys in the morning.

[The committee adjourned at 22:02.]