



“When You Talk - We Listen!”



MANITOBA PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD

Re: MANITOBA PUBLIC INSURANCE CORPORATION (MPI)  
2023/2024 GENERAL RATE APPLICATION  
HEARING

Before Board Panel:

- Irene Hamilton, K.C.- Panel Chairperson
- Robert Gabor, K.C. - Board Chair
- Susan Nemec - Board Member
- George Bass, K.C. - Board Member
- Susan Boulter - Board Member

HELD AT:

Public Utilities Board  
400, 330 Portage Avenue  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
October 26, 2022

Pages 1334 to 1626  
Day 6

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES

Kathleen McCandless ) Board Counsel  
Robert Watchman ) Board Counsel  
Kara Moore (remote) ) Board Counsel  
Roger Cathcart ) Board Advisor  
Blair Mantketelow-Eckler (remote) ) Board Advisor  
  
Steve Scarfone ) Manitoba Public  
Michael Triggs ) Insurance  
Anthony Guerra )  
Jordan Lang (Student-at-law) )  
  
Byron Williams ) CAC (Manitoba)  
Chris Klassen )  
  
Karen Wittman ) Taxi Coalition  
Sharna Nelko )  
  
Charlotte Meek ) CMMG  
  
Jennifer Sokal ) IBAM  
Michael Weinstein )  
  
Christian Monnin ) Bike Winnipeg  
Charles Feaver (np) )

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		Page No.
3	List of Undertakings	1337
4	List of Exhibits	1338
5		
6	BOARD CONSULTANT	
7	DR. JENNIFER HALL, Sworn	
8		
9	Examination-in-chief by Ms. Kara Moore	1342
10	Presentation by Dr. Jennifer Hall	1392
11	Cross-Examination by Christian Monnin	1357
12		
13	MPI ROAD SAFETY/LOSS PREVENTION PANEL	
14	MICHAEL TRIGGS, Affirmed	
15	PATRICK SARGINSON, Affirmed	
16	BRYCE DOELL, Sworn	
17		
18	Examination by Mr. Steve Scarfone	1360
19	Cross-examination by Mr. Kara Moore	1396
20	Cross-examination by Mr. Chris Klassen	1435
21	Cross-examination by Mr. Christian Monnin	1460
22	Cross-examination by Ms. Charlotte Meek	1545
23	Re-Direct Examination by Mr. Steve Scarfone	1618
24		
25	Certificate of Transcript	1626

1		List of Undertakings	
2	No.	Description	Page No.
3	27	MPI produce the final report regarding	
4		the analysis of data collected from the	
5		Ready Assess Pilot Project	1419
6	28	MPI to provide fatalities and serious	
7		injuries per ten thousand (10,000)	
8		registered vehicles up to 2020,	
9		including Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and	
10		BC.	1591
11	29	For MPI to provide a breakdown of the	
12		84 percent of fatalities broken down by	
13		the four (4) factors	1593
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1	List of Exhibits	
2	Exhibit No.	Page No.
3	MPI-70	Response to Undertaking 11. 1339
4	MPI-71	Response to Undertaking 8 with
5		Appendix. 1339
6	MPI-72	Response to Undertaking 1 with
7		Appendices 1 Through 5. 1340
8	PUB-23	PowerPoint Presentation of Dr.
9		Jennifer Hall 1342
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 --- Upon commencing at 8:59 a.m.

2

3 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Good morning,  
4 everyone. Mr. Scarfone, I assume you have some  
5 exhibits to enter, and then would you introduce your  
6 panel?

7 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Yes, indeed.  
8 Thanks, Madam Chair.

9 MPI filed a response, or will, I'm told  
10 by Ms. Schubert 'cause she hasn't yet received it -- a  
11 response to Undertaking number 11; that appears to be  
12 Exhibit number 70.

13

14 --- EXHIBIT NO. MPI-70: Response to Undertaking  
15 11.

16

17 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: MPI Exhibit  
18 number 71 will be a response to Undertaking number 8,  
19 along with an appendix.

20

21 --- EXHIBIT NO. MPI-71: Response to Undertaking 8  
22 with Appendix.

23

24 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And MPI Exhibit  
25 number 72 is a response to Undertaking number 1 with

1 Appendices 1 through 5.

2

3 --- EXHIBIT NO. MPI-72: Response to Undertaking 1  
4 with Appendices 1 Through  
5 5.

6

7 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And this morning  
8 we have appearing the Road Safety Panel. Mr. Guerra  
9 had marked their presentation as Exhibit number 68 for  
10 Ms. Schubert's purposes and pulling that up this  
11 morning.

12 So the far right of this Road Safety  
13 Panel is Mike Triggs. Mr. Triggs is Vice-President,  
14 General Counsel, and Corporate Secretary for the  
15 Corporation.

16 Beside Mr. Triggs is Patrick Sarginson.  
17 He's the Director of Driver Vehicle Administration  
18 Policy. He's also the Registrar of Motor Vehicles.

19 And beside Mr. Sarginson is Bryce  
20 Doell, Manager, Loss Prevention, Planning, and  
21 Analysis.

22 And we have a combination of people in  
23 the back row that are appearing virtually. Behind me,  
24 though, is Adam Cheadle, Road Safety Program  
25 Specialist, and appearing virtually, listening on

1 line, is Kelly Saunderson, Manager of Marketing and  
2 Campaigns, and Scott Patton, Manager of Customer  
3 Insights and Analytics.

4 So we can have the witnesses sworn or  
5 affirmed. Thank you, Dr. Christle.

6

7 MPI ROAD SAFETY/LOSS PREVENTION PANEL

8

9 BRYCE DOELL, Sworn

10 PATRICK SARGINSON, Affirmed

11 MICHAEL TRIGGS, Affirmed

12

13 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

14 And I understand that Dr. Jennifer Hall is on the  
15 Teams link, and she will be proceeding first with the  
16 presentation on the Public Utilities Board Technical  
17 Conference on Road Safety. Yeah. And could she be  
18 sworn in as well, please?

19

20 BOARD CONSULTANT:

21 JENNIFER HALL, Sworn

22

23 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Dr.

24 Hall. Please proceed with your presentation.

25 MS. KARA MOORE: Sorry, Madam Chair.



1 Before Dr. Hall begins, I'd just intended to ask her a  
2 few preliminary questions.

3 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Certainly.

4 Please proceed, Ms. Moore.

5

6 EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY MS. KARA MOORE:

7 MS. KARA MOORE: Good morning, Dr.

8 Hall. This is Kara Moore speaking.

9 And -- and, Madam Chair, just one (1)  
10 preliminary matter. I would like to mark Dr. Hall's  
11 PowerPoint presentation as PUB Exhibit 23, and it was  
12 sent to all counsel this morning.

13

14 --- EXHIBIT NO. PUB-23: PowerPoint Presentation of  
15 Dr. Jennifer Hall

16

17 CONTINUED BY MS. KARA MOORE:

18 MS. KARA MOORE: So, Dr. Hall, I'm  
19 just going to start by asking you some questions about  
20 your background and experience.

21 So you are currently the President and  
22 CEO of Sirius Strategic Solutions Ltd., correct?

23 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): I am.

24 MS. KARA MOORE: And you've been in  
25 that role since 2010?

1 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): I have.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: And in this role, you  
3 facilitate policy and program research, strategic  
4 planning, and other problem-solving projects for  
5 public, private, and non-profit organizations?

6 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes, I  
7 do.

8 MS. KARA MOORE: Prior to this role,  
9 you were the manager of Indigenous Government and  
10 Strategic Relations of Technical Safety BC for a term  
11 from May to August of 2019?

12 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes.

13 MS. KARA MOORE: And prior to that,  
14 you worked with the Insurance Corporation of BC?

15 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes, I  
16 did.

17 MS. KARA MOORE: And you worked with  
18 ICBC from July 2000 to January of 2010, minus a period  
19 of time from November 2003 to November 2004?

20 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes, I  
21 did.

22 MS. KARA MOORE: And your job titles  
23 with ICBC included Manager of Government Relations,  
24 Corporate Policy and Communications, Senior Manager of  
25 Driver Licensing Policy, and Divisional Executive.

1 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: Is that correct?

3 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes

4 indeed.

5 MS. KARA MOORE: Moving to your  
6 education, you hold a doctorate from the University of  
7 Victoria, School of Public Administration?

8 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes, I  
9 do.

10 MS. KARA MOORE: And you are currently  
11 an assistant professor at the University of Victoria  
12 School of Public Administration and a professor of the  
13 University of Alberta faculty of extension,  
14 management, and leadership?

15 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes, I  
16 am.

17 MS. KARA MOORE: You're a member of  
18 several associations, including the International  
19 Professional Association for Transportation and Health  
20 and the Road Safety Standing Committee for the  
21 Transportation Association of Canada?

22 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes, I  
23 am.

24 MS. KARA MOORE: And you've previously  
25 been a member of the Federal Vulnerable Road Users

1 Countermeasures Project Advisory Panel, North American  
2 Road Safety Certification Steering Committee, and you  
3 were formerly the President of the Canadian  
4 Association of Road Safety Professionals.

5 Is that correct?

6 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes, it  
7 is.

8 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. Thank you. In  
9 the spring of this year, you were retained by the  
10 Public Utilities Board to take on the role of  
11 facilitator of a road safety technical conference?

12 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes, I  
13 was.

14 MS. KARA MOORE: And that technical --  
15 technical conference took place at the Board's offices  
16 on June 23rd and 24th of 2022, correct?

17 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): It did.

18 MS. KARA MOORE: And as facilitator,  
19 you were to be impartial?

20 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes, I  
21 was.

22 MS. KARA MOORE: And following the  
23 conclusion of the technical conference you prepared a  
24 report. Is that correct?

25 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): I did.

1 MS. KARA MOORE: And, Ms. Schubert,  
2 can you please bring up PUB Exhibit 16. Dr. Hall, can  
3 you see that on your screen?

4 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes, I  
5 can.

6 MS. KARA MOORE: So, just to confirm,  
7 this is the cover page of your report?

8 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): It is.

9 MS. KARA MOORE: And, Ms. Schubert,  
10 can you please turn to page 4 of this exhibit. And  
11 I'm looking at the third paragraph that starts with  
12 the word, "the approach."

13 So, in this paragraph, you write:

14 "The approach to this year's  
15 technical conference included a  
16 review of the previous agenda and  
17 discussion outline, the Board's  
18 requests and direction to MPI,  
19 consideration of current data,  
20 research and road safety issues, and  
21 input from selected stakeholders."

22 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes.

23 MS. KARA MOORE: Did you have input on  
24 the approach to the technical conference?

25 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes, I

1 did.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: And going back to  
3 page 3 of your report, you've listed the technical --  
4 technical conference on road safety agenda as an  
5 addendum. And I believe you circulated this agenda in  
6 advance of the road safety conference?

7 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): I did,  
8 m-hm.

9 MS. KARA MOORE: And this can be found  
10 at appendix 1 of your report?

11 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes.

12 MS. KARA MOORE: And the MPI  
13 presentations are also listed as an addendum, and  
14 these presentation materials can be found at appendix  
15 2 of your report?

16 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes.

17 MS. KARA MOORE: You've also prepared  
18 a PowerPoint presentation to accompany your testimony  
19 today?

20 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes.

21 MS. KARA MOORE: And for the record,  
22 that report was marked this morning as PUB Exhibit 23.

23 And you are prepared to speak today to  
24 the technical conference and the contents of your  
25 report, right?

1 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Yes, I  
2 am. Okay. Thank you, Dr. Hall. And with that, I  
3 would ask that you proceed to your presentation.

4

5 PRESENTATION BY DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS):

6 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by TEAMS): Thank  
7 you. Good morning, everyone. As noted, I was pleased  
8 to be asked to facilitate the second technical  
9 conference for road safety on behalf of the Public  
10 Utilities Board.

11 Throughout the presentation,  
12 participants were invited to ask questions and provide  
13 comments. I felt well supported in the process by all  
14 parties, and this made my job easier in that  
15 participants were well prepared and engaged in the  
16 discussion and dialogue. Next slide, please.

17 In addition to presenters from MPI,  
18 representatives from a breadth of stakeholders were  
19 engaged in the process both in person and online. And  
20 my role, as noted, was to facilitate the conference,  
21 ensuring that stakeholders had ample opportunity to  
22 ask questions, share their views on MPI's efforts and  
23 results of their work, and contribute to constructive  
24 dialogue about the future of road safety in Manitoba.

25 Opening remarks were provided by Mr.

1 Mike Triggs, from MPI, who put the road safety  
2 technical conference into context with respect to its  
3 consideration in rate setting.

4           Mr. Triggs identified collaboration as  
5 a key factor in the success of road safety initiatives  
6 with the need to share data and information as part of  
7 the process of building solutions to identity road  
8 safety risk.

9           Ms. McCandless, counsel for the Public  
10 Utilities Board, provided an overview of the approach  
11 to the conference in that the goal was to have a non-  
12 binding roundtable type discussion and to develop a  
13 consensus on action items documented for future rate  
14 application processes. Next slide, please.

15           For its first substantive presentation,  
16 MPI provided a summary of the impacts of COVID-19 on  
17 road safety, including high level statistics on  
18 traffic volumes, collisions, and fatalities.

19           The numbers reflected an overall  
20 reduction in traffic volumes and collisions, but a  
21 slight increase in fatalities.

22           Speeding remained an issue with  
23 excessive speeding seeing a significant increase  
24 during the pandemic.

25           Distraction and seatbelt use were also



1 problematic, with the number of fatalities related to  
2 distraction increasing and the number of serious  
3 injury crashes related to seatbelt use also  
4 increasing.

5                   Finally, there was also an increase in  
6 the number of fatalities and serious injuries for  
7 motorcycle riders during the pandemic.

8                   Given the changes observed over this  
9 time, there was a continued focus on data sharing and  
10 analysis, which became a pillar of the new 2022-2025  
11 road safety strategy in order to make more targeted  
12 and effective decisions.

13                   MPI indicated that implementation of  
14 the strategy would be done in two (2) phases. The  
15 first focusing on research and analysis to determine  
16 root causes of road safety issues. And the second on  
17 developing targeted interventions based on the data  
18 and analysis.

19                   With respect to the Provincial Road  
20 Safety Committee, MPI provided a review of its work to  
21 date including an interim progress report produced in  
22 May 2019. It was noted that while there has been some  
23 success in achieving a downward trend in serious  
24 injuries and collisions, that trend has not  
25 accelerated over the last few years.

1           A review of the committee's progress,  
2 achievements, make-up, and mandate resulted in a  
3 confirmation that there was value in continuing its  
4 work. New members have been added and the committee  
5 will be focusing on laying out its plans for future  
6 work and deliverables, identifying emerging issues and  
7 provincial priorities. Next slide, please.

8           This presentation highlighted MPI's  
9 investments in data collection and analysis, study  
10 results, and new interventions based on the research  
11 undertaken. Several projects were highlighted,  
12 including an observational study on seatbelts and  
13 electronic devices; a speed study to better understand  
14 the prevalence, location, and degree of speeding on  
15 various road types in different seasons, times of day,  
16 and days of the week; a roadside service focusing on  
17 alcohol and drug use and impaired driving; and a large  
18 vehicle study as was requested by the Board.

19           In addition, a brief overview of  
20 planned evaluations for 2022, to measure the  
21 effectiveness of road safety initiatives, was also  
22 provided. Next slide, please.

23           An update was shared on MPI's work with  
24 the assembly of Manitoba Chiefs to develop a First  
25 Nations road safety engagement strategy that would

1 support road safety in and around First Nations  
2 communities.

3           The strategy would seek to expand the  
4 network of stakeholders and strategic partners such as  
5 tribal councils, University College of the North, and  
6 Manitoba First Nations police.

7           It would also seek to improve  
8 engagement at the community level and establish and  
9 evolve reliable data sources.

10           In December 2021, MPI and the AMC  
11 signed a letter of intent to collaborate on road  
12 safety engagement activities and programming in First  
13 Nations communities. The letter of intent established  
14 funding for a road safety coordinator position at AMC  
15 and for a First Nations road safety forum with road  
16 safety experts, First Nations leadership, and First  
17 Nations technicians.

18           Following the 2019 technical  
19 conference, MPI was asked to survey external  
20 stakeholder committee members on their views and  
21 recommendations on how the committee could be  
22 improved.

23           Members felt that there was value in  
24 the committee's continuation, but there was more room  
25 for collaborative work on road safety issues and

1 potential solutions.

2                   New terms of reference were developed  
3 to facilitate this approach to collaboration and  
4 clarify the role of this committee vis a vis the  
5 provincial road safety committee. Next slide, please.

6                   MPI shared an update on the development  
7 of their new Public Road Safety Dashboard, which is  
8 intended to improve the way road safety data is  
9 organized and shared with others who would benefit  
10 from it.

11                   The new dashboard will be customizable,  
12 rather than presenting a pre-defined view of the  
13 results. Data would be provided monthly, as it  
14 becomes available, as opposed to the Traffic Collision  
15 Statistics Report, which has been published once  
16 annually.

17                   Stakeholders were very supportive of  
18 this work; the increased accessibility of the data and  
19 willingness to collaborate on its analysis.

20                   This part of the presentation outline  
21 results of analysis of Manitoba's Driver Training and  
22 Testing Data for Class 5 and Class 1. With this data,  
23 MPI can better understand where traffic -- where  
24 specific errors are committed and determine the most  
25 frequent causes of failure in knowledge and road

1 tests.

2 MPI is also improving Class 1 Driver  
3 Safety through development of a new governance  
4 framework to clarify standards and requirements for  
5 training providers.

6 Since mandatory entry level training  
7 was introduced in 2019, all Class 1 applicants must  
8 complete an approved training program before  
9 attempting the road test.

10 Through engagement with training  
11 providers, a need was identified for clearer and  
12 consistent oversight and MPI has worked with the  
13 Manitoba Trucking Association and training providers  
14 to clarify standards and requirements for training  
15 providers.

16 MPI also indicated that it is piloting  
17 a computer-based assessment tool designed to evaluate  
18 skills that are highly indicative of collision  
19 avoidance abilities. Depending on the findings of the  
20 Driver Readiness Assessment Pilot, the tool may be  
21 used to assess student progress, instructor  
22 performance and curriculum gaps.

23 MPI was also asked to look at the  
24 speed-related collisions in the context of geomapping,  
25 which allows for the data to pinpoint problem areas

1 when looking at collisions with speed as a  
2 contributing factor.

3 Results of the geomapping data were  
4 presented, reflecting their value as key indicators of  
5 where speed related collisions were occurring.

6 Geomapping findings will be combined  
7 with identified hot spots from MPI's speed observation  
8 study to further target speed reduction strategies.  
9 Next slide please.

10 The conference ended with an  
11 opportunity for all participants to share their  
12 thoughts on any other road safety issue and follow-up  
13 on any other previous discussion items.

14 To reflect on a few of the highlights  
15 that were shared by the stakeholders, there was  
16 discussion on road safety campaigns to support safe  
17 cycling; discussion on the use of signage;  
18 communication and the role of media; monitoring the  
19 evolution of collision avoidance technology;  
20 motorcycle rider training; revitalization of the  
21 external stakeholder committee; sharing the road and  
22 traffic culture; and continued data sharing.

23 In wrapping up and thanking the  
24 stakeholders for their participation and contributions  
25 throughout the technical conference, MPI reiterated

1 its commitment to the sharing of data and enhancing  
2 dialogue and collaboration to improve road safety in  
3 Manitoba.

4 And that concludes my presentation.

5 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Dr.  
6 Hall. Ms. Moore...?

7 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you, Madam  
8 Chair. Actually, I have no further question for Dr.  
9 Hall.

10 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: And have the  
11 participants discussed who will ask questions first?

12 MS. KARA MOORE: Yeah, my  
13 understanding is that MPI will begin, followed by the  
14 Interveners.

15 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.  
16 Mr. Scarfone...?

17 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Sorry. We're  
18 beginning with cross-examination? There -- there's no  
19 questions from MPI with respect to that presentation.  
20 It was very well done. So, we're not starting with  
21 these gentlemen quite yet.

22 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: No, I'm sorry.  
23 Yes, questions of the presenter. You have no  
24 questions?

25 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: No questions.

1 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

2 Mr. Klassen...?

3 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Good morning,

4 Madam Chair. Chris Klassen for CAC Manitoba. CAC

5 Manitoba also has no questions for Ms. Hall but the

6 Board of Directors does wish to pass on their thanks

7 to her for her work on this important policy issue.

8 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

9 Ms. Meek...?

10 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Similarly, CMMG

11 has no questions for Ms. Hall. Thank you.

12 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

13 Mr. Monnin...?

14 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Thank you,

15 Madam Chair.

16

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:

18 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Ms. Hall, a

19 simple question. Having gone through this exercise,

20 is there anything that you could share with us today

21 on how this process could be amel -- ameliorated or

22 could be -- could -- could benefit from any comments

23 and constructive criticism, anything that you would

24 suggest on how to make this a more efficient process?

25 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by Teams): I would



1 probably need to give that some -- some thought. I  
2 felt that the conference actually went fairly well. I  
3 -- but I would be happy to provide some additional  
4 comments, following this -- this session, if that's  
5 appropriate.

6 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Thank you.  
7 Those are my questions.

8 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Dr.  
9 Hall, and thank you very much for your participation -  
10 -

11 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Sorry.

12 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry.  
13 Mr. Gabor...?

14 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Ms. Hall, I've got  
15 a few questions for you and you can either answer them  
16 now or, following up on Mr. Monnin's question, provide  
17 later.

18 So, one (1) of the things you may want  
19 to -- to consider is what -- what -- what, in your  
20 opinion, went well in the conference and whether you  
21 have any recommendations for changes for future  
22 technical conferences and I don't know if you want to  
23 comment on that now or you want to just provide a  
24 comment at a later time?

25 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by Teams): I think

1 I would like to give that some thought and provide a -  
2 - a comments --

3 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Okay.

4 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by Teams): --  
5 following the session.

6 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Okay, and any  
7 comments you provide will be shared with all the  
8 parties --

9 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by Teams):  
10 Absolutely.

11 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: -- not just with  
12 the Board. The other question is, we've had  
13 discussions before as to how frequently these  
14 conferences should go. Do you have any comment on  
15 that?

16 Is this something we should do every  
17 year, every few years, or -- or something of that  
18 nature, taking into account that, if there are any  
19 changes to programs sometimes it takes time to -- to  
20 see if there are results from -- from any action  
21 items?

22 DR. JENNIFER HALL (by Teams): Yes.  
23 Absolutely. It -- off the top of my head, likely  
24 annually would be a lot of work for all participants  
25 and it would be a continuous process of -- of

1 preparation and, perhaps, not the best use of time, in  
2 terms of, as you say, ensuring that there as -- is  
3 appropriate data analysis, results of studies  
4 available but, again, I would be happy to give that  
5 further consideration, in my response about other  
6 opportunities for enhancing the process.

7 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Thank you very  
8 much.

9 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.  
10 Ms. Nemec...? Mr. Bass...? Ms. Boulter...?

11 Thank you very much, Dr. Hall. Thank  
12 you for facilitating the conference and for your  
13 testimony here this morning. I will now ask Mr.  
14 Scarfone to proceed.

15

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. STEVE SCARFONE:

17 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Thank you, Madam  
18 Chair. So, we are, indeed, ready for the panel to  
19 make the next presentation this morning. Mr. Doell  
20 will present Exhibit Number 68, the Road Safety  
21 presentation.

22 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: But, before Mr.  
23 Doell does that, I will make some brief introductory  
24 remarks on that. And it's more to introduce myself to  
25 the Panel and to -- as many of you know me.

1 I've been attending these hearings  
2 since 2009, but you're probably wondering, well, why  
3 is a lawyer heading up road safety, what's the  
4 qualifications, what's the experience that he can  
5 bring to lead this change that we're -- we're bringing  
6 forward.

7 And, with that, I want to go through  
8 some of my -- my past experience and I'd say  
9 transformational projects, initiatives that brought  
10 about, I'd say, paradigm changes in thinking and  
11 approaching to problems.

12 As I -- I've been a lawyer for 32  
13 years. I articulated in Bay Street, in a management  
14 labour law firm and, then, went to Yellowknife for two  
15 (2) years, with -- with the purpose of getting two  
16 years' of experience in general practice and, in that  
17 area, I've got experience in, you know, many jury  
18 trials, appellate court work, and so forth.

19 But with things being changed, which is  
20 relevant to this job was early on in my career I was  
21 legal counsel to the NWT Water Board. And in --  
22 that's one (1) of the applications they dealt with,  
23 was the first diamond mine in Canada up there.

24 And what we had changed -- the -- the  
25 problems we had faced up in the Northwest Territories

1 was that mining companies would come up. They'd leave  
2 a deposit of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) for  
3 reclamation and then after they'd taken the gold out  
4 of the land, they left.

5                   There's nothing left but a big mess  
6 that the people had to clean up. So, it was  
7 recognized we had to do something different. And what  
8 we entered into in that situation was a system of  
9 developing a continued building of a security deposit  
10 in place.

11                   It had been on say for \$20 million over  
12 a number of years, is put forward. We also, at that  
13 time -- the first time the Northwest Territories  
14 brought in the Indigenous communities and had Elders  
15 speak. This was their land that they're building  
16 diamond mines on. It wasn't just Crown's land.

17                   So, this -- this is innovative  
18 thinking. It seems pretty, you know, matter of fact  
19 now that we do that, but that was new in those days  
20 and those were the changes that we had brought  
21 forward.

22                   I left practice -- private practice,  
23 and went to the Workers' Compensation Board of the  
24 Northwest Territories where I was their general  
25 counsel and corporate secretary.

1                   One (1) of the roles I had there was to  
2   oversee the creation of -- well, what happened was  
3   1999 Nunavut was created and the plan was -- is to --  
4   every government department, government agency, we  
5   replicated over to Nunavut, so there'd be a separate  
6   Nunavut Hydro Department of Finance and so forth and  
7   so on.

8                   The Workers' Compensation Board is the  
9   only one that was -- spanned both jurisdictions. We  
10  kept -- we created a system where there's two (2)  
11  Ministers responsible. Report to two (2)  
12  legislatures, and -- but it was one (1) Board.

13                   So, we created that. And that has  
14  stayed in -- in place until today and has worked well.  
15  It's the only cross-jurisdictional Board in the  
16  country that I'm aware of and it works successfully.

17                   And that was finding ways, new  
18  solutions, looking at problems, that's best for the  
19  people. Also at that -- I think many of you people if  
20  you think back you can recall days when there used to  
21  be smoking at restaurants, and bars, and in office  
22  places, and that, and there was a big debate over  
23  that.

24                   Should it -- you know, smoker's rights,  
25  the bar owners and restaurant owners having, you know,

1 it impacts their -- their businesses and there's a big  
2 debate across the country on how to deal with that.

3 Well, the Workers' Compensation Board  
4 at that time, and still today, also had jurisdiction  
5 over occupational health and safety. We looked at  
6 this problem. We said, well, nobody care about those  
7 things but what we care about is workers' safety. And  
8 workers are working in restaurants, workers are  
9 working in bars.

10 And we said, well, you can't have  
11 second-hand smoke in the workplace and we instituted  
12 those changes. We're the first jurisdiction in the --  
13 in the country to do that. That was my idea, my  
14 approach for that program. That was replicated across  
15 the country. You don't see smoking in bars and  
16 restaurants in Canada.

17 Another major issue that was issued --  
18 you know, the Workers' Compensation Board at that time  
19 had to deal with use of narcotics for the treatment of  
20 chronic pain syndromes.

21 And how that was treated is like  
22 doctors would be, you know, just giving out the  
23 narcotics. And the Workers' Compensation Board was  
24 having to pay for it. And it just created --  
25 addiction problems had to be dealt with.

1                   So, working with the Chief Medical  
2 Officer at WCB, what we decided to do is we created a  
3 -- a contract between the -- the physician and the  
4 patient in order to create goals and targets, so  
5 there's actually some treatment, some benefits gained.

6                   If there's benefits being gained,  
7 Workers' Compensation Board would continue paying for  
8 it. That was a model that was developed again, across  
9 all the jurisdictions and WCBs across the country. It  
10 was also then adopted by all the College of Physicians  
11 and Surgeons across the country.

12                   It's been improved massively since the  
13 initial concept that I developed, but that was, again,  
14 it was a change, a paradigm thought change in how you  
15 approach a problem.

16                   I was also President of the Northwest  
17 Territories Law Society and then later became council  
18 member for the Federation of Law Societies of Canada.  
19 I worked with the Manitoba member Tim Kelene  
20 (phonetic). Some of you may know him.

21                   Then in 2009 -- 2009 I had moved to  
22 Winnipeg and joined the WCB. But in 2016 I -- I took  
23 this current position on as general counsel and  
24 corporate secretary.

25                   What I help the area with changes that



1 we did at the -- at the Board was institute, you know,  
2 proper Board governance. You know, I wasn't the  
3 leader on this, I was a supporter of this. But you've  
4 seen the changes since 2016 in the way that MPI  
5 operates and how it organizes, how it's focussed on  
6 its core mission, and how the -- the board of  
7 directors has taken on their roles and  
8 responsibilities, how they are acting the way they  
9 should be.

10 We saw evidence that Mr. Bunston was  
11 talking about the investment committee making  
12 decisions. It's not, you know, MPI staff coming here:  
13 We shall do this, rubber stamp what we want to do.  
14 They're going to make independent decisions on  
15 (INDISCERNIBLE) board who sets a direction for the  
16 Corporation. That's proper board governance. I had a  
17 significant role in bringing that forward on that.

18 I think one (1) of the areas we -- you  
19 see some changes is how this Corporation has presented  
20 itself at the -- at these hearings within the last six  
21 (6) years. There's been a change there. I tried  
22 getting more transparency, openness, honest, get  
23 information to the -- the Board.

24 Mr. Williams is not here today. He  
25 made the compliment at the commencement of the

1 hearings about the high standards that MPI has  
2 established for these hearings, and I thanked him for  
3 that.

4           Some of the things that we've seen, the  
5 changes on that, again, it's information that we can  
6 bring forward. If we would have done it the old ways,  
7 we'd be talking about Project Nova, and sometime in  
8 2032, after -- five (5) years after the post-project  
9 implementation review has been done, then we'd be look  
10 -- discussing it for the first time. That's how BI-3  
11 was dealt with before, and Mr. Gabor would remember  
12 that process.

13           We've changed how we deal with those  
14 things. We've also changed by having panels so you  
15 hear from the experts in place as opposed to just, you  
16 know, a VP talking about it or the president talking  
17 about it. You have the people who actually work on  
18 these matters make -- informing the Board of these  
19 decisions.

20           We also have the confidential filing,  
21 something we never did before. These are all changes  
22 that I thought are necessary to bring forward a --  
23 just a paradigm shift in the thinking of how you --  
24 you approach the -- the problem, what we're supposed  
25 to do here. We are here to serve Manitobans. That's

1 (INDISCERNIBLE).

2 Also, I think what's really important  
3 is that you have the skilled people who know how to do  
4 things better than you as the -- the VP to handle  
5 this. That's why I have Mr. Guerra and Mr. Scarfone  
6 here. They're much better -- more skilled at doing  
7 their job than I am with this, I -- I sit down on the  
8 third floor and -- and watch on the -- on the video  
9 screens.

10 And with that, that's kind of the  
11 background. That's the experience I bring into and  
12 the approach I -- I take to these road safety matters  
13 is I have to wear a different hat, though, when I'm at  
14 road safety.

15 When I wear a GRA hat, I'm concerned  
16 with -- just have to get, you know, the proper rate to  
17 generate the premiums to cover the expenses. That's -  
18 - that's what the GRA's about.

19 When I wear my road safety hat, my  
20 priority's a lot different. Claims costs, social  
21 costs, they don't matter to me at all. They're not my  
22 priority. I'm not focussed on those. My concern is  
23 the number of fatalities and the number of seriously  
24 injureds. My concern is reducing the number of the  
25 fatalities and the serious injuries in Manitoba.

1                   The reason I'm concerned about this is  
2 because they -- these numbers represent people who  
3 have been killed or seriously injured. And I'll --  
4 just -- a few examples.

5                   Barry Safnik (phonetic), he was an MPI  
6 employee, somebody who I -- I worked with, someone who  
7 I spoke to regularly. He was also a cyclist who was  
8 killed in -- on roads in Winnipeg.

9                   You heard earlier this year that Jordyn  
10 Reimer, another MPI staff member who was doing the  
11 right thing -- she was the designated driver, and her  
12 vehicle was hit by an impaired driver. She was  
13 killed.

14                   Ms. Meek mentioned Denis L'Heureux who  
15 was a motorcyclist who was killed just a couple of  
16 weeks back. He was a friend of my assistant. And we  
17 all know Robin Grey (phonetic) who was a long-time  
18 presenter at the -- at these panels.

19                   These are people. These -- although  
20 we're talking about numbers and that, these people  
21 represent those numbers. And, you know, Manitoba's a  
22 small, close-knit community. We all know our  
23 neighbours.

24                   And as -- it's with a tremendous bit of  
25 foreboding that I make this next statement, but

1 there's a very strong likelihood that we will --  
2 people in this room will either know somebody or will  
3 know someone who knows a person who will die in a  
4 motor vehicle accident in 2023.

5           And with that in mind, you know, I have  
6 to -- and I'm the person who's accountable for the --  
7 to find a way to reduce numbers, the number of people  
8 who are going to be dying actually.

9           That's what concerns -- I -- well, how  
10 do we do this? We need to have a meaningful strategy  
11 in order to deal with that, and also recognize that,  
12 you know, you're not going to reduce the -- or prevent  
13 the people being killed or seriously injured and more  
14 vehicle collisions if you don't understand how and why  
15 and where these collisions are happening.

16           That's the fundamental basic starting  
17 point for everything. You've got to know those  
18 answers. You can't do anything until you know those  
19 things, you know.

20           MPI has information on every one of  
21 these collisions, and we have information on every  
22 driver in these collisions. We have to be data  
23 driven, you know. Mr. Herbelin has said in the start  
24 of this presentation one (1) of the founding, core  
25 principles for MPI is being data driven. We have our

1 information.

2                   That's our strength. That's where our  
3 strength lies, and we've got to use that. We've got  
4 to use that data to find out what the root cause of  
5 the accident or these collisions are and develop  
6 strategies with our stakeholders and our partners for  
7 addressing them. That's how we're going to deal with  
8 it, and we need to be able to act fast on these  
9 strategies.

10                   We're still in the early stages, but we  
11 have completed a -- a full review of the fatalities  
12 that occurred in 2021. More analysis can be acquired  
13 for past years, and we're going to have to keep this  
14 going forward as fatalities continue on and that  
15 because, you know, one year gives us some insight, but  
16 it's not going to be -- more years will give us  
17 greater understanding in this.

18                   But this is a good start, and Bryce is  
19 going to speak to some more details. But one (1) of  
20 the common factors we found is that collisions are  
21 caused by the bad drivers, bad driving history of  
22 those drivers. And there's a strong positive  
23 correlation -- correlation between certain bad driving  
24 history and fatal collisions.

25                   It's not the type of vehicle that they

1 drive. It's the driver. What we're seeing is that  
2 the proportion of trucks or passenger vehicles in  
3 fatal collisions pretty much replicates what it is in  
4 the general fleet population. But it's the bad  
5 drivers that are causing the accidents.

6 Initial steps have been initiated to  
7 work with Manitoba's First Nations. We estimate that  
8 if the severity of the consequences of the collisions  
9 of First Nations can be reduced to the provincial  
10 average, that we'd save the lives of five (5) people  
11 and prevent thirteen (13) people from being seriously  
12 injured each year. Just think that through, just  
13 reducing down to the provincial average could save  
14 that many lives.

15 We can't tell First Nations how to  
16 solve these problems. This is something that they  
17 have to solve. Each community is different and  
18 unique, but we can provide them with information,  
19 advice, and collaboration. We respect that they know  
20 their individual communities, and they will find their  
21 solutions. Our job is to listen, to support, and to  
22 encourage.

23 Another important step, as I said, is  
24 how to deal with these things quickly and that, and  
25 part of that is revamping our budget approach to road

1 safety.

2                   Now, we'll continue to have annual  
3 programs that will go on for year after year and that,  
4 and they'll be funded year after year. We've --  
5 though we've developed a process now where we're  
6 reviewing each program to determine whether or not it  
7 should be increased, decreased, the same or programs  
8 should be eliminated.

9                   And that's a -- that's an appropriate  
10 process for existing programs. However, with the  
11 traditional budgeting process, it does not allow for a  
12 timely introduction of new programs.

13                   So what we're proposing to do in -- in  
14 this year is make \$2 million more available for new  
15 initiatives that yet have not been determined what  
16 we're going to be doing it on. And this will allow --  
17 like doing that, as we develop our strategies in -- in  
18 the current year, we will have the money available to  
19 immediately implement those strategies and go forward  
20 on them.

21                   You look back, the -- the past  
22 processes in which things are done, if we have -- we  
23 currently have a good initiative or early stage --  
24 close to an interim agreement with a partner, spend  
25 three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000) a year on



1 it.

2                   The problem is if we did -- or we had  
3 to do a business case, and then we'd then have to get  
4 approval for it in the budget, and then that budget  
5 would go through this process, and then it'd be next  
6 year, April 1st of 2024, before we'd even start  
7 talking about doing it.

8                   But we want to actually start working  
9 on that right away, and this new process of having  
10 this pool of money available will allow us to do that.  
11 So we're changing our -- our process, we're changing  
12 our mind, thinking this, focussing on data and making  
13 decisions based upon that.

14                   And I can say that the -- the team that  
15 reports in to me are extremely enthusiastic about this  
16 approach. They feel really empowered about this.  
17 They feel confident that -- that they can make  
18 progress.

19                   I was very pleased when I was going  
20 about a month ago, as this went down, I was speaking  
21 with them. And the analysts -- the analysts were  
22 excited. These people are, oh, yeah, we're -- we're  
23 finding these problems, we're finding these patterns,  
24 this looks promising, we want to work on this.

25                   This is the enthusiasm that, when you

1 give the -- you empower the staff to do the work and  
2 you -- it's -- they can see that what they do is going  
3 to make a difference. They're engaged and they're  
4 going to go for it.

5                   With that somewhat lengthier  
6 introduction, I'll pass it on to Bryce, who is leading  
7 the team. And he can do the presentation.

8                   MR. STEVE SCARFONE: I have no  
9 questions for Mr. Triggs, Madam Chair. In addition to  
10 his accomplished career, he's also my boss, and so I  
11 think I'm in trouble. I might -- if I'm not here  
12 tomorrow, you know what happened. You're all witness  
13 to my termination. I tried to skip past his very  
14 thoughtful comments, but thank you, Mr. Triggs.

15                   And then -- so, now we will have our  
16 road safety presentation by Mr. Doell.

17                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: Thank you. So, I'll  
18 -- I'll begin with a discussion of some of the high-  
19 level statistics that are important to understand with  
20 respect to road safety in Manitoba.

21                   From there, I'll move on to a  
22 description of MPI's 2022 to 2025 road safety strategy  
23 that's been mentioned by Dr. Hall and by Mr. Triggs.  
24 Then we'll go into some of the key themes that are  
25 important to understand with respect to that strategy.

1                   From there, I'll move into some  
2 specific initiatives that MPI is -- is undertaking  
3 right now in support of that strategy and how that  
4 aligns with the strategic goals that we've set out.

5                   And from there, I'll conclude with a  
6 discussion of our budget for this year, for the  
7 upcoming year, as well as the history and how that  
8 budget has changed in line with this new data driven  
9 strategy.

10                  So, I'll begin with some historical  
11 benchmarks so we're all on kind of a common footing of  
12 the current road safety situation in Manitoba. So, we  
13 -- we're looking at two (2) charts here. On the left  
14 is the number of fatalities per ten thousand (10,000)  
15 registered vehicles, but on the right we've got the  
16 number of serious injuries per ten thousand (10,000)  
17 registered vehicles.

18                  And there's a couple things that we can  
19 take away from these. So, first, with respect to  
20 fatalities, after a period of long-term decline prior  
21 to 2015, we've since seen a plateauing in the number  
22 of fatalities in Manitoba. And we've seen that number  
23 remain slightly above the national average for several  
24 -- several years now.

25                  With respect to serious injuries, we're

1 seeing a promising trend in that the serious injuries  
2 per ten thousand (10,000) registered vehicles is  
3 showing a long-term decline. And even more promising  
4 is that the gap between Manitoba and the national  
5 average is narrowing on a year-by-year basis though  
6 that the number for Manitoba does remain higher than  
7 the national average.

8 All this to say is that, when we look  
9 at the -- the numbers that we see, we realize that the  
10 kind of existing approach that we've taken to road  
11 safety in Manitoba has taken us far, but it's taken us  
12 as far as we can.

13 And, as Mr. Triggs alluded to, we're  
14 adopting a new approach so that we can bend these --  
15 these curves of fatalities and serious injuries even  
16 further downwards.

17 So, the way we intend to do that is  
18 through a more data-driven approach to the way we  
19 identify and address road safety issues. So, through  
20 that analysis, we've got four (4) key areas of focus,  
21 or four (4) MPI's road safety activities, those being,  
22 distraction, speed, impairment, and occupant  
23 restraints, or seatbelts, in other words.

24 These are the areas where we see the  
25 most number of fatalities and serious injuries every

1 year.

2                   One (1) think I think that's important  
3 to note here is that we organize them this way is to  
4 focus our -- our efforts and set priorities. When we  
5 talk about road safety, it really is a complex  
6 interconnected environment, so speed and impairment  
7 are often closely related. Vulnerable road users can  
8 often be the victims of someone who's distracted or  
9 impaired, for instance. Rural road condition -- or  
10 rural road collisions often involve an element of  
11 speed or impairment.

12                   So, though we have kind of the issues  
13 separated this way to organize our work, it is  
14 important to remember that these are interrelated  
15 problems that we see and that a focus on one (1) does  
16 not necessarily come at the expense of others.

17                   So, from here, I'll move into a little  
18 bit more detail on the -- on MPI's road safety  
19 strategy that's been referenced a couple times today  
20 already.

21                   So, as Mr. Trigg's mentioned, we're --  
22 we're taking a different approach to the way that we  
23 do road safety at MPI. And we're looking at changing  
24 in kind of three (3) broad areas.

25                   So, number 1, is improving the data

1 sources that we have available. So, we do have a  
2 wealth of data on collisions and drivers in the  
3 province. But it's important for us to organize that  
4 data and make it available to do the type of analysis  
5 we need to do to understand root causes.

6           The second theme for this strategy is  
7 enhancing our analytical capabilities. So, if we want  
8 to be data driven, we need the skills, abilities, and  
9 tools to do that sort of analysis. And we've been  
10 working diligently to build up that capacity in  
11 support of the strategy.

12           And finally, MPI recognizes that  
13 partnerships with external stakeholders are vital to  
14 the success of any road safety strategy. MPI is but  
15 one (1) player of many in the province with a role to  
16 play in road safety.

17           We recognize that part of the success  
18 of our strategy will be our ability to engage and  
19 influence other organizations in the province.

20           Getting into a little bit more detail  
21 on what this strategy actually looks like, the 2022 to  
22 2025 road safety strategy is organized kind of into  
23 two (2) phases. Now, this isn't a calendar-driven  
24 exercise. There is overlap between what we're doing.

25           But as Dr. Hall mentioned at the

1 beginning, the first phase taking place in the current  
2 fiscal year is really focussed on solidifying our  
3 understanding of the root causes of fatalities and  
4 serious injuries in Manitoba. And that's really data  
5 driven insights that we're looking at, so on-the-  
6 ground research, analyzing the data we have available  
7 to understand what's the cause of fatalities and  
8 serious injuries in the province.

9           The second phase as we move into 2023  
10 through 2025 is shifting that paradigm more towards  
11 implementing the findings that we find during the  
12 first phrase, coming up with targeted programming to  
13 really make an impact on the issues we've identified  
14 in phase 1.

15           So, broadly speaking, our strategy is  
16 to organize around three (3) pillars, so the first  
17 being that data driven understanding of what's causing  
18 fatalities and serious injuries in the province, and,  
19 secondly, the effectiveness of what we're doing to  
20 address those.

21           Secondly, as we've talked about already  
22 is our commitment to engaging with First Nations. So,  
23 we understand that the First Nations face unique road  
24 safety challenges. And MPI is working with our  
25 partners at the AMC to understand and address those

1 challenges.

2                   And finally, of course, we've mentioned  
3 being data driven on several occasions. What that  
4 means in terms of the data we have available is taking  
5 a continuous improvement mind set so that we have  
6 better data available to us to understand those  
7 problems and that we make that available to other  
8 organizations, as well.

9                   So, from here, I'd like to go into some  
10 specific efforts that MPI's taking in support of that  
11 strategy. I think illustrates what this looks like on  
12 the ground in terms of our road safety operations.

13                   So, as we mentioned, the first phase of  
14 the strategy is very focussed on research and analysis  
15 to understand root causes. So, to that end, we're --  
16 we've conducted and are conducting research studies on  
17 those four (4) priority areas: so distraction,  
18 seatbelt use, speed, and impairment.

19                   So, in September 2021, MPI conducted a  
20 province-wide observational study of seatbelt use and  
21 distraction. So, we went across the province, people  
22 on the ground observing what actual drivers are doing  
23 in their vehicles, are they wearing their seatbelts,  
24 are they using electronic communication device, what  
25 are the characteristics of those individuals.



1                   This is groundbreaking work for us that  
2 let us really understand where exactly the problem  
3 lied in the province. We've already kind of seen the  
4 benefits of that research. We were able to identify  
5 that distraction is -- tends to be an urban problem  
6 that we see more in Winnipeg than we do outside of the  
7 city.

8                   Conversely, we found very valuable  
9 insights into the rates of non-seatbelt use,  
10 highlighting that we've got, essentially, a seatbelt  
11 problem in rural areas of the province. So, these are  
12 brand-new insights that we've been able to uncover  
13 through this data-driven approach we're taking.

14                   Secondly, I'll highlight a speed study  
15 that's currently ongoing. So, similar to seatbelts  
16 and distraction, we're looking to better understand  
17 where speed is an issue across the province and how we  
18 might address it.

19                   So, to that end, we've installed radar  
20 devices across the province to understand the rates of  
21 speed that we see in different road types, in  
22 different geographic locations and so forth. That  
23 research is ongoing through the end of December this  
24 year.

25                   And finally, we've recently concluded

1 the data collection phase to understand the rates of  
2 impairment across the province. Again, because we've  
3 identified rural areas as where we need to focus,  
4 we've expanded the reach of this study in 2022  
5 compared to what we did in 2016 to sample additional  
6 rural areas with the understanding that we need to  
7 pinpoint exactly where impairment is a problem, what  
8 types of drugs are causing impairment, and so forth.

9                   So in line with our strategy, we do  
10 intend to share these results with other stakeholders  
11 so that not only our programming benefits from it, but  
12 from others do as well.

13                   So from here, I'll move on to some of  
14 the work we're doing with respect to engaging with  
15 First Nations.

16                   So as Dr. Hall mentioned, MPI has  
17 partnered with the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs. We've  
18 funded a road safety coordinator position at the AMC.  
19 We're working with that individual to better  
20 understand the unique road safety challenges that  
21 First Nations face.

22                   But with that individual, with the AMC,  
23 MPI will seek to -- to develop programming that gets  
24 at the heart of the issues that First Nations face  
25 with respect to road safety.

1                   So one (1) such program that's already  
2 come out of that partnership is a reflective vest  
3 program in Peguis First Nation. So this example, I  
4 think, is really is illustrative of the -- the  
5 approach that MPI wants to take with respect to road  
6 safety.

7                   So what happened is we had a member of  
8 the local EMS service come to MPI and let us know that  
9 they saw an issue with pedestrian fatalities on the  
10 side of poorly lit roads in their community.

11                   We went back, looked at our data,  
12 confirmed what we were hearing from the community.  
13 Researched best practices into how to deal with  
14 pedestrian collisions in low light conditions and  
15 identified a no-cost reflective vest program as  
16 something that's a best practice that we can get up  
17 and running very quickly to address this problem.

18                   So to that end, we've distributed -- or  
19 we intend to distribute -- they're not all distributed  
20 yet -- a thousand (1,000) reflective vests to  
21 community members free of charge, as well as an  
22 awareness campaign to encourage their use for  
23 pedestrian safety.

24                   So the approach we're taking is we're  
25 starting with one (1) community, we're going to see if

1 this works. If it's successful, we'll look to scale  
2 it up to other communities as well.

3 Another programming initiative that is  
4 illustrative of the approach that we're taking with  
5 our new strategy is the 2022 coordinated seatbelt  
6 campaign.

7 So as I mentioned earlier, we  
8 identified seatbelt use in rural areas as being an  
9 area of concern. We see a lot of fatalities every  
10 year because of non-seatbelt use and we know it's an  
11 issue in specific rural areas of the province.

12 So with that information in hand, MPI  
13 developed a provincially coordinated campaign to  
14 target those areas. So what I mean by that is we  
15 worked with our law enforcement partners at the RCMP  
16 to conduct enhanced seatbelt enforcement in these  
17 areas and tied that with a media campaign to get the  
18 message out to individuals to encourage them to wear  
19 their seatbelts.

20 This is industry best practice in road  
21 safety to coordinate enforcement in campaigns so that  
22 people are hearing the message and then seeing it as  
23 well when they're on the road with law enforcement  
24 enforcing it.

25 So I talked about some specific

1 programs that MPI is doing in support of the strategy.

2           The other vital part of it is  
3 evaluating the effectiveness of what we're doing to  
4 make sure that we are having the impact that we intend  
5 to have.

6           So to that end, MPI has conducted a  
7 comprehensive evaluation of our suite of road safety  
8 programs. So what this means is we looked at, for  
9 each individual program, what its stated outcomes  
10 were, as well as how it was intended to address our  
11 larger strategic goals of reducing fatalities and  
12 serious injuries.

13           We had a team of analysts collect data  
14 from a wide variety of data sources, both internally  
15 at MPI, as well as externally through surveys, and  
16 through research conducted by other organizations, to  
17 understand the effectiveness of individual programs.

18           So wherever possible, we focused on the  
19 impact on fatalities, serious injuries, and  
20 collisions.

21           Where that's not analytically possible,  
22 we then moved down kind of a step in the hierarchy to  
23 looking at changes in attitudes and behaviours and so  
24 forth.

25           Through that analysis, we found that

1 the majority of our road safety programs were found to  
2 have some effectiveness. Sorry, if I can ask we just  
3 back up one (1) slide. I'm not quite done.

4           Yeah. So we found the majority of our  
5 programs were found to have some effectiveness.

6           So in keeping with our data-driven  
7 strategy, we'll look at those that are most effective,  
8 how we can scale those up to broaden their reach. And  
9 those that are less effective, we're taking a critical  
10 look at how they can either be changed or how we can  
11 eliminate them altogether to better re-allocate those  
12 resources.

13           So we've talked about some of the  
14 programs, how we're measuring whether they're  
15 effective. The last really important piece to this is  
16 understanding what's really causing fatalities on the  
17 road. And this is something that Mr. Triggs referred  
18 to is doing a full review of all the fatalities that  
19 happened in 2021, looking at the drivers who were  
20 involved in it, what we can learn about where our  
21 attention needs to be.

22           We came with -- came away with three  
23 (3) significant conclusions.

24           So the first being, that our focus  
25 needs to be on rural areas if we want to reduce

1 fatalities. We see a disproportionate number  
2 happening outside of the city, and particularly in  
3 First Nations. So you -- you can see the statistics  
4 here for yourself, that 84 percent of our fatalities  
5 happened outside of the city.

6                   Clearly, that's disproportionate to the  
7 distribution of the population within the city. And  
8 likewise, with 19 percent of the fatalities happening  
9 in First Nations, that's disproportionate to the  
10 number of people who are living in those communities.

11                   The data is telling us that our focus  
12 needs to be on rural areas and First Nations.

13                   Secondly, with respect to demographics,  
14 we do see a disproportionate number of victims being  
15 male, as well as being between the ages of twenty-five  
16 (25) to thirty-four (34) and sixty-five (65) and over.  
17 And that's an important insight for us, especially  
18 with respect to campaigns, communications,  
19 understanding who the individuals are who are most  
20 likely to be involved in fatalities.

21                   And the third insight here, I think is  
22 the most kind of important one, and it was kind of the  
23 most stunning insight that we found -- is that, as Mr.  
24 Triggs said, we're seeing that the people -- the  
25 drivers who are involved in fatalities -- so not

1 necessarily the individual who died in the incident,  
2 but all the drivers involved in a fatal incident --  
3 they tend to have a history of risky driving.

4           And I know that seems kind of obvious  
5 in -- in retrospect, but that is kind of a new finding  
6 that we were able to come up with because we've got  
7 all the driver history in the province and we are able  
8 to analyze it.

9           So drivers involved in fatal collisions  
10 do tend to have a track record of either speeding,  
11 impaired driving, or frequent collisions over a long  
12 period of time.

13           So this is a really valuable piece of  
14 information that will let us develop some more  
15 targeted programming in the years to come.

16           So, of course, to develop that targeted  
17 programming and have it impact, we want to have that  
18 impact quickly. Because, of course, we're talking  
19 about people's lives and we don't have time to wait  
20 years to go through approvals and budgeting and so  
21 forth to actually have these programs up and running.

22           So we have implemented a new model for  
23 how we develop and implement programming. So -- and  
24 Mr. Triggs touched on this a little bit on this in his  
25 opening remarks but, kind of, the old model was very



1 much tied to the budgeting process.

2                   The new model of program development  
3 that we've implemented is de-coupled from that  
4 budgeting process with -- and the -- the bottom line  
5 being is that we're able to reduce the amount of time  
6 it takes from when an issue is identified to when  
7 we're able to actually see results on the ground from  
8 the program.

9                   So, kind of, in the old world, we'd  
10 have to come up with an idea that was tied to the  
11 budget cycle. So we'd, you know, develop a business  
12 case, submit it as part of the budget, budget would  
13 get approved, you know, the money would become  
14 available, you developed the program, put it into  
15 place. And we'd be talking about eighteen (18)  
16 months, two (2) years, maybe longer before we actually  
17 saw results from anything.

18                   With this new approach that we're  
19 taking, we're able to set aside the money for the  
20 specific issues at the beginning of the budget year  
21 and make that -- those funds available so that when  
22 issues are identified through our data-driven approach  
23 and programs are developed, we're able to implement  
24 those much more quickly and realize those results much  
25 more quickly as well.

1                   So in closing, I'll go through a quick  
2 description of -- of our budget, how we arrive at it  
3 every year, and what those numbers look like for the  
4 last five (5) years and moving forward.

5                   So the -- the approach that we take  
6 when building the road safety budget is a zero (0)  
7 based budgeting method. So for existing programs, we  
8 look at everything that we're currently delivering.  
9 We look at the evolving needs of that program in terms  
10 of enrollment, effectiveness, and so forth. We make  
11 decisions on whether that program needs to be expanded  
12 or reduced or discontinued.

13                   New programs are submitted via lean  
14 business case, so that new program will outline the  
15 need that's being addressed. So is it -- you know, is  
16 it addressing impairment, how is it going to address  
17 impairment, for example. That is -- that business  
18 case will also outline objectives and benefits, costs,  
19 outcomes, and so forth. And approval will be made  
20 based on the merits of that idea.

21                   And finally, one of the larger line  
22 items in the budget is the enhanced enforcement  
23 budget. And that's a funding that MPI provides to law  
24 enforcement for enhanced enforcement using overtime  
25 hours.

1                   So you recall when I talked about the  
2 seatbelt campaign, we were using enhanced enforcement  
3 to target that. That's what we're talking about when  
4 we reference enhanced enforcement.

5                   That budget is set through an annual  
6 discussion with our law enforcement partners. So we  
7 look at our data to see where the -- the key priority  
8 issues are; we discuss with the professionals -- law  
9 enforcement agencies to see where do they understand  
10 the issues to be; and then make decisions on whether  
11 to -- to change the budget or how to reallocate it for  
12 enhanced enforcement at that point.

13                   So, in the end, what we come up with is  
14 the budget we see here. So, as you'll note, we're  
15 going to be spending an extra two (2) million  
16 (\$2,000,000) in '23/'24 and that's really in line with  
17 the data-driven approach that we've been sharing with  
18 you this morning.

19                   So, through that research analysis,  
20 we've identified that we have a need to develop new  
21 programming for First Nations. So, we need to  
22 understand the unique challenges they face and develop  
23 programming accordingly. That's going to require new  
24 additional funds and that's reflected in the budget.

25                   Again, our data also tells us that

1 rural road safety is an issue and if we want to reduce  
2 fatalities and serious injuries, we need to be focused  
3 on rural areas.

4 We also know that for people living in  
5 rural or remote areas, there are additional barriers  
6 to driver training that don't exist in urban locations  
7 and we do have funding set aside to offer improved  
8 adult driver training in rural areas.

9 And, finally, I've shared with you  
10 several of the research initiatives that we're  
11 undertaking as part of the strategy. We're already  
12 seeing the benefit of that with some insights into the  
13 -- the root causes of fatalities and we do anticipate  
14 additional programming to be made based on the -- the  
15 final outcomes of that research.

16 So, with all that being said, I think  
17 MPI has a clear direction of the strategy we'll be  
18 taking in the coming years. And we're -- we think  
19 that we're well positioned based on the programs we  
20 have in place, the research and analysis we're doing  
21 and the budget increase in the coming year to deliver  
22 on that strategy. And that concludes my presentation.

23 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

24 Mr. Scarfone...?

25 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Thank you, Madam

1 Chair.

2

3 CONTINUED BY MR. STEVE SCARFONE:

4 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Thank you, Mr.  
5 Doell for that presentation. Just a couple questions  
6 for you, particularly as it concerns the partnership  
7 that MPIC has formulated with the First Nations.

8 I understand that that's, I guess, a  
9 recent development that's -- that's come about in the  
10 last couple years. Correct?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct,  
12 yeah, in the last year.

13 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: In the last year.  
14 And so you spoke of some of the unique challenges with  
15 respect to that and I can, like Mr. Triggs had drawn  
16 some previous experience having before this legal  
17 career worked in many First Nation reserves in  
18 northwestern Ontario.

19 And two (2) things that were very  
20 apparent, one (1) is the driver licensing issue, that  
21 I think probably translates well into the -- into the  
22 First Nations in Manitoba; meaning that, many of the  
23 residents don't have a driver's license and are  
24 driving motor vehicles.

25 And then the second observation was,

1 and I don't know how the Corporation would deal with  
2 this is -- is the motor vehicles up there, because  
3 they're brought in normally by winter road are in a  
4 poor mechanical condition at -- at some point.

5 And -- and how does the Corporation --  
6 or what has the Corporation learned with respect to  
7 those two (2) issues in -- in the First Nations?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, I would say we  
9 don't have all the answers to those problems at this  
10 point in time and that's the reason why we're engaging  
11 with the AMC because we know that MPI can't go into  
12 these communities and understand all the problems they  
13 face on our own; that requires meaningful engagement  
14 with the AMC. That is ongoing as we speak.

15 MPI is engaged in discussions with the  
16 University of the College of the North to find ways to  
17 better deliver driver training in northern areas and  
18 those efforts are ongoing.

19 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Okay, and so has  
20 the Corporation noticed that there is a  
21 disproportionate number of residents that are -- are  
22 unlicensed and driving motor vehicles?

23 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I don't have those  
24 statistics at hand, but based on the -- what we've  
25 heard from community members, that is accurate.

1 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Okay. Thank you  
2 very much. Those are all my questions for the Panel.

3 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr.  
4 Scarfone. Ms. Moore...?

5

6 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. KARA MOORE:

7 MS. KARA MOORE: Good morning to the  
8 panel. My name is Kara Moore and I am one of Board  
9 Counsel and I have a series of questions to you -- for  
10 you today, none of which will be directed at any  
11 specific person on the panel, so whoever feels most  
12 able to answer can go ahead and do so.

13 I'm going to start with some questions  
14 regarding the Road Safety Framework in place at MPI.  
15 First though, do you agree that successful loss  
16 prevention and road safety strategies can minimize  
17 economic and social costs to ratepayers?

18 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

19 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. So the  
20 last time that road safety was a topic in a General  
21 Rate Application hearing, was in the 2020 GRA. And I  
22 appreciate, I don't believe any of you were the panel  
23 at that time, but, at that time, MPI advised that they  
24 were working within the 2017 to 2020 Operational Plan.

25 Are you familiar with this?

1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. And at the  
3 2020 GRA hearing, MPI testified that it was targeting  
4 a new three-year operational plan covering the years  
5 2020 to 2023 and to be introduced in the spring of  
6 2020.

7 And that operational plan was to be  
8 filed in the 2021 GRA, but of course, given COVID, the  
9 road safety topic was deferred to this year.

10 So, my question really is: Has a new  
11 Operational Plan been created since the 2017 to 2020  
12 Operational Plan?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yeah, so, MPI has  
14 developed the 2022 -- twenty (20) -- to 2025 Road  
15 Safety Strategy, which serves the same functional  
16 purpose to direct our road safety activities.

17 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. So, the new  
18 strategy serves as a replacement of the previous  
19 operational plan?

20 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

21 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. With  
22 respect to stakeholder engagement, MPI sits on two (2)  
23 major committees which are the External Stakeholder  
24 Committee on Loss Prevention and the Provincial Road  
25 Safety Committee?



1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: MPI co-chairs the  
3 Provincial Road Safety Committee with Manitoba  
4 Infrastructure. Is that correct?

5 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

6 MS. KARA MOORE: The previous Road  
7 Safety Strategy that MPI was working on was the Road  
8 to Zero Strategy and I understand that this was a  
9 deliverable of the Provincial Road Safety Committee?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

11 MS. KARA MOORE: And this year, as  
12 we've already heard and will discuss today, MPI has  
13 introduced a new strategy called the 2022 to 2025 Road  
14 Safety Strategy.

15 Was this also a deliverable of the  
16 Provincial Road Safety Committee?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No, this was a  
18 deliverable of MPI, not the Provincial Road Safety  
19 Committee.

20 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. But I assume  
21 that this strategy also serves not only to replace the  
22 previous operational plan but also the Road to Zero  
23 Strategy?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: It does for MPI and  
25 not with the -- the other organizations of the

1 Provincial Road Safety Committee.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. Thank you.

3 So, now I'd like to talk about the new strategy. And  
4 a copy of the 2022 to 2025 Road Safety Strategy is --  
5 is on the screen. Thank you, Ms. Schubert, but for  
6 the record, it's attached as appendix 1 to CAC-MPI-1-  
7 75.

8 My understanding is the new Road Safety  
9 Strategy is divided into two (2) phases and is  
10 organized by three (3) main guiding principles. First  
11 being, decisions on road safety must make sense based  
12 on data both relating to the causes and fatalities and  
13 causes of fatalities and serious injuries, as well as  
14 the effectiveness of MPI initiatives.

15 Second, engagement with First Nations  
16 on road safety issues; and third, improving the road  
17 safety data eco system.

18 Is that a fair summary of the new  
19 strategy?

20 MR. BRYCE DOELL: It is. That's  
21 correct.

22 MS. KARA MOORE: The first phase of  
23 the Road Safety Strategy was to take place throughout  
24 2022 and is centered around improving understanding of  
25 the current road safety situation in Manitoba.

1 Correct?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Correct.

3 MS. KARA MOORE: And the second phase  
4 of the Road Safety Strategy covers 2023 through to  
5 2025 and is centered on taking what we learned in  
6 phase 1 and putting it into action.

7 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

8 MS. KARA MOORE: Has MPI completed  
9 phase 1 of the Road Safety Strategy?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No.

11 MS. KARA MOORE: When does it intend  
12 to do so?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: At the end of the  
14 fiscal year of 2022/2023.

15 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay.

16 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That would be in --  
17 sorry, April 2023 to be clear. Yeah.

18 MS. KARA MOORE: Understood. And has  
19 MPI begun phase 2 of the Road Safety Strategy?

20 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. So, as I  
21 mentioned during my remarks that it's not a purely  
22 calendar-driven exercise, there is overlap between the  
23 two (2) phases, so there is some progress that's been  
24 made on phase 2.

25 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. One (1) of the

1 action items that MPI listed under the engagement with  
2 First Nations focus of the strategy, was to host a  
3 First Nations Road Safety forum with Assembly of  
4 Manitoba Chiefs, that includes road safety experts,  
5 First Nations leadership and First Nations technicians  
6 to identify, plan and prioritize actions that address  
7 local First Nations road safety issues. And, Ms.  
8 Schubert, has helpfully pulled that section up on the  
9 screen there.

10 Are there any plans currently underway  
11 for this Road Safety Forum to take place?

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: We're currently in  
13 discussions with the AMC and what the nature of that -  
14 - that forum will actually look like. There is no  
15 plans, in terms of specific dates, organizations  
16 involved, but those discussions are ongoing.

17 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. Thank you.  
18 Another objective under this area of focus is to  
19 develop new road safety pilot programs to improve  
20 pedestrian safety and off-road vehicle helmet use in  
21 First Nations, based on community-based sugg --  
22 suggestions that had already been brought forward.

23 What types of suggestions is MPI  
24 considering, in -- in determining what future  
25 initiatives it will be working on?

1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, with respect to  
2 pedestrian safety, that would be the -- the pedestrian  
3 vest program that I referenced earlier in my remarks  
4 with Peguis First Nation.

5 With respect to off-road vehicle helmet  
6 use, that program has not been developed yet but the  
7 suggestion would be some kind of community training  
8 initiative or the provision of helmet use,  
9 potentially, in that community.

10 There may be other programs that come  
11 up that we're not aware of yet. Just to be clear,  
12 we're not strictly focussed on those two (2) but those  
13 are the ones where we have some concrete idea at this  
14 point.

15 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. I'd now  
16 like to shift my questions to the impact of the COVID  
17 pandemic on collision trends.

18 So, I understand, from the section of  
19 the General Rate Application re -- relating to road  
20 safety and loss prevention that MPI reported that,  
21 with the onset of the pandemic in 2020, collisions  
22 dropped by 24 percent when compared to the five-year  
23 average?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I don't have that  
25 number in front of me but that sounds correct.

1 MS. KARA MOORE: Sure. I mean, yeah,  
2 we can pull it up or you can take my word for it but  
3 either way --

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I'll take your word  
5 for it. That's --

6 MS. KARA MOORE: -- it's not int --  
7 not intended to be a trick question, and the pan --  
8 pandemic also led to a decline in traffic volumes in  
9 2020 and 2021? Correct?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.  
11 Yeah.

12 MS. KARA MOORE: But, unfortunately,  
13 this trend did not carry over to fatalities and the  
14 number of people killed in motor vehicle collisions  
15 actually increased by 3 percent, from 2019 to 2020,  
16 and remained consistent in 2021. Is that accurate?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's accurate.  
18 Yes.

19 MS. KARA MOORE: And, according to  
20 research that MPI relies upon, the cause of this  
21 disconnect is that changes in traffic volumes  
22 encouraged extreme risk taking, leading to greater  
23 crash severity?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL. That's correct. I'll  
25 also add that reduced traffic volumes lead to greater

1 speeds and that's not purely a Manitoba phenomena.  
2 That's something was observed across North America and  
3 the world as well.

4 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. And,  
5 despite traffic volumes returning now to near normal  
6 levels, this risk taking has remained higher than  
7 usual. Is that true?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I don't think at  
9 this point we can definitively say that, given that  
10 the, you know, the recovery back to -- to normal life  
11 is still ongoing. I don't think we can make  
12 conclusion at this point.

13 MS. KARA MOORE: Sure. So, I'm going  
14 to now ask some questions regarding a series of  
15 studies that MPI has recently conducted or has shared  
16 that it intends to conduct in the near future.

17 First, in response to the pandemic  
18 challenges that we've just discussed, MPI conducted  
19 two (2) studies to understand the problems of two (2)  
20 risky behaviours, being the use of hand-operated  
21 electronic devices and the non-use of seat-belts, and  
22 you spoke about that in your presentation this  
23 morning?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yep. That's right.

25 MS. KARA MOORE: And the study with

1 respect to the use of hand-operated electronic devices  
2 showed that 7 percent of all drivers in Manitoba were  
3 observed using or looking at an electronic  
4 communication device while driving?

5 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.  
6 Yes.

7 MS. KARA MOORE: And use was higher in  
8 cities, at 9 percent, than in rural areas? Correct?

9 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Correct.

10 MS. KARA MOORE: Additionally, the  
11 study found that 7 percent of Manitoba drivers and 6  
12 percent of front-seat passengers were not wearing  
13 their seatbelts?

14 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct and,  
15 if I could just clarify on the nature of the study?

16 MS. KARA MOORE: Certainly.

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: These observations  
18 were made while -- while individuals were stopped at a  
19 stop sign or a red light for safety reasons for the  
20 observers. So, just an important note.

21 MS. KARA MOORE: Understood. And non-  
22 use of seat-belts was found to be much worse in rural  
23 areas, at 15 percent?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's right. Yes.

25 MS. KARA MOORE: Has this data been



1 shared with Winnipeg Police and RCMP or -- or does MPI  
2 intend to share this data, in order to assist with hot  
3 spots for enforcement?

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: This information was  
5 shared with all members of the Provincial Road Safety  
6 Committee, which would include both Winnipeg Police  
7 Service and the RCMP.

8 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. Does MPI  
9 currently have any other initiatives or action items  
10 planned in response to the result of this study?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, as I mentioned  
12 during my remarks, we did conduct a co-ordinated seat-  
13 belt campaign in 2022. We may expand or alter that  
14 program next year, depending on what the results of it  
15 are.

16 With respect to distraction, we re-  
17 allocated our enhanced enforcement budget for  
18 distracted driving from rural areas to urban areas.  
19 So, we're looking to see what the outcomes of that  
20 budget shift and what that seatbelt campaign are,  
21 before we make other decisions on how to proceed.

22 MS. KARA MOORE: Understood. Thank  
23 you. Now, moving to the Alcohol and Drug Roadside  
24 Survey, in 2016, MPI conducted such a survey which  
25 showed that 10 percent of drivers had drugs, both

1 legal and illegal, in their systems, and I understand  
2 that a further survey was planned for the fall of  
3 2022?

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct. The  
5 -- the survey was planned to happen in 2020 but, due  
6 to COVID, it got pushed back to 2022, when it was safe  
7 to gather samples from people.

8 MS. KARA MOORE: Understood. And I  
9 understand, from your presentation this morning, that  
10 MPI recently completed the data collection phase of  
11 this survey?

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.  
13 Yes.

14 MS. KARA MOORE: When does MPI  
15 anticipate that the results of that survey will be  
16 available?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: We anticipate the  
18 results of that survey will be available in January of  
19 2023.

20 MS. KARA MOORE: And will those  
21 results be made publicly available?

22 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. They will be.  
23 Yeah.

24 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. And in  
25 the General Rate Application, MPI advised that it

1 intended to compare the results of the 2022 survey  
2 with those of the 2016 survey, in order to determine  
3 the change in prevalence since new legislation came in  
4 to effect in 2018.

5                   So, will that comparison also be shared  
6 in January of 2022 -- or 2023 rather?

7                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: That comparison is a  
8 bit more of a complex analysis than just the raw  
9 results of the study, so those would follow at a later  
10 date.

11                   MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. Certainly, and  
12 does MPI have a targeted date in mind for that?

13                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: I -- we don't have a  
14 specific date in mind for that. I think we can expect  
15 it within the calendar year of 2023. We don't have a  
16 specific date for that though.

17                   MS. KARA MOORE: Sure. Thank you.  
18 And MPI also conducted a large vehicle study that I'd  
19 liked to discuss and that was pursuant to Board Order  
20 Number 176 of '19?

21                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yep. That's  
22 correct.

23                   MS. KARA MOORE: So, as part of the  
24 large vehicle study, my understanding is that vehicles  
25 were classified by type, body style, make and model,

1 and weight class, and collisions were then analyzed  
2 based on several factors, including number of  
3 collisions, number of vehicles involved, number of  
4 injuries, average incident cost and average injury  
5 cost, among other factors.

6 Is that an accurate assessment of the  
7 study?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. That's  
9 accurate.

10 MS. KARA MOORE: The key findings of  
11 that study included that relative to compact cars,  
12 pick-up trucks, mid and full-size cars, and passenger  
13 or cargo vans, each had higher cost per incident,  
14 higher per injury cost, and higher vulnerable injury  
15 cost?

16 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. That's  
17 correct.

18 MS. KARA MOORE: Further, drivers in  
19 pick-up trucks, mid and full-size cars, passenger and  
20 cargo vans, and SUVs were found to be more likely to  
21 be at fault than drivers in compact cars? Correct?

22 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.  
23 Yes. I will qualify that but I think the differences  
24 were marginal. I'm not sure they're meaningful but,  
25 strictly speaking, in terms of their percentages,

1 there was a difference there.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: Sure. Ms. Schubert,  
3 if you could, please, pull up PUB-MPI-1-138. This was  
4 an Information Request in which Board Counsel asked  
5 MPI whether it planned to develop any road safety  
6 programming and this was at Question C, targeted at  
7 the specific risks associated with large vehicles.

8 And, in response, on the second page  
9 there, MPI advised that it was not currently planning  
10 any road safety programming targeted at owners of  
11 larger vehicles.

12 Is that still the position of MPI or is  
13 there any intention to employ strategies to address  
14 the increased risk caused by larger vehicles?

15 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's still the  
16 position of MPI and the reason for that is that we see  
17 the issues of impairment, speed, distraction, and  
18 seatbelt use to be issues that'll lead to more  
19 reductions in fatalities and serious injuries than a  
20 focus on large vehicles.

21 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. And,  
22 before I move on from the various studies that MPI has  
23 completed recently, going back to the Alcohol and Drug  
24 Roadside Survey, are there any preliminary findings  
25 that MPI is in a position to share regarding the data

1 collected from that survey?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No. There's no  
3 preliminary findings that we're able to share at this  
4 time.

5 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. So, I'd  
6 now like to move on to the topic of engagement with  
7 First Nations.

8 MPI has shared that it intends to, and  
9 -- and really has already begun the process of  
10 collaborating with First Nations in ongoing efforts to  
11 understand road safety issues?

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

13 MS. KARA MOORE: In the General Rate  
14 Application MPI shared that 23 percent of crash  
15 victims in First Nations are either killed or  
16 seriously injured compared to 5 percent of those in  
17 the whole province?

18 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's right, yes.

19 MS. KARA MOORE: And in December of  
20 2021 MPI and the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs signed a  
21 letter of intent to collaborate on road safety  
22 engagement activities and programming in First  
23 Nations, correct?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Correct.

25 MS. KARA MOORE: And MPI shared in --

1 in the Application, and I believe this morning as  
2 well, that it's in the process of developing a First  
3 Nation strategy with the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs?

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct, yes.

5 MS. KARA MOORE: What is the status of  
6 that strategy?

7 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, the road safety  
8 coordinator at the AMC was hired in July. That  
9 individual is now developing the work plan for how  
10 they'll engage individual First Nations to understand  
11 the road safety issues they face.

12 Following from that will come the --  
13 the engagement -- or excuse me, the -- the First  
14 Nations road safety strategy.

15 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. And is -- is  
16 there a targeted date for that strategy to be  
17 completed?

18 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Not at this time.  
19 The -- the plan for those engagement activities then  
20 deliver the strategy, that plan is still under  
21 development.

22 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. You  
23 shared today that MPI worked with the Assembly of  
24 Manitoba Chiefs in Peguis First Nation on a pedestrian  
25 safety program that included distributing reflective

1 vests to community members for greater visibility when  
2 walking in low-light areas?

3 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's right. Yes.

4 MS. KARA MOORE: And so I understand  
5 the status of that project to be that most, not all,  
6 but most of the vests have been distributed now to  
7 community members?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: The program only  
9 began a couple weeks ago.

10 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay.

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So we don't have the  
12 exact number of vests that have been distributed as of  
13 today.

14 MS. KARA MOORE: That's fine.

15 MR. BRYCE DOELL: But it's early days,  
16 yeah.

17 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. Sure. So the  
18 status of that right now is -- is that it's really  
19 just begun?

20 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's right.

21 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. I understand.  
22 And is MPI or will MPI be monitoring pedestrian  
23 collisions at Peguis First Nation going forward in  
24 order to assess the success of that program?

25 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.



1 MS. KARA MOORE: And are there any  
2 other measures that MPI will use to -- to determine  
3 whether the program is successful?

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So the -- the number  
5 of collisions with pedestrians is the -- the outcome  
6 that we're seeking. That is the measure that we'll  
7 use --

8 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay.

9 MR. BRYCE DOELL: -- for the success  
10 of the program.

11 MS. KARA MOORE: And so based on that  
12 measure, MPI will determine whether to continue that  
13 program with other First Nation communities?

14 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct, with  
15 a caveat that given the scale of the program, if the  
16 uptake is what we expect it to be and the community  
17 response is positive, we wouldn't delay in seeing  
18 results.

19 If there's indications that it is  
20 successful and they just haven't showed up in the  
21 numbers yet, that wouldn't pre-judge us from expanding  
22 it if we thought there was a case to be made for that.

23 MS. KARA MOORE: Certainly, and have  
24 you received feedback from any other First Nations  
25 communities that there's an interest in participating

1 in this program or it hasn't got that far yet?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No, we haven't  
3 received any feedback on that at this point.

4 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. So I'm  
5 going to jump around to a couple different areas now.  
6 So, first some questions with respect to pedestrian  
7 collisions.

8 Anecdotally, we've recently seen in the  
9 news what appears to be an increase in collisions  
10 involving pedestrians.

11 Does MPI have any information or data  
12 at this time to explain what appears to be an increase  
13 in collisions with pedestrians?

14 MR. BRYCE DOELL: If you're recurring  
15 -- sorry, excuse me, referring to the number of  
16 collisions that have happened in recent weeks, I think  
17 at this point it's too early for us to understand  
18 really what the cause of that is.

19 That is a -- a priority for us to  
20 understand it, but it's -- you know, we're simply  
21 talking about incidents that have happened over the  
22 last couple weeks. We need more time to understand  
23 what's happening.

24 MS. KARA MOORE: Understood. Does MPI  
25 have any plans to study collisions involving

1 pedestrians in the near future?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: We have no plans at  
3 this time. The -- I'll note that this rash of  
4 pedestrian collisions we've seen recently is something  
5 that we're taking quite seriously, obviously. We just  
6 need to take the time to understand what our data is  
7 saying about what's causing it before we come up with  
8 that plan.

9 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I have a bit of a  
10 clarification on what Bryce -- mistaken. We -- we  
11 will be continuing our analysis of fatalities on an  
12 ongoing basis. So, based on that you will each --  
13 each fatality that happens throughout the province,  
14 we'll be determining all the root causes associated  
15 with that and then that will go into a -- for more  
16 strategies for dealing with various matters.

17 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you,  
18 understood. Presumably, an increase in collisions  
19 involving pedestrians will contribute to an increase  
20 in PIPP claims costs?

21 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Can I ask you to  
22 repeat the question?

23 MS. KARA MOORE: Sorry. Presumably,  
24 an increase in collisions involving pedestrians will  
25 contribute to an increase in PIPP claims costs?

1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: All else being  
2 equal, yes.

3 MS. KARA MOORE: Does MPI anticipate  
4 any -- well, I think actually Mr. Triggs sort of just  
5 answered this question.

6 So, MPI doesn't necessarily anticipate  
7 any changes in programming right now, but depending on  
8 the outcome once you've had an opportunity to study  
9 those collisions, that may change, is -- is my  
10 understanding?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

12 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. So  
13 shifting gears again.

14 At the 2022 technical conference MPI  
15 advised that it was developing a publically available  
16 dashboard of road safety data.

17 What is the status of that dashboard?

18 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, that dashboard  
19 is in the development phase. I expect it to be  
20 available in January or February of 2023.

21 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. And just  
22 a few questions with respect to driver's education.  
23 Ms. Schubert, if you could please pull up PUB-MPI-1-  
24 134. Thank you.

25 So, in this Information Request, MPI

1 was asked to provide an update on the evaluation of  
2 the driver training program, driver's ed. MPI  
3 responded that it was in the process. I believe it's  
4 the second paragraph on this page here that we're  
5 looking at, and this is the response to the  
6 Information Request.

7 MPI responded that it was in the  
8 process of analysing data collected from the Ready  
9 Assess Pilot Project, and that a final report was  
10 scheduled for release in September 2022.

11 So first, for clarity, I understand  
12 Ready Assess is a virtual driving assessment?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

14 MS. KARA MOORE: Has the final report  
15 that MPI refers to in this response been released?

16 MR. BRYCE DOELL: It's been received  
17 by MPI, but not released externally.

18 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. Is MPI able to  
19 produce a copy of that report to the Board?

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yeah, we're able to  
24 provide that report. It is prepared by an external  
25 vendor --

1 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay.

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: -- to be clear, but  
3 we are able to release that.

4 MS. KARA MOORE: Certainly. So, Mr.  
5 Scarfone, I would ask for an undertaking that MPI  
6 produce the final report regarding the analysis of  
7 data collected from the Ready Assess Pilot Project.

8 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Just one (1)  
9 moment, please.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Yes, MPIC will  
14 make that an undertaking. Thank you.

15 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you.

16

17 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 27: MPI produce the final  
18 report regarding the  
19 analysis of data collected  
20 from the Ready Assess  
21 Pilot Project

22

23 CONTINUED BY MS. KARA MOORE:

24 MS. KARA MOORE: And in response to  
25 this same Information Request, MPI also said that

1 based on the conclusions of that report, MPI would  
2 decide whether to implement Ready Assess as part of  
3 its operations.

4 Has MPI made that determination at this  
5 time?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No, it has not made  
7 that determination at this time.

8 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. And -- and so  
9 what's the status of -- of making that decision?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, we're cross-  
11 referencing the report that was provided by the vendor  
12 with our own internal data to understand what the --  
13 the use cases might be for it with respect to driver  
14 training or testing.

15 But that is kind of a separate analysis  
16 from the strict results that we found as far as the  
17 pilot.

18 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. Madam  
19 Chair, I'm just about to jump into a new section of  
20 questioning, so now might be an opportune time for an  
21 morning break.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms.  
23 Moore. Yes, let's take a break. Now we'll come back,  
24 please, at a quarter to 11:00.

25

1 --- Upon recessing 10:30 a.m.

2 --- Upon resuming at 10:45 a.m.

3

4 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Moore...?

5 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you, Madam

6 Chair. Is -- is the panel ready to proceed? Yeah.

7

8 CONTINUED BY MS. KARA MOORE:

9 MS. KARA MOORE: So I'm now going to  
10 ask -- my last series of questions will be about  
11 budget. So, Ms. Schubert, if you could please pull up  
12 part 9, Appendix of the -- of the Application,  
13 Appendix 15. Thank you. So we're just looking at the  
14 first page here, and this Figure EXP, Appendix 15-1.

15 So this figure shows total Basic Road  
16 Safety and Loss Prevention costs.

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct, yes.

18 MS. KARA MOORE: And this provides a  
19 comparison of the actual costs versus forecasted costs  
20 in each of the years 2017/'18 through to 2021/'22?

21 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Correct.

22 MS. KARA MOORE: And if we look at  
23 line 17, the actual spending during each of these  
24 years was less than the forecasted costs?

25 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: That's correct,



1 yeah.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: And in particular,  
3 for the 2020/'21 years, MPI forecasted -- and -- and  
4 this is sort of the second from the right block of  
5 columns there.

6 MPI forecasted road safety spending to  
7 be 11.2 million, and actual spending that year came in  
8 at 7.7 million, or 3.5 million less than the forecast?

9 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's accurate,  
10 yes.

11 MS. KARA MOORE: Was this lower level  
12 of spending influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, it was.

14 MS. KARA MOORE: Okay. And can you  
15 perhaps elaborate on the cause of this lower level of  
16 spending?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sure. So during the  
18 pandemic, many of the partner organizations that we  
19 work with to deliver road safety had difficulty  
20 spending that budget on approved projects or  
21 programming due to public health restrictions.

22 We had less money spent with respect to  
23 enhanced enforcement, so we had law enforcement  
24 agencies with less money available to spend, less  
25 resources available in terms of their enhanced

1 enforcement.

2 But really what's driving it is the --  
3 the public health restrictions limiting our ability to  
4 interact with the public.

5 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. Ms.  
6 Schubert, can you please turn to PUB/MPI-1-135, Figure  
7 1. Thank you.

8 And -- and just for the panel, this was  
9 a portion of a response to an Information Request.  
10 And this Figure is a comparison schedule between the  
11 forecasted and actual Road Safety and Loss Prevention  
12 Program costs for the 2021 and 2022 year.

13 Do you agree with that?

14 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I do, yes.

15 MS. KARA MOORE: And if we look at  
16 line 15, MPI forecasted to spend almost 11 million  
17 annually on program costs for the 2021/'22 year?

18 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct, yes.

19 MS. KARA MOORE: And looking at line  
20 16, MPI also forecasted to spend about 2.2 million on  
21 departmental expenses?

22 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

23 MS. KARA MOORE: For an overall  
24 forecasted expenses for the 2021/'22 year of 13.2  
25 million?

1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct, yes.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: And the actual  
3 spending for the 2021/'22 year was 10.3 million?

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Correct.

5 MS. KARA MOORE: It appears, if we  
6 look at lines 2 and 3, that the leading causes for  
7 this reduction in spending was -- was decreased  
8 spending in the areas of drivers' education and  
9 impaired driving?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.  
11 I'll note here that the Enhanced Enforcement Program  
12 that I was referring to is included in the line number  
13 3, the impaired driving prevention strategies.

14 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. Are you  
15 able to provide an explanation for the re -- the  
16 reason for the decreased spending in these two (2)  
17 areas in particular?

18 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sure. So with  
19 respect to the impaired driving prevention strategies,  
20 so as I mentioned, with our Enhanced Enforcement  
21 Program, we provide funding to law enforcement  
22 agencies to provide additional enforcement on road  
23 safety issues beyond their typical operations.

24 They had resourcing constraints as a  
25 result of the pandemic that led to an inability to

1 spend the full amount of that budget.

2                   With respect to driver education and  
3 improvement, again, we had pandemic-related issues  
4 that caused that fore -- or the actual to be less than  
5 the forecast in that case, having lower enrolment and  
6 the move to -- to online driver's ed as well.

7                   MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. And  
8 looking at line 9, there's also been a pretty  
9 significant decrease in spending in the area of  
10 vulnerable road user education strategies.

11                   Are you able to provide an explanation  
12 for this decreased level of spending?

13                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: Can I ask you to  
14 repeat the question?

15                   MS. KARA MOORE: Sorry. So looking at  
16 line 9, it appears that the forecasted expenses for  
17 vulnerable road users was about four hundred thousand  
18 (400,000), and the actual amount spent was three  
19 hundred thousand (300,000) less than that.

20                   So I'm just asking for an explanation  
21 for that discrepancy.

22                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sure. So again,  
23 that was unfortunately a victim of pandemic health  
24 restrictions, so a lot of the vulnerable road user  
25 programming is community based. Face-to-face

1 interaction with individuals, that was impacted by the  
2 pandemic.

3                   So, for example, the BEST Program,  
4 which is delivered in school to teach safe cycling  
5 skills to -- to youth, that funding went unused in the  
6 spring of 2021, for example.

7                   MS. KARA MOORE:    Thank you.  
8 Understood. Ms. Schubert, if we could not turn to  
9 Figure EXP-40. Thank you.

10                   This is a table which shows the  
11 2021/'22 actual expenses and the 2022/'23 forecasted  
12 expenses for Road Safety and Loss Prevention.

13                   Do you agree?

14                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    Agree, yes.

15                   MS. KARA MOORE:    And looking at line  
16 17, which is the total program costs and expenses, for  
17 the 2022/'23 year, MPI is now forecasting an increase  
18 to expenses from 10.3 million to -- and the 10.3  
19 million number is from the actual 2021/'22 year -- to  
20 12.3 million for 2022/'23.

21                   And so that's an increase of about \$2  
22 million, correct?

23                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    That's correct,  
24 versus the actual spend in '21/'22.

25                   MS. KARA MOORE:    Yes. And it appears

1 that some of the larger areas of budget increases are  
2 the areas of driver education, impaired driving, and  
3 vulnerable road users, which we just discussed.

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's  
5 accurate.

6 MS. KARA MOORE: And so is it safe to  
7 assume that the increases in these areas is sort of  
8 getting caught up in those programs after the hiatus  
9 of COVID-19, or is there another explanation?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.  
11 It's an expectation that we'll return to normal with  
12 respect to the pandemic.

13 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. Ms.  
14 Schubert, if we could go back briefly to that Appendix  
15 15. Thank you.

16 Looking at EXP Appendix 15-1, if I  
17 could direct the panel's attention to the 2021/'22  
18 columns, which are the last three (3) columns on the  
19 right.

20 Looking at departmental expenses at  
21 line 16, MPI incurred 2.2 million in departmental  
22 expenses compared to the forecast of 2.3 million, or  
23 one hundred and sixteen thousand (116,000) less than  
24 forecast?

25 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct,

1 yeah.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: Is it accurate to say  
3 that the majority of these departmental expenses are  
4 related to payroll?

5 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's  
6 accurate.

7 MS. KARA MOORE: Kristen, if we could  
8 please flip back to Figure EXP-40.

9 Looking at line 16 on this figure, it -  
10 - it doesn't appear that MPI has forecasted any  
11 significant increases in departmental expenses from  
12 the 2021/'22 to 2022/'23 years?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's accurate,  
14 yes.

15 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. And,  
16 Kristen, if we could now turn to -- thank you -- back  
17 to Appendix 15, and it'll be Figure EXP Appendix 15-2.

18 Do you agree that this figure provides  
19 a comparison of the forecasted expenses in Road Safety  
20 and Loss Prevention presented in the 2022 and 2023  
21 GRAs?

22 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's  
23 accurate.

24 MS. KARA MOORE: And so this figure  
25 was filed as part of the General Rate Application

1 filed in July of 2022?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Correct. Yes.

3 MS. KARA MOORE: And so, based on that  
4 original application for the 2022/'23 year, which is  
5 the first set of columns on the left, road safety and  
6 loss prevention expenses were forecasted to be around  
7 12.3 million?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's accurate,  
9 yes.

10 MS. KARA MOORE: For the 2023/'24  
11 year, road safety and loss prevention expenses are  
12 forecast at 12.7 million?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

14 MS. KARA MOORE: And for the 2024/'25  
15 year, road safety and loss prevention expenses are  
16 forecast at 12.7 million?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

18 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. And now,  
19 Kristen, if we can refer to the October update, which  
20 is MPI Exhibit 50, at PF-1. Thank you.

21 So, if we look at -- so, this was the  
22 October update that MPI filed just a few weeks ago.  
23 And I believe that the numbers in this update are  
24 accurate as of August 31st, 2022. Is that correct?

25 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sorry. That's



1 correct.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. So, if we  
3 look at line 21, we can see the expenses that MPI most  
4 recently forecasted for road safety and loss  
5 prevention. Do you see that?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I do, yes.

7 MS. KARA MOORE: So in the October  
8 update, for the 2023/'24 year, MPI has increased its  
9 budget for road safety expenses from 12.7 million from  
10 the figure that we just looked at to almost 15  
11 million, being an increase of 2.3 million?

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

13 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. And MPI  
14 has also forecasted a significant increase in road  
15 safety expenses in the 2024/'25 and 2025/'26 years?

16 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Correct.

17 MS. KARA MOORE: And, Mr. Triggs, I  
18 believe you spoke about this this morning, and you  
19 probably already answered this question, but I  
20 understand there's an increase in the budget not for -  
21 - not earmarked for any specific initiatives right now  
22 but to have funds readily available as -- as ideas for  
23 programs come up.

24 Is -- is that what this increase shows?

25 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Correct.

1 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. Kristen,  
2 I'd now like to refer to MPI's expenses and IFRS  
3 presentation, which is MPI Exhibit 55 at slide 17.

4

5 (BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 MS. KARA MOORE: Sorry, slide 17,  
8 please. Thank you. So, I appreciate that the panel  
9 was not involved in this presentation. In particular,  
10 I just have a couple quick questions on this.

11 So, looking at lines 26 and 27 on this  
12 slide, during MPI's expenses and IFRS presentation,  
13 Board counsel asked for an explanation of the reasons  
14 for the higher than expected road safety and loss  
15 prevention expenses.

16 And in response, MPI's panel indicated  
17 that the increase in expenses resulted from additional  
18 road safety strategies that MPI was implementing and  
19 deferred the details of the -- of those strategies to  
20 this panel.

21 And so, I'd ask this panel, what are  
22 the additional strategies? Is it the same increase  
23 that we just talked about or is this representing  
24 something different?

25 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: It is the same

1 increase you just talked about.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you.

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 MS. KARA MOORE: So, to confirm, there  
7 are no specific strategies earmarked for this  
8 increase, it's just to have funds specifically  
9 available?

10 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: No specific  
11 programs I think would probably be a more accurate way  
12 to describe it.

13 MS. KARA MOORE: Right.

14 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: But, yeah, we --  
15 we have the overall strategy we're trying evolve. And  
16 when -- the coming months that initiatives and  
17 programs are identified as possibilities, we'll have  
18 the -- the funds available to spend on those.

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you very much.  
23 Are there any other -- sorry. Does MPI anticipate any  
24 further material changes to the road safety budget  
25 most recently provided in the October update?

1 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: No.

2 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. And,  
3 Kristen, if we could go back to figure EXP, appendix  
4 15-2.

5 Has MPI prepared an update to this  
6 figure with current numbers?

7 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: That is --  
8 looking at the document, it appears to be what was  
9 filed in July 12 when he filed it so that -- this was  
10 made prior to the budget updates we made. So I don't  
11 -- I'm unaware of whether or not a specific table like  
12 this has been updated or not.

13 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you.

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Actually, the  
18 slide presentation that we had, the last slide on the  
19 slide deck, is an update for this coming year  
20 reflecting those changes on that, so that's --

21 MS. KARA MOORE: Right. That's very  
22 helpful. Thank you. Just a few more questions for  
23 you this morning.

24 MPI advised in the October update, and  
25 this is not specific to road safety, but just

1 generally, that it's forecasting two hundred and  
2 eighty-three (283) new FTE positions?

3 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Correct.

4 MS. KARA MOORE: I understand that MPI  
5 currently has approximately twenty-four (24) FTE  
6 working on administering road safety initiatives?

7 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: That's correct.

8 MS. KARA MOORE: Does MPI intend to  
9 increase its road safety staff count?

10 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Not in this year.  
11 Again, we've just recently increased the staffing  
12 compliment by four (4) in this current year. And  
13 depending on how things work out and the process  
14 that's made, if we need to assess and increase the  
15 FTEs, then that would be something we would consider  
16 but, at the present time, there's no plan for that.

17 MS. KARA MOORE: Thank you. Madam  
18 Chair, unless there are any questions that arise from  
19 the undertaking that MPI has given this morning, those  
20 are all my questions for this panel.

21 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms.  
22 Moore. Mr. Klassen...?

23 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you, Madam  
24 Chair.

25

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CHRIS KLASSEN:

2 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Good morning,  
3 members of the panel. Chris Klassen, for CAC  
4 (Manitoba). Thanks for your time this morning.

5 I'll begin with a series of general  
6 questions about your work in road safety, and then  
7 move into a few more specific areas of questioning  
8 related to the information that's been shared in the  
9 Application and in your presentation this morning.

10 Generally, you'll accept, and I'll ask  
11 you to agree, that road safety is an important policy  
12 issue for Manitobans. That's correct?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I would agree with  
14 that, yes.

15 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And you'll agree  
16 that MPI observes a five (5) year average of  
17 approximately ninety-two thousand (92,000) crash  
18 incidents per year. Is that correct?

19 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct, yes.

20 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And there were  
21 three hundred and twenty (320) people seriously  
22 injured last year, correct?

23 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

24 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And seventy-eight  
25 (78) fatalities in crash incidents both in 2020 and in

1 2021, correct?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

3 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And would MPI

4 agree that -- that crash incidents have significant

5 impacts on, of course, those involved and, also, their

6 loved ones?

7 MR. BRYCE DOELL: We would agree with

8 that, yes.

9 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And, also, on

10 society more broadly?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, we would agree

12 with that.

13 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And one (1) tool

14 available to MPI for quantifying these impacts is the

15 social cost of collisions, correct?

16 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That is one (1) tool

17 that's available, yeah.

18 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And you'll agree

19 that MPI has placed on the record of this proceeding a

20 social cost of collision statistics from 2019

21 developed by Transport Canada?

22 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's right, yes.

23 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And can you

24 confirm that this metric, being the Transport Canada's

25 social cost of collisions, takes into account the

1 economic costs of -- of injuries, correct?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: It does.

3 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And fatalities,  
4 correct?

5 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

6 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And, also,  
7 property damage, correct?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's accurate,  
9 yes.

10 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And other  
11 categories of costs taken into account by this metric  
12 include demands on public services, including  
13 emergency services --

14 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's accurate.

15 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: -- and costs to  
16 the healthcare system and the justice system?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Also accurate.

18 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you.

19 MR. MIKE TRIGGS: Mr. Klassen, as I  
20 said in my opening statements, I'm not too concerned  
21 with the matter of social costs. You know, this is  
22 almost like a given of things.

23 What really matters is the fact that,  
24 when we're dealing with the fatalities and serious  
25 injuries, we'll dealing with individuals. And when I



1 wear the road safety hat, I'm concerned with that.

2                   The GRA number hat for determining how  
3 much we may need, okay, that's a -- a different  
4 perspective and different calculation you have to  
5 make.

6                   But with the -- MPI's approach for road  
7 safety is about that individuals and people. People  
8 that we know are the ones who are dying.

9                   So we're not motivated by reducing the  
10 social cost. We're not motivated by reducing our  
11 insurance claims cost; that's not much of a concern  
12 for us.

13                   What our concern is the fact that  
14 people in Manitoba are dying. And what can we do to  
15 change that. So that's where our -- our perspective  
16 is on this.

17                   MR. CHRIS KLASSEN:       And I -- thank  
18 you for that insight, Mr. Triggs. And our -- our  
19 clients certainly appreciate that perspective from MPI  
20 as well.

21                   But recognizing that there may be value  
22 for MPI or for the Board in -- in using a tool of --  
23 of -- to quantify the impacts of this social and  
24 policy issue, I have just one (1) or two (2) more  
25 questions for you, Mr. Doell, on -- on the social cost

1 of collisions.

2                   There are two (2) other categories of  
3 cost used by that metric that I -- I haven't listed  
4 yet. And those are costs of traffic delays and out-  
5 of-pocket expenses, correct?

6                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:     That's correct.

7                   MR. CHRIS KLASSEN:     And would you  
8 accept, subject to check, that the Transport Canada  
9 information on the record of this proceeding assessed  
10 2019 social costs of collisions in Manitoba at 1.78  
11 billion?

12                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:     That's accurate. I  
13 would add the caveat that it's not tailored  
14 specifically to Manitoba. You know, there are costs  
15 in there, in that methodology, that don't fit  
16 themselves precisely with what's happening in  
17 Manitoba. I -- I guess, all I can say is it's an  
18 estimate.

19                   MR. CHRIS KLASSEN:     Of course. And  
20 thank you for that answer.

21                   And briefly to confirm your response to  
22 my friend, Ms. Moore, earlier, it's correct that MPI  
23 observed a decline in crashes during the pandemic  
24 period?

25                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:     Yes, that's

1 accurate.

2 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And the  
3 approximate margin was -- was 24 percent. Is that  
4 correct?

5 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

6 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And can you  
7 confirm that, despite this reduction in crash  
8 incidents, MPI observed a spike in fatalities during  
9 the pandemic period?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's -- I wouldn't  
11 characterize it as a spike. You know, a spike kind of  
12 implies a significant increase. The number of  
13 fatalities did increase, although I will say, again,  
14 as -- as I mentioned earlier, it was consistent with  
15 what was observed in other jurisdictions as well.

16 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you. And  
17 MPI notes that the number of people seriously injured  
18 on Manitoba roads by year has been steadily trending  
19 downward since 2016. Is that correct?

20 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.  
21 Yeah.

22 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And, in fact, it  
23 appears -- and I'll ask you to confirm -- that the  
24 number of serious injuries dropped by almost 14  
25 percent in 2020 from the earlier figure at 2019.

1                   And I haven't brought it up before you,  
2 but I can if that would be helpful.

3                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    I can take your word  
4 for it.  If we're going to continue speaking about it,  
5 it would be helpful to have in front of me, but I'll  
6 take your word on the exact number.

7                   MR. CHRIS KLASSEN:    I -- I don't think  
8 that will be necessary.

9                   And just one (1) final figure that I'll  
10 ask you to confirm is that the -- the drop in serious  
11 injuries from 2019 to '20 persisted through 2021 and  
12 the number of serious injuries in 2020 and '21 are  
13 relatively consistent.  Is that correct?

14                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    The number of  
15 fatalities were relatively consistent?

16                   MR. CHRIS KLASSEN:    Serious injuries  
17 in 2020 and in 2021.

18                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    Yes, that's correct.

19                   MR. CHRIS KLASSEN:    And does MPI  
20 usually observe a correlation between the number of  
21 serious injuries and the number of fatalities?

22                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    What we've seen from  
23 the data over the last five (5) years is that  
24 fatalities have plateaued, but we see a long-term  
25 decrease year over year in the number of serious

1 injuries.

2 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you for  
3 that.

4 My next question is for you, Mr.  
5 Triggs. And I'd like to respond just briefly to your  
6 comment of a moment ago with respect to MPI's  
7 priorities and the importance of -- of the fact these  
8 are real people's lives impacted by these -- these  
9 incidents.

10 Would you agree that road safety for  
11 MPI is both an important policy issue and an important  
12 claims costs issue?

13 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes. So  
14 obviously, if we reduce the number of fatalities and  
15 serious injuries, it's going to reduce the number of  
16 claims that are made, which will reduce the amount of  
17 premiums that are -- have to be paid. So there is a  
18 connection.

19 But as I said in my introduction when I  
20 deal with the road safety concern, my responsibility  
21 is here. When I wear that hat, I'm not overly  
22 concerned by that. I'm concerned about the people.

23 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And I understand  
24 that. Thank you. Ms. Schubert, would you mind  
25 displaying on the screen page 6 of Exhibit PUB-16,

1 being Dr. Hall's report? And it'll be the first  
2 paragraph on page 6.

3                   And, Mr. Triggs, I'll refer your  
4 attention to the first paragraph here. It's my  
5 understanding that this section of Ms. Hall's report  
6 is presented as a summary of your opening remarks.  
7 Could you confirm that that's your understanding as  
8 well?

9                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS:     That's my  
10 understanding of the report. Yes.

11                   MR. CHRIS KLASSEN:     And in the first  
12 paragraph here, she summarizes your comments from that  
13 day as putting road safety into context for the  
14 purposes of the GRA.

15                   And you explained that road safety  
16 initiatives reduce crashes, reduce costs, and that, in  
17 turn, reduces auto insurance rates.

18                   And you explained that as MPI spends  
19 ratepayers' money on road safety, there is a need to  
20 ensure that money is being used effectively and within  
21 MPI's responsibilities.

22                   Would you adopt that statement today as  
23 true?

24                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS:     Yes, I believe  
25 that's -- my -- I can go back to the transcript to see

1 what exactly I already said but that certainly  
2 captures the sentiment.

3 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you. And  
4 Ms. Schubert, could I ask you to turn us now to page  
5 14 of the loss prevention chapter. Thank you.

6 And members of the witness panel,  
7 you'll -- you'll see, on the screen before you, the  
8 section of the GRA application that refers to MPI's  
9 road safety strategy 2022 to 2025. Correct?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Correct.

11 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And I'll ask you  
12 to confirm that MPI identifies this road safety  
13 strategy as being defined by three (3) guiding  
14 principles. Correct?

15 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

16 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And that these  
17 are, first, decisions on road safety initiatives must  
18 make sense based on a data-driven understanding of the  
19 root causes of traffic fatalities and serious injuries  
20 in Manitoba. And the effectiveness of specific  
21 initiatives in addressing these root causes. Correct?

22 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Correct.

23 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And second, to  
24 acknowledge that First Nations in Manitoba face unique  
25 road safety challenges and commit to engaging with

1 First Nations to understand and address those  
2 challenges. Correct?

3 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

4 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And third, to  
5 continuously improve the road safety data ecosystem to  
6 support the initiatives of internal and external road  
7 safety stakeholders. Correct?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's also correct.

9 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And it's -- it's  
10 our understanding -- and I'll ask you to confirm --  
11 that the road safety strategy is -- is divided into  
12 two (2) phases.

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

14 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And the two (2)  
15 phases of the strategy refer to tasks taking place in  
16 different time periods. Correct?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

18 Although I will kind of reiterate -- as I noted before  
19 -- not a calendar-driven exercise. We are doing two  
20 (2) things at once.

21 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Yeah. And I -- I  
22 understand that and thank you for that clarification.

23 Would you agree that one (1) purpose of  
24 phase one (1) is to develop baseline data sets?

25 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's



1 accurate.

2 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And that phase two  
3 (2) is focused on using new data to inform road safety  
4 interventions addressing root causes of serious  
5 collisions?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. That would be  
7 the focus of the second phase.

8 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you. Ms.  
9 Schubert, could I ask you to take us to page 5 of  
10 Appendix 1 to CAC-MPI-175?

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And page 5,  
15 please. Thank you.

16 And could you confirm briefly for me,  
17 Mr. Doell, that -- that this document on the screen in  
18 front of you is MPI's 2022 to 2025 road safety  
19 strategy?

20 MR. BRYCE DOELL: It is, yes.

21 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And MPI identifies  
22 objective one (1) of phase one (1) -- and I'm  
23 summarizing here, but I'll ask you to confirm for the  
24 benefit of the Panel -- that objective one (1) is to  
25 conduct research to develop a baseline understanding

1 of high risk behaviours. Is that correct?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

3 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And in its  
4 description of the activities under objective one (1),  
5 MPI lists research on prevalence of distracted  
6 driving, seatbelt use, and speeding as part of its  
7 plans to develop baseline data sets. Is that correct?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

9 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And we see those  
10 there in -- in the first bullet?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct, yes.

12 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Earlier today, I  
13 heard you add a fourth (4th) item to that list of --  
14 of priorities for phase one (1). And that was  
15 impairment.

16 Can you confirm whether MPI is also  
17 developing a baseline data set with respect to  
18 impairment as part of phase one (1) of the strategy?

19 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. That's  
20 accurate. At the time of authorship of this document  
21 there was still some uncertainty as to the timing of  
22 the impaired driving study, given the COVID-19  
23 situation. And that's the reason it wasn't included  
24 in phase 1 here.

25 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you. And,

1 in the second bullet we see an activity that I believe  
2 Mr. Triggs has described already this morning, which  
3 is to identify the root causes of fatalities through  
4 detailed data analysis, going back to 2019.

5 Is that correct?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

7 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And recognizing  
8 his comment that -- that -- analyzing the causes of  
9 fatalities is an on-going exercise, has the specific  
10 activity described at bullet 2, being an analysis  
11 going back to 2019, taken place?

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, the analysis of  
13 2021 has taken place and that's when I referred to my  
14 opening remarks, where we talked about the individuals  
15 with high risk driving behaviour. Males 25 to 34 and  
16 65 plus in rural areas and First Nations being an  
17 issue.

18 2019/2020 those -- that work still has  
19 to take place, but the way this type of analytical  
20 work goes is that there's a lot of work to gathering  
21 clean data to start, which we've done as part of that  
22 2021 analysis. So, the -- only one (1) year is  
23 completed the -- the larger task is farther along than  
24 -- might indicate with just the 2021 completed.

25 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And I appreciate

1 that. Thank you for that response.

2 Is it a possibility that through that  
3 activity described here at bullet 2, that MPI might  
4 identify additional subject areas that might require  
5 the development of a baseline data set as part of  
6 phase 1 of the Road Safety Strategy?

7 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's certainly a  
8 possibility. Yes.

9 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you. And,  
10 Ms. Schubert, if I could ask you to scroll down to  
11 Objective 2, which I believe is at the top of the next  
12 page, here.

13 Mr. Doell, can you confirm that  
14 Objective 2 requires MPI to critically evaluate the  
15 success of its existing road safety Initiatives?

16 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That is accurate.  
17 Yes.

18 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Can you confirm  
19 whether or not these activities under phase 1 have  
20 been completed?

21 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So the -- the  
22 analysis of the effectiveness of existing road safety  
23 programs, that has been completed and that was when I  
24 referred to my opening remarks in terms of developing  
25 analytical methodologies, gathering data and so forth.

1 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I'll speak to a  
2 little bit more detail on -- on that. It was a -- a  
3 report that's in -- prepared draft, is approximately,  
4 about 130 -- 50 pages long. It's on my desk. I've  
5 gotten half-way through the -- the reading of it.  
6 I've had questions that have to go back to the staff  
7 to, you know, confirm up for the final report, but it  
8 is close to being completed.

9 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you for that  
10 clarification, Mr. Triggs, and, Mr. Doell, for your  
11 answer earlier. Ms. Schubert, can I ask you to scroll  
12 to page 8 please.

13 And, down the page, under the heading  
14 Road Safety Data Ecosystem. Mr. Doell, could you  
15 please confirm that, under Objective 1, here under the  
16 heading of Road Safety Data Ecosystem, MPI's proposed  
17 to develop a decision matrix for use in planning its  
18 road safety interventions?

19 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

20 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And, we see that  
21 here at bullet -- at the first bullet under Objective  
22 1 on page 8, correct?

23 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Correct.

24 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And can you  
25 confirm that it's MPI's plan to use this matrix to

1 determine which new Road Safety Initiatives to pursue  
2 based on three (3) items being their target issues,  
3 likelihood of success and resource requirements.

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's also  
5 accurate. Yes.

6 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Do you anticipate  
7 that this matrix will substantially change MPI's road  
8 safety planning and decision making?

9 MR. BRYCE DOELL: The -- I -- I think  
10 that depends on the ideas that are brought forward. I  
11 -- I don't want to pre-judge the ideas that the -- the  
12 road safety team brings to us.

13 So, essentially, the method we're  
14 taking is that we've got a team of experts who know  
15 road safety inside and out and we've empowered them to  
16 bring ideas forward to us.

17 So, I'm not in a position to pre-judge  
18 what ideas will be prepared under that new framework.

19 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: I appreciate that  
20 and I -- I don't think I'm asking you to do that.

21 But, with respect to MPI's use of the  
22 matrix, I'm wondering if you can confirm whether or  
23 not the process, by which those ideas are vetted, will  
24 change substantially. And I recognize that's an  
25 objective term.

1 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Okay, at a -- at  
2 a high level, we're trying to accomplish with this  
3 strategy and it -- it's been kind of referenced a bit  
4 in some of the statements that I've made.

5 Otherwise, that you've brought forward  
6 here, is that, we want to use the data, analyze it,  
7 what's the root causes of it. Determine if there is  
8 any sort of program with -- what's a strategy for  
9 addressing those root causes and then we'll -- those  
10 strategies, be, you know, wise use of the -- the  
11 resources that -- that funds to go for it.

12 So, for instance, if -- now, I'm just  
13 going to make numbers up. If -- if we decided that,  
14 you know, we can come forward with ten (10) million  
15 dollars (\$10,000,000) worth of spending, additional  
16 spending on new projects, they're going to have  
17 benefit for reducing fatalities and serious injuries.

18 We'll be pursuing that. Tanya Dawes  
19 (phonetic) will come to this Board explain why we're -  
20 - we're going to do that.

21 But I'm not going to be spending  
22 \$10,000,000 just for the sake of having a big budget.  
23 I want to make sure that that money is wisely used.  
24 So there has to be some merit to the program. The  
25 initiatives that we're bringing forward in order to do

1 that. An that's -- this here is designed to give us  
2 some rigour and guidelines around how our thought  
3 process for approving -- and is -- well, that seems  
4 like a good idea, let's do that, you know.

5 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thanks, Mr.  
6 Triggs. Ms. Schubert, could I ask you to pull up  
7 Exhibit 50 on the screen and specifically pro forma 5.

8 And before I refer your attention to  
9 this page, one (1) last question with respect to the  
10 decision-making matrix and the road safety strategy.  
11 Has that been developed? And is it in use?

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: It's under  
13 development now. Not in use yet.

14 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you. If I  
15 can draw your attention to line 19 of the document in  
16 front of you.

17 I'll ask you to confirm that the Road  
18 Safety and Loss Prevention budget, as it was presented  
19 in the July 12th filing, was approximately twelve  
20 point 3 (12.3) million, let's say, with rounding?

21 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's  
22 accurate.

23 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And the difference  
24 between that figure and the road safety budget as  
25 presented in the October 12th rate update, we see



1 further along, line 19, is two hundred and two  
2 thousand dollars (\$202,000). Correct?

3 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.  
4 Yes.

5 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And, would you be  
6 able to confirm --

7 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I -- I'm just  
8 looking at the number here and it's -- maybe it's not  
9 me understanding the chart properly, but we had and  
10 it's in other documents that we have put forward, that  
11 the -- the budget has been increased by two million  
12 dollars (\$2,000,000) so it should be, I think, around  
13 fourteen million (14,000,000) , but I -- I'm uncertain  
14 as to that.

15 I may have to speak with some of our  
16 finance people to get more accurate explanations what  
17 this particular document is saying, but the intent is  
18 that the budget is increasing to fourteen million  
19 (14,000,000).

20 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And that might be  
21 the case, Mr. Triggs, if we scroll down to pro forma 6  
22 referring to the '23/'24 year. Again, at line 19.

23 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Correct. Yes.  
24 I've --

25 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Okay.

1 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: -- that's got it.  
2 I was looking -- I was thinking that's this coming  
3 rate year as opposed to the -- the current rate year.

4 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Yeah, no. I  
5 understand. And -- and -- and thank you for that.

6 And so, to ask the same question about  
7 the '23/'24 year, Mr. Doell, the road safety budget  
8 between the July 12th filing and the October rate  
9 update, has increased from 12.6 to 14.9, almost  
10 fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000). Correct?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

12 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And, if we go over  
13 one (1) column to the right, pro forma 6 presents the  
14 variance between those two (2) as -- as being  
15 approximately 2.3 million.

16 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's accurate.  
17 Yes.

18 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And that's a  
19 change in the projected budget for the 2023/'24 fiscal  
20 year between July 12th and October 12th of the --  
21 presented on July 12th first and then October 12th of  
22 this year. Correct.

23 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

24 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And I -- I  
25 apologize for the compound question, but thank you for

1 keeping up with me.

2                   And, can you confirm and -- and I -- I  
3 believe this was eluded to in your discussion with Ms.  
4 -- with my friend Ms. Moore, early -- earlier, but is  
5 it accurate to say that that approximately 2.3 budget  
6 -- million dollar budget increase is not tied to  
7 specific programming changes put in place between July  
8 12th and October 12th of this year?

9                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS:   Generally  
10 correct. I think we we're having some minor  
11 programming changes, adjustments of, you know, like  
12 the -- the .3 -- \$300,000 is spread out. Some of the  
13 other programs, additional in -- spends on that but  
14 the \$2 million extra is unassigned program  
15 initiatives.

16                   MR. CHRIS KLASSEN:   Thank you. And  
17 so, to confirm, then, the decision-making matrix that  
18 MPI has proposed through Phase 1 of its road safety  
19 strategy has not been used to justify the budget  
20 increase for the year 2023/'24?

21                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS:   No. As -- as I -  
22 - Mr. Doell had said, and as I explained there, the  
23 past process of doing all these works in advance of,  
24 you know, eighteen (18) months, in advance of when  
25 that money is actually going to be used, is not a -- a

1 prudent way to address road safety issues. You have  
2 to have the funds available but, prior to spending  
3 those funds, then you go through the prudent exercise  
4 of, you know, applying the matrix to make sure that  
5 these monies are appropriately spent.

6 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you. Ms.  
7 Schubert, would you mind pulling up the -- the slides  
8 presented by Mr. Doell this morning and I believe I'm  
9 looking for slide 19. Thank you.

10 Mr. Doell, can you confirm that the  
11 slide in front of us presents a historical summary of  
12 MPI's road safety budgets, presenting one into the  
13 future '23/'24, and going back five (5) years to  
14 2018/'19? Correct?

15 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct. It  
16 presents the actual spend from 2018 through '21/'22,  
17 with forecast numbers for '22/'23 and budget for  
18 '23/'24.

19 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you. And  
20 not getting into specifics, but we see in -- in actual  
21 spends and -- and, if -- if we exclude the pandemic  
22 year of 2021, MPI's road safety spending to date, as  
23 presented on the table, ranges from roughly 10.3  
24 million up to 12.2, which is this -- in the current --  
25 the current year. Correct?

1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

2 Yes.

3 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And, just to  
4 provide a little bit of a -- a longer term perspective  
5 for the benefits of our client and the Board, Ms.  
6 Schubert, could you please pull on to the screen Order  
7 151 of 2013 at page 44.

8 And, Mr. Doell, can you confirm that,  
9 in your role, exercising oversight, along with Mr.  
10 Triggs and Mr. Sarginson, of course, of the road  
11 safety programming, you have undertaken a review of --  
12 of past Public Utilities Board Orders respecting MPI's  
13 road safety work?

14 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. That's  
15 accurate.

16 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And will you have  
17 reviewed at -- at one point in the past, Order 151 of  
18 '13 as -- as part of that exercise?

19 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I'm not familiar  
20 with this specific document or specific section but I  
21 -- I do see it here up on the screen.

22 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you. And --  
23 and I'll ask you to refer to the first paragraph,  
24 under the heading Section 8, Road Safety, and simply  
25 to confirm that the Corporation's actual road safety

1 expenses in the 2012/'13 year were approximately 13.1  
2 million. Correct?

3 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That is correct.

4 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: And, Ms. Schubert,  
5 if we could turn now to Order 135 of '14, the  
6 following year, at page 60.

7 And, again, in the first paragraph,  
8 under the heading here, Mr. Doell, I'll ask you to  
9 confirm that, in the 2014 -- '13/'14 year, the  
10 Corporation's actual road safety and loss prevention  
11 expenses were approximately \$12.8 million?

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's accurate.  
13 Yes.

14 MR. CHRIS KLASSEN: Thank you, Mr.  
15 Doell, and, Mr. Triggs, for your responses to my  
16 questions.

17 Madam Chair, for CAC (Manitoba) those  
18 are our questions. Thank you.

19 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr.  
20 Klassen. Ms. Meek...?

21 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: I think,  
22 actually, Madam Chair, Mr. Monnin is going to go ahead  
23 first, today, if that pleases the Board?

24 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank  
25 you. Mr. Monnin...?

1 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Thank you,  
2 Madam Chair.

3

4 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:

5 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: I'd like to  
6 start with some initial questions that flowed from the  
7 presentation of this morning.

8 Mr. Triggs, following up on what was  
9 shared this morning about the additional \$2 million  
10 being made available, I understood your evidence, from  
11 earlier today, was that you need to act fast on these  
12 strategies, and I understand that that \$2 million  
13 increase is -- is part and parcel of that desire to be  
14 more nimble and act fast. Is that fair to say?

15 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes, it is.

16 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And is that  
17 based on past experience that the -- the Corporation  
18 wasn't able to act as nimbly or as fast as it wished  
19 to do so with regards to road safety and that's why  
20 we're seeing this increase of \$2 million?

21 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: It's -- goes to  
22 the -- there's a number of factors that went into that  
23 decision to increase the -- the \$2 million budget.  
24 The first part of it was the -- the response of the  
25 budget-making process, which is long, drawn-out, you

1 know, you -- and, if you're going to spend some money,  
2 basically, you have to know what it is eighteen (18)  
3 months in advance. That's not an agile process.

4           The Corporation is developing agile  
5 processes for its work across the -- the organization  
6 as a whole. So, we want to be able to react quicker  
7 to things, coming to -- to speed on this.

8           An -- another thing that came in to it,  
9 one is I started looking at, you know, what I'm  
10 accountable for, and it's that downward trend that we  
11 spoke to. That's what, you know, my boss has set for  
12 me, to be accountable for.

13           I looked at this and it's just -- it's  
14 all kind of the timing of things that went through.  
15 So, okay, we're going to, you know, do some studies,  
16 and, then, we're going to make some programs, and  
17 then, the program is going to be implemented, and  
18 then, maybe, we're going to see some results.

19           The time we're seeing some results,  
20 we're talking three (3), four (4) years down the line,  
21 and, to me, that -- do not meet with what my  
22 responsibilities were -- were for.

23           So, what I had then asked, you know,  
24 the team to do, and what I had asked the executive  
25 team and, ultimately, the board of directors, to do



1 was, okay, let's accelerate this process. Let's get -  
2 - we should be able to, when we get the -- the data  
3 from the analysis on that, let -- we should be able to  
4 think about programs a lot quicker than -- and develop  
5 those programs quicker, and let's implement those  
6 quicker.

7                   If I have to wait for a budget cycle to  
8 do it, we can't do that. That defeats the purpose.  
9 So, what I want to have the budget cycle -- our  
10 budgeting process aligned with the thought process or  
11 quick implementation. So, that's why the -- it came  
12 up.

13                   So, where do I have \$2 million from?  
14 No, I don't have that but, when we just, you know what  
15 -- I'm not -- I don't know what we're going to spend  
16 that on today but the idea is I want this team to be  
17 empowered to analyze their data and -- and the experts  
18 that Bryce has referred to come up with solutions,  
19 come up with ideas and bring those forward as quick as  
20 you can and, then, we can implement those as quick as  
21 they -- we can. So, that's how we're going to see the  
22 -- the changes.

23                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Thank you for  
24 that answer. So, it -- it is -- the new format -- it  
25 isn't based on any previous lost opportunities from

1 road safety planning in the past? You're not  
2 anchoring this decision, say, well, two (2) years ago,  
3 we had a really great whiz-bang idea but we couldn't  
4 get it off the ground because we couldn't get access  
5 to funds? Is -- is -- is that fair to say?

6

7

(BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes. That is  
10 fair to say, and I just wanted to confirm that there  
11 wasn't any specific examples, you know. This -- this  
12 came from my perspective on how things were working.

13 Well, this really is looking forward to  
14 what we needed to do and just kind of as assessment of  
15 how, you know, the budget cycle worked and, having sat  
16 through, you know, since 2009, all of the road safety  
17 hearings have been held at the PUB and that and I  
18 think there's got to be a better way of doing things.  
19 So, that's the approach.

20 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And I seem to  
21 recall in -- in this panel's exchange, with Board  
22 Counsel Moore, with regards to previous road safety  
23 budgets, and that, consistently, those budgets were  
24 underspent. Is that fair to say?

25 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: That would be and

1 there -- there's a number of reasons. Most recently  
2 is the -- the pandemic but one (1) of the challenges -  
3 - our -- our biggest area where we -- or single area  
4 spent is the enhanced enforcement area.

5           And, you know, one (1) of the  
6 challenges we're facing right now with -- with that is  
7 that the police forces, like everyone else, is -- are  
8 having staffing shortages. So, it may be a great idea  
9 that we want to have enhanced RCMP officers doing  
10 overtime in the Interlake area to deal with speeding  
11 and seatbelts and -- and so forth but they don't have  
12 the staff to do that. We can't spend the money there  
13 on that

14           So, we have to work with -- that  
15 presents a challenge. That's a unique challenge  
16 that's coming up for us on that, so. A lot of the  
17 programs are based upon other people being able to  
18 spend the money that we're making available for them  
19 and if they can't to that, then we can't spend --  
20 that's where we come up with these deficiencies.

21           MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And -- and so  
22 that would likely be the same -- those -- those  
23 factors or considerations, excluding the pandemic  
24 let's -- let's all hope, those factors for staffing  
25 shortages, or -- that would apply to the same \$2

1 million, that you might not be able to get that out of  
2 the door with programming because of things out of  
3 your control.

4 Is that fair to say?

5 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: That is a -- a  
6 possibility, because we don't know where we're  
7 actually going to spend that. It may not be an  
8 enhanced enforcement, it may be in some other area  
9 where we do have that opportunity, but we don't know  
10 at this point in time.

11 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And so, fair to  
12 say that this \$2 million is earmarked, but there's no  
13 commitment to spend that on actual tangible programs  
14 sitting here today?

15 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes, I think  
16 we're clear that nothing has been established at this  
17 point in time. That is -- is our goal to be -- have -  
18 - have this money available so that when these  
19 programs are being developed, staff knows that they  
20 can actually -- it's there to be spent as opposed, oh,  
21 let's wait eighteen (18) months for the next budget  
22 cycle before we can actually do -- act on it.

23 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And what is the  
24 Corporation's position on that \$2 million earmarked  
25 amount? If it isn't spent, is that carried over or

1 does it increased by a similar amount for the -- for  
2 the next cycle?

3 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: We haven't made  
4 any decisions on that. It's going to be a kind of  
5 play it by ear process. One of the things that, you  
6 know, the Corporation prides itself on is we don't do  
7 the typical, you know, air quotes, government spend.  
8 If you -- if you don't spend it this year you lose it,  
9 the budgeting.

10 We don't do that. If it doesn't get  
11 spent it doesn't mean that the money is not going to  
12 be, you know, sought there for next year.

13 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And -- and any  
14 consideration given to whether it's a sinking fund or  
15 replenished fund? Say if you spend a million dollars  
16 of that in this cycle, will it be -- with that million  
17 dollars be carried over as a sinking fund or will it  
18 be rep -- replenished to -- to \$2 million in -- in the  
19 next cycle?

20 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: We haven't had  
21 that discussion.

22 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Is it fair to  
23 say that this has really been shared with -- with us  
24 and -- and the Panel today. Is that fair to say?

25 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I'm not sure what

1 you mean by that.

2 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Well, we -- we  
3 heard about this announcement today and I believe Mr.  
4 Doell was -- in his evidence was -- was speaking about  
5 that and -- and I understood his submissions was this  
6 was being shared with you this morning.

7 Is it fair to say that this is being  
8 elaborated by me asking you questions about it this  
9 morning?

10 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes.

11 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And turning now  
12 to -- to road safety, the new strategy, is it fair to  
13 say that a lot of it -- a lot of that is being -- a  
14 lot of emphasis is being put on the importance of  
15 data?

16 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Absolutely.

17 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Because data is  
18 -- is information and that's important to have in  
19 order to make decisions?

20 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Correct.

21 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And when Mr.  
22 Doell was being asked questions by Board counsel Moore  
23 with regards to whether there's any research being  
24 done with respect to increase in collisions and  
25 pedestrians, I believe the evidence was that we need

1 to take time to understand that data.

2 Is that fair to say?

3 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I -- I think  
4 though it's -- there is -- fatalities are happening,  
5 unfortunately, on a weekly basis. And as that  
6 information comes in, we have to analyse that data. I  
7 think that's what the discussion was about.

8 In ord -- you have to analyse that data  
9 in order to come to conclusions on -- on it.

10 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: You have to  
11 have a fair amount of time with that information in  
12 order to decipher it and then make a decision and move  
13 forward.

14 That's fair to say?

15 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Absolutely.

16 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay. Kristen,  
17 could you take us to slide 10, for example, of the  
18 presentation of MPI this morning? Research in support  
19 of MPI's road safety strategy.

20 I believe I heard Mr. Doell referring  
21 to the seatbelt and electronic study as -- as  
22 groundbreaking.

23 Is that fair to say?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yeah, there was  
25 groundbreaking findings for us, absolutely.

1 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And -- and  
2 slide 14, please. This was more information about  
3 evaluating the effectiveness of the road safety  
4 programs, that you've conducted a comprehensive  
5 evaluation on the road safety programs, and slide 15,  
6 please.

7 And again, analysing the causes, but  
8 this is more data that -- that's -- we're -- we're  
9 really getting this in real time. If you go back to  
10 slide 10, the research was done in September of this  
11 year and there's more research that's being shared in  
12 December of this year and then some being concluded in  
13 October this year.

14 Is that fair to say?

15 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Just to clarify the  
16 seatbelts and electronic communication device study  
17 was in September of last year.

18 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay.

19 MR. BRYCE DOELL: The remaining  
20 studies are in --

21 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Fair enough.  
22 I appreciate that. Thank you. But speeding studies  
23 December '22?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: The speed study is a  
25 two (2) phase study, so we looked at dry road



1 conditions in May and June and then we're also going  
2 to be conducting a second phase of the study in  
3 November and December to understand how speeding  
4 differs in dry road conditions versus winter road  
5 conditions. So that study is partially completed.

6 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: In -- in the  
7 context of -- of this General Rate Application, I  
8 appreciate the Corporation's position, or view on --  
9 on road safety and GRAs generally, but my  
10 understanding is that road safety hasn't been in front  
11 of this Board since 2019 as an issue for  
12 consideration.

13 Now, there's good meaningful work being  
14 done at the technical conference, but some of this  
15 information is being shared with us in real time  
16 today.

17 How is this Board and -- and how are we  
18 in or -- how are able -- what are we supposed to do  
19 with this information in the short time that we have  
20 today? This is just sharing the information and we'll  
21 deal with it at -- at the technical conference?

22 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Well, that's one  
23 (1) of the concerns I've had with the -- the whole  
24 process of road safety at the GRA process. I -- I  
25 don't think it's a -- really a -- a valuable use of

1 time and resources to address the road safety matters  
2 on that.

3           There's a lot of time that goes into  
4 this. What we're trying to do through this data and  
5 this presentation today is an update to show the --  
6 the Panel, you know, what -- that work is continuing  
7 on -- ongoing on this.

8           So, in June we presented information.  
9 It was a status report of what has happened, what MPI  
10 is doing. This presentation day is new information  
11 that has come up since that point in time.

12           The major development was the analysis  
13 of the 2021 fatalities that came up in September. We  
14 completed that, so that's post the -- the technical  
15 conference. The budgeting component, that decision  
16 again, that was made post the technical conference.

17           So, it -- the -- really what the  
18 technical conference always does and even at the -- a  
19 lot of times at -- at this is sharing information on  
20 road safety programs. It's not getting to the  
21 fundamental -- the big issue for this Board, what it  
22 needs to do is -- well, is -- what's MPI spending on  
23 road safety, because obviously you spend more -- if  
24 you're spending the money effectively on road safety  
25 and it's reducing claims costs, that's going to affect

1 their premium.

2                   So, the Board wants to know, how much  
3 is it spending on road safety? Is it an effective use  
4 of that money? Are the programs that you're doing  
5 adequate, are they accomplishing those tasks?

6                   Should be spending more money, should  
7 be spending less money. Those are the kind of -- the  
8 questions that the committee or the panel here needs  
9 to consider. We get into a lot more detail in past  
10 hearings and even at the road safety technical  
11 conference.

12                   We've got, you know, heat maps, and so  
13 forth and so on. I don't see how -- from my personal  
14 experience, I don't see how that helps the Panel make  
15 this decision on whether or not MPI is spending enough  
16 money or the money it's spending is appropriate on,  
17 you know, road safety to reduce the claims cost  
18 component of it.

19                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And -- and if I  
20 can just clarify, and -- and I -- if I can resist a  
21 little bit of what you said on this question. I  
22 believe I heard you say, I don't think that road  
23 safety is -- is appropriate here, and you also said  
24 personally.

25                   But when you say that, you're speaking

1 on behalf of the Corporation, not on behalf of Mr.  
2 Triggs, correct?

3 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yeah. When --  
4 when I'm speaking, I'm speaking of an officer of the  
5 Corporation on that.

6 Now, let's be clear on this, it -- it's  
7 not that road safety is not important. Road safety is  
8 absolutely important and it's absolutely important for  
9 the reasons that I said it was.

10 But the level of detail that we get  
11 into at the technical conference, and we get to the  
12 Panel -- the hearing, I don't see from my pers -- from  
13 my perspective. I don't see how this helps the -- the  
14 Panel make its decision that it does.

15 If it -- if the Panel members do find  
16 value and benefit, how that helps them determine the  
17 rates that are proving are appropriate, I'd appreciate  
18 to know that, so that I can then make better  
19 presentations.

20 Because ultimately my other -- wearing  
21 my other hat, I'm accountable for the -- the General  
22 Rate Application. And if things are -- that MPI is  
23 doing is not satisfactory for the Panel, I need to  
24 know that.

25 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And so, if --

1 if the Panel were to direct the Corporation, and by  
2 association yourself, to provide more timely and more  
3 thorough data with respect to road safety, the  
4 Corporation and Mr. Triggs would comply with that?

5 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Absolutely. I  
6 would also -- if they wished that, I'd appreciate to  
7 understand, you know, the reason why. So if there's  
8 information that the -- the Panel needs to make its  
9 decisions, we would like to understand the reasons  
10 behind it, so then if there's more information related  
11 to it or various perspectives on it, we can provide  
12 that information as well.

13 We want to be helpful to the Panel,  
14 make them able to do their decisions as best they can.  
15 A lot of times, you know, unfortunately, we don't  
16 really have a dialogue with the -- the Panel on, you  
17 know, what works and what doesn't work, so we're  
18 guessing a lot of times on why the information is  
19 being sought and what purposes it's for.

20 If we understood the context, we could  
21 provide maybe better perhaps information or better  
22 context for the Panel.

23 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Thank you. I'd  
24 like to ask you some questions about the road safety  
25 strategy. And I'd like to start you -- start this --

1 it can be found at CAC-MPI-1-75.

2 In particular, starting at page 3 under  
3 the heading 'Introduction', given what I've heard this  
4 morning as evidence and -- and what's contained in  
5 here, I have some questions with respect to -- to  
6 vision. And it reads -- the document provides the  
7 vision is:

8 "Understanding the motor vehicle  
9 fatalities, injuries, and collisions  
10 are preventable, we envision a future  
11 where Manitoba's traffic fatalities  
12 and serious injuries are reduced to  
13 zero."

14 Would -- would any member of the panel  
15 care to chime in? Would you -- with this suggestion  
16 that someone reading this vision statement would be  
17 left with the impression and the understanding that  
18 Manitoba Public Insurance's road safety strategy is  
19 committed to what is referred to as Vision Zero?

20 Is that fair to say?

21 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I -- yes, we are  
22 committed to that, but what's also part of this is  
23 what can we do in the context of that road -- because  
24 that Road to Zero concept is beyond just, you know,  
25 MPI. That involves all the stakeholders associated

1 with road safety.

2           As -- as I said earlier, our biggest  
3 strength is our data and, you know, we -- we see  
4 actually -- the data must be shared beyond just this  
5 Panel, this process. We have tons of data out there  
6 that the stakeholders need to have easy access to.

7           It's -- you need a lot of the capacity  
8 and capabilities in order -- as a basis to put that  
9 forward, put it out there, but ultimately the goal is  
10 is so that the people who are making decision, whether  
11 it's the RCMP, the City of Winnipeg, Winnipeg's police  
12 forces, municipalities throughout the province, if  
13 they have the data for making decisions, that's going  
14 to help drive those numbers down and will hopefully  
15 achieve that reduction to zero.

16           That's what our goal is. Now, the  
17 challenges for us is to be able to collate, present  
18 that, make that data available. That's kind of a  
19 longer-term project, but we -- in an ideal world, we'd  
20 like to have people go on to our website and be able  
21 to, you know, do searches and analysis and come up  
22 with information for that.

23           You know, when the -- Bryce's team,  
24 they did, you know, an analysis of the reports that --  
25 I mean, all the programs that we did. We did

1 something like sixteen (16) programs on it.

2 One (1) of the things that struck me  
3 with that is that a lot of the bases for evaluating  
4 the approach was, you know -- was studies that were  
5 done, academic studies, or research done, you know,  
6 about five (5), ten (10), whatever many years ago is -  
7 - is the base. So that's the only thing out there for  
8 it.

9 Well, we at Manitoba Public Insurance,  
10 we have unique data out there, as I said. We have the  
11 ability to tie collisions to the drivers involved in  
12 it, their driving history, their -- their driver  
13 education history, all that information.

14 If we can get that data out to the  
15 public, there's -- that's where we're going to be able  
16 to make changes in -- in how road safety is dealt  
17 with. And that's what our ultimate goal is. We can  
18 make decisions for ourselves and programs we're going  
19 to have, but the bigger impact is going to be more  
20 longer term.

21 When we get this data out to the public  
22 like Bike Winnipeg or maybe someone in Ontario,  
23 wherever it may be, they can use this data to find --  
24 make improvements in road safety.

25 As I said at the start of the



1 introduction, what I'm looking for here in this whole  
2 race is a paradigm shift in the thinking in which we  
3 approach this problem. Our strength is data, and we  
4 have to get that data out to the public.

5 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Now, thank you  
6 for that. That's not in the vision statement, is it?

7 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: (NO AUDIBLE  
8 RESPONSE).

9 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And so the  
10 question was a very simple one, I -- I would suggest.  
11 It's -- it's: If someone were to read the vision  
12 statement, which is a forward-facing document by the  
13 Corporation, I suggest to you that if someone were to  
14 read it, their understanding would be that, based on  
15 the vision statement, that there's a commitment to  
16 Vision Zero. Is that fair to say?

17 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes.

18 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay. But  
19 based on your decision and -- and from what I'm going  
20 to suggest to you -- sorry, based on your -- your  
21 response and -- and some of these questions I have for  
22 you, I'm going to suggest to you that it -- that it  
23 isn't for a host of reasons that you've just  
24 explained.

25 If you turn to page 4 of the Road

1 Safety Strategy, at the second paragraph, we have --  
2 it says -- it says:

3 "Manitoba Public Insurance setting  
4 out the Road -- the Road to Zero.  
5 Manitoba Road Safety plan 2017/2020  
6 sought to accelerated previous  
7 downward trends in the number of  
8 fatalities or serious injuries."

9 And it further states:

10 "In spite of several successful  
11 initiatives, the overall Road to Zero  
12 Plan was not able to achieve its goal  
13 with the trend in traffic fatalities  
14 plateauing over the years from 2017  
15 to 2020."

16 And so the question for the panel is:  
17 Reading that, or taking into account what I just read  
18 to you from your Road Safety Strategy, that someone  
19 reading this would understand that the 2017 to 2020  
20 plan did not have the effect of accelerating a  
21 previous downward trend in the number of fatalities or  
22 serious injuries, correct?

23 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes, I would  
24 agree. Ultimately, you know, going back to the vision  
25 statement there, ultimately we want to get to that

1 Road to Zero, which means, you know, zero fatalities.

2 Did the plan of -- the Manitoba Road  
3 Safety plan 2017/2022 accomplish that? No.

4 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: In fact --

5 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: And that's why  
6 MPI has developed this new strategy for itself. You  
7 know, there's two (2) different plans we've talked  
8 about, and Mr. Doell has referred to it, is that, you  
9 know, there's the Provincial Road Safety Plan which  
10 has a number of different members, and then there's  
11 MPI's plan.

12 So MPI's plan is focussing on what it  
13 can do, where it can focus its strength on. Its  
14 strength is on this data and its use of that data,  
15 which is one (1) of the key objectives as outlined in  
16 this Road Safety Strategy.

17 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And so my  
18 understanding from -- from what's there and what  
19 you've just said, I'll suggest to you is that it  
20 acknowledges that the Road to Zero plateaued over the  
21 years that the plan was in effect, correct?

22 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Absolutely.

23 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And in the next  
24 paragraph, the new Safety Plan provides MPI's 2020/'25  
25 Road Safety Strategy and establishes a new path which

1 I think you've alluded to forward to -- for reducing  
2 traffic fatalities and serious injuries in Manitoba by  
3 adopting a data-driven approach to identifying root  
4 causes of -- of killed or seriously injured, KSI,  
5 collisions.

6 This new path doesn't seek to meet the  
7 goal of zero traffic fatalities or zero injuries, does  
8 it? It's just to reduce. Is that fair to say?

9 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Well, it's set in  
10 a time frame, and I think it's giving all the partners  
11 and all the causes that go into fatalities and -- and  
12 that, it is unrealistic to think that that can be  
13 accomplished by 2025. That's just -- that's not going  
14 to happen.

15 So this is a -- a plan for this period  
16 of time, this short three (3), four (4) year period,  
17 and what's MPI going to be doing in that three (3) or  
18 four (4) year period to address -- contribute to the  
19 attainment of that ultimate goal of zero fatalities.

20 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: This five (5)  
21 year plan doesn't address the ultimate goal of zero  
22 fatalities. It -- it doesn't go past the five (5)  
23 years. Fair to say?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: It's a five (5) year  
25 plan.

1 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: It is a five (5)  
2 year plan. Well, three (3) year plan. The -- the  
3 ultimate goal again, you know, what's the stretch  
4 target, what's the ultimate place where you want to  
5 be, is is that zero fatalities.

6 Are we going to get there in 2025?  
7 Absolutely not. But what are we going to do in order  
8 to move the needle, get towards that? And what can  
9 realistically be done in -- by 2025? And that's what  
10 this plan is to address.

11 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: If you could  
12 turn to Bike Winnipeg-MPI-2-3, please.

13 This is a series of questions that Bike  
14 Winnipeg put to MPI, more in the context of the City  
15 of Winnipeg's Road Safety Strategic Action Plan. But  
16 in response to question (c), at page 2 of 3, the  
17 question being:

18 "Does MPI's forecasted spending for  
19 road safety envision the ability to  
20 significantly change the shared  
21 belief system and associated actions  
22 of Manitoba drivers with respect to  
23 any specific issues?"

24 MPI provided the following answer.

25 "MPI's forecasted spending is

1                   intended to support" --

2                   Bear with me here.

3

4                                   (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:     The second

7 paragraph of the answer at 'C':

8                                   "MPI's forecasted spending is  
9                                   focussed on those issues that  
10                                  contribute to the most fatalities and  
11                                  serious injuries of Manitoba. MPI's  
12                                  forecasted spending envisions the  
13                                  ability to achieve the goals set out  
14                                  in the road safety strategy, downward  
15                                  trends, or the rates of fatalities  
16                                  and serious injuries in Manitoba from  
17                                  2022 to 2025, so the rates of  
18                                  Manitoba's reductions exceed the  
19                                  rates of the national average."

20                   Is it fair to say that this language is  
21 -- is carefully crafted to -- to suggest that we're --  
22 the Corporation's not even confident that it can  
23 achieve its goals? It's -- it's envisioning the  
24 ability to achieve those goals.

25                                   Is that intended to be crafted that

1 way, to -- to -- for someone like me to be reading  
2 that and getting that interpretation?

3 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, that's not  
4 correct. The -- the language was crafted to reflect  
5 the language used in the question. So, in other  
6 words, the -- the question referred to the ability to  
7 simply change the shared belief system of associated  
8 actions of Manitoba drivers with respect to any  
9 specific issues.

10 The language is simply reflecting the  
11 language posed in the question for clarity.

12 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Sure. But I'll  
13 -- I'll resist that answer with -- with this -- with  
14 this question. You -- it's responsive to the question  
15 that -- that you've identified where it says:

16 "...is not focussed on issues that  
17 contribute to the fatalities and  
18 serious injuries in Manitoba."

19 You could have stopped full stop there,  
20 and that would have been responsive to that question  
21 about changing culture. But it goes on saying, this  
22 is what our forecasted spending envisions.

23 Aside from the -- the previous  
24 question, Bike Winnipeg, the ability to achieve --

25 "...envisions the ability to achieve

1                   the goals set out in the road safety  
2                   strategy."

3                   And perhaps I'm misinterpreting that,  
4 and -- and that wouldn't be the first time in my  
5 career. But my suggestion here is it's crafted -- the  
6 language here is suggesting that it doesn't -- that  
7 the Corporation doesn't commit to reaching those  
8 goals, it envisions the ability to achieve them, which  
9 is -- is a lot more flexibility and what this plan is  
10 -- is trying to get to.

11                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, I -- I apologize  
12 if there's any lack of clarity in that answer, but I  
13 think we're very clear on the road safety strategy,  
14 the -- MPI's commitment to that goal of reducing the  
15 rates of fatalities and serious injuries below the  
16 rate of the national average.

17                   This response was certainly not meant  
18 to reduce our commitment to that goal. That is a firm  
19 commitment that we've made under the road safety  
20 strategy, and we do stand by that.

21                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And -- and I  
22 appreciate the answer. And -- and so, my takeaway is  
23 that the Corporation is committed to achieving the  
24 goals set out in the new road safety strategy; fair to  
25 say?



1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: We are committed to  
2 achieving the goals set out in the road safety  
3 strategy. That's correct.

4 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Madam Chair, I  
5 -- I see that it's -- it's noon. This is the break.  
6 And some of the questions I have I can pursue, but I'm  
7 in the Board's hands.

8 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Monnin,  
9 how long approximately do you have before you can  
10 move?

11 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: I think it  
12 depends on the answers, but I -- I would say it could  
13 be thirty (30), forty (40) minutes, maybe an hour. It  
14 depends on how we want to -- the collective way you  
15 want to deal with that.

16 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: No, that's  
17 fine then. Then I think we should probably break now  
18 for lunch. So, it's 11:57. Back at 1:00, please.

19 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Madam Chair,  
20 before we do that, I do have -- switching gears, I  
21 have -- I've been made aware that there's a filing  
22 that will occur later today that will correct an  
23 exhibit that's on the record. And so, I wanted to  
24 address that now if it's appropriate.

25 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Yes. That

1 would be great. Thank you.

2 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Okay. Thank you.

3 So, it has to deal with PUB-MPI-1-128, as Ms. Schubert  
4 has brought up. Just one (1) moment. That doesn't  
5 appear to be -- oh, there it is. Thank you so much.

6 So, this appendix -- and -- and the  
7 reason I bring it up, in particular, is because Mr.  
8 Bass asked a question about the capital requirements  
9 of the Corporation with the asset mixes that will be  
10 proposed under the new investment strategy.

11 And so, you'll see there under Other  
12 Metrics near the bottom of that chart there's a --  
13 there's a line that reads, "Minimum capital required."  
14 And over in -- on the right where it says, "Compared  
15 to current," you'll see at number 4 it reads, "MCTs  
16 are all higher."

17 So, I'm told by the Mercer  
18 representative, and we've confirmed this with Mr.  
19 Bunston, that that should in read "the minimum capital  
20 required will increase."

21 So, what that -- the effect of that is,  
22 indeed, the MCT percentages will decrease with the  
23 minimum capital requirement increasing. And so, we  
24 wanted to make that apparent. And, of course, the  
25 Capital Panel will be next week, I believe. And --

1 and you can ask any questions that may arise from that  
2 correction. But that correction will be filed later  
3 today. And --

4 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: So, just to be  
5 clear, number 4 will say "minimum capital required"?

6 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Yes.

7 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

8 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: "Minimum capital  
9 required will increase." And the effect of that will  
10 be the MCT percentage will -- will go down, which, of  
11 course, may impact the -- the rebate -- the rebates  
12 that are forecast in the future.

13 MR. GEORGE BASS: Except that -- and I  
14 appreciate that -- that clarification. And that does  
15 help because that was one (1) of the points I was  
16 getting at.

17 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Yeah.

18 MR. GEORGE BASS: But when I asked the  
19 question, Ms. Low testified that she has not done the  
20 MCT modelling.

21 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Right.

22 MR. GEORGE BASS: So, I'm not so sure  
23 how you can now give me a conclusion about MCT  
24 changing.

25 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Yes.

1 MR. GEORGE BASS: I accept the -- the  
2 part about required capital, that makes sense, but not  
3 the MCT based on her testimony.

4 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Right. And so,  
5 that may be just a directional -- some directional  
6 advise that Ms. Low provided, but, of course, you're  
7 going to have to ask her, Mr. Bass. I have no -- I  
8 can't comment on -- on that, obviously, so.

9 And it's -- it's good though that  
10 they're here next week so you can clarify that with  
11 her.

12 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank  
13 you. We'll pose those questions during the Capital  
14 Management Plan Panel.

15 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Yes. Thank you.

16 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.  
17 Anything further?

18 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: No.

19 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.  
20 We're adjourned then -- adjourned then until 1:00,  
21 please.

22

23 --- Upon recessing at 12:02 p.m.

24 --- Upon resuming at 1:00 p.m.

25

1 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

2 Mr. Monnin...?

3 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Thank you,

4 Madam Chair.

5

6 CONTINUED BY MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:

7 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: I'd like to ask

8 you some questions with regards to the overview of the

9 -- the road safety strategy in regards to data

10 collection.

11 My understanding is that the first

12 phase of road safety strategy is centred on developing

13 improved understanding of the current road safety

14 situation in Manitoba; more research - more data.

15 Fair to say?

16 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's fair to

17 say.

18 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And this will

19 be achieved through research and analysis to identify

20 the most common root causes of -- the vernacular being

21 KSI incidents. I know I'm not supposed to say that.

22 Killed or serious injury incidents. Fair to say?

23 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. That's fair to

24 say.

25 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And we're

1 almost near the end of 2022 and we've heard this  
2 morning of -- of some of the recent studies that have  
3 been done.

4 Is the data collection phase almost  
5 complete? Is there -- is there more ongoing?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: There are the  
7 outstanding studies that we've talked about already.  
8 Insofar as those are nearing completion, that data  
9 collection phase is nearing completion as well.

10 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And is it safe  
11 to say that MPI has a proponent of a safe systems  
12 approach to road safety?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. We're  
14 generally operating under the safe systems approach  
15 framework.

16 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And is -- is it  
17 safe to say the one (1) aspect of the safe systems  
18 approach is recognizing that there's -- the evidence  
19 to act already exists? Is that fair to say?

20 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I would say it's  
21 fair to say there is some evidence to act. I would  
22 say it would be over confident to say that we  
23 understand all of the problems that are currently  
24 ongoing, which is the reason why we're doing this  
25 research and analysis.

1 In short, I don't think all the answers  
2 are out there. I think there's still work to do.

3 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Fair. And  
4 perhaps we can go about it another way. You're -- MPI  
5 is doing their work on -- on some meaningful research  
6 that's valuable.

7 But there's other evidence -- there's  
8 other research out there that you can leverage. Fair  
9 to say?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Certainly. Yes.  
11 Yeah.

12 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And in that  
13 regard, MPI gathers results and data from the road  
14 safety programming of some -- some peer insurers or  
15 some peer entities such as SGI, for example, or ICBC.  
16 Fair to say?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Can I ask you to  
18 repeat the question?

19 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Sure. MPI  
20 already and does and has gathered results and data  
21 from road safety programming of, what I'll refer to  
22 as, peer insurers. Is that fair to say?

23 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yeah, we look what  
24 other jurisdictions are doing. That's correct.

25 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Sure. And MPI

1 maintains a regular dialogue related to road safety  
2 program ideas with its counterparts, such as  
3 Saskatchewan Government Insurance and such as  
4 Insurance Corporation of British Columbia.

5 Is that fair?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yeah, that's fair to  
7 say.

8 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And in -- in  
9 the -- those discussions, in that dialogue, is it fair  
10 to suggest that there might be some research and data  
11 in there that can be leveraged immediately.

12 Say, for example, with this new \$2  
13 million fund to act nimbly, is that something that MPI  
14 would -- would use that -- that fund for?

15 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Hypothetically, yes.  
16 If there was an issue that we could -- that we think  
17 could be addressed by a program for another  
18 jurisdiction, we would certainly entertain  
19 implementing that.

20 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And in light of  
21 this new earmarked amount of \$2 million, does MPI have  
22 any idea that it -- does MPI think that it will search  
23 out that existing data and evidence that is already  
24 there in order to leverage that data with easy --  
25 quicker access to -- to finances?



1 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: Yes. I -- I  
2 think it's important to clarify that MPI is not  
3 relying solely on the data we collect.

4 Of course, we would look to what's  
5 available elsewhere to make those decisions.

6 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: I'll put it a  
7 simpler way. If -- if you saw something that worked  
8 somewhere else and all you needed was to fund that --  
9 that -- what worked somewhere else, you wouldn't  
10 discount that. You might actually take a look at it  
11 and see, Can we put that into place immediately or  
12 quickly? Is that fair to say?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, it is. The  
14 other side of it where we want to focus on Manitoba's  
15 data though as well, is you want to be applying these  
16 programs in the right spots.

17 For example, you know, what came out in  
18 the data was that, you know, we high -- a very high  
19 uptake on seatbelt use in the city of Winnipeg. But  
20 not so much in the Interlake and -- and in Parkland  
21 areas.

22 So we don't want to be -- if we came  
23 across this excellent program for increasing uptake of  
24 seatbelt use, we wouldn't want to be necessarily  
25 applying it in Winnipeg. We would be focused on the

1 areas where we need to apply it.

2 So that's kind of how we want to focus  
3 our analysis of our data, so we can determine where  
4 best to apply programs.

5 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Sure. Let's  
6 pursue that a little bit more than, shall we?

7 So if -- if I understand that point,  
8 it's that seatbelt use is lower in rural areas in  
9 Manitoba. Right?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

11 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay. But I --  
12 I understand -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- that  
13 seatbelt use is lower in rural areas of, say, Ontario  
14 or Saskatchewan or other jurisdictions.

15 Is that fair to say?

16 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: That would be  
17 fair to say. Although I will add the caveat that we  
18 have insights beyond just the urban rural divide.

19 We have insights into seatbelt use in  
20 specific geographic locations within Manitoba, which  
21 is a more useful piece of information than probably  
22 speaking about rural communities in general.

23 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay. So maybe  
24 I can come to a landing on -- on my line of  
25 questioning here.

1                   With the \$2 million that has been  
2 earmarked, is it MPI's plan to only use that money for  
3 programming that flows from phase one (1) of its own  
4 road safety program? Or does it intend to use it for  
5 programs used in other jurisdictions that -- that may  
6 work in Manitoba?

7                   Have you -- has -- have you turned your  
8 mind to that?

9                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS:    What we'll be  
10 looking for is programs that work. So if you, you  
11 know -- speaking in hypotheticals, if there was a  
12 program out in Ontario that dealt with seatbelt uptake  
13 in rural areas, that we think, Okay, let's apply that  
14 to parts of Manitoba, then we would do that. It  
15 wouldn't apply to maybe a city of Winnipeg component.

16                   We're -- because \$2 million is a fair  
17 bit of money to spend on that. We're going to be  
18 looking, you know, not just at what we're doing, but  
19 other areas as well to try and determine what needs to  
20 be do (sic).

21                   The -- the first stage is to, you know,  
22 analyze the data and say, Okay, well, what -- again,  
23 it goes back to where in the root causes in the  
24 accidents in Manitoba on that.

25                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:   Right. But I

1 think MPI has determined that the root causes are  
2 seatbelt use, speeding, impaired driving, and  
3 distracted driving. Like, it's -- as of today, I  
4 gathered from your -- your presentation, the -- you've  
5 determined that those are the root causes.

6 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: That is at a very  
7 high level. With the analysis that just came out from  
8 the study that was completed in the 2021 fatalities,  
9 is that a lot of this though is -- there's particular  
10 drivers who are -- are causing all those incidences.  
11 And you look at the driving record.

12 So what we need to do is -- is really -  
13 - is our focus going to be on -- again, this is early,  
14 early stages. We haven't analyzed and put the  
15 thoughts into it. The information just came out in  
16 the last month.

17 But we want to look at these things and  
18 say, How can we approach those drivers who are causing  
19 this problem? That's going to be the key thing.

20 So we know that it's these drivers who  
21 are -- are speeding. These drivers who are  
22 distracted. The -- the impaired drivers. But they  
23 have a long history of suspensions and traffic  
24 violations and collisions and so forth.

25 So that's where we think there's going

1 to be a lot of, you know, bang for our buck is  
2 focusing on those people.

3 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay. So these  
4 four (4) key factors are -- are now -- it's based on  
5 high level data? Is that -- did I understand what --  
6 the evidence that was just given?

7 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: So those --  
8 those numbers that are referenced here are the number  
9 of fatalities related to distracted driving, speed,  
10 impaired driving, and occupant restraints.

11 There is much more that we need to  
12 understand about the details of each of those issues  
13 if we want to make an impact with targeted  
14 programming.

15 So when we talk about seatbelts, for  
16 instance, the root cause isn't just people aren't  
17 wearing their seatbelts, it's that young men in rural  
18 areas -- particularly the Interlake and Parkland  
19 regions -- wear seatbelts at a rate that is lower than  
20 the rest of the province.

21 That's a deeper level of insight beyond  
22 just this high-level issues that we intend to -- to  
23 drive our programming.

24 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay. So, if I  
25 -- I apologize for jumping around, but this is where

1 the -- the answers are leading me. If you can go to  
2 Bike Winnipeg MPI-2-3B. And that's questions with  
3 regards to...

4

5

(BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: I apologize.  
8 CMMG-MPI-2-6. This is questions from my friends at  
9 CMMG with regards to, I believe, the -- the large bike  
10 study.

11 And, in particular, in response to  
12 question A1 related to the large vehicle study, the  
13 answer is:

14 "MPI does not have programs planned  
15 related to large vehicles because it  
16 has decided to prioritize the issues  
17 of seatbelt use, distractions,  
18 speeding impairment."

19 And -- and I apologize, but I take that  
20 at being pretty firm about where you're focussing your  
21 money and where the spend's going to be. And it's not  
22 because it's high level, it's because it has decided  
23 that this is where you're going to be focussing the  
24 money.

25 Is that -- that's my takeaway from that

1 answer. Is that fair?

2 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: Perhaps I can  
3 clarify.

4 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay.

5 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: So, we do know  
6 that distraction, impairment, speed, and seatbelt use,  
7 those are the specific behaviours that cause the most  
8 amount of fatalities in Manitoba. So, we've  
9 identified as -- those as the priority areas that we  
10 need to focus our efforts on.

11 What we actually do about each of those  
12 areas is a little bit more nuanced, right. It's not  
13 enough to say we've got twenty-four (24) seatbelt  
14 deaths a year, we need to get people to wear more  
15 seatbelts. It's we need to understand who's not  
16 wearing, where are they not wearing them, why are not  
17 -- why are they not wearing them, and then what do we  
18 do about it.

19 So, the characterization of high level  
20 is, like, yes, that is the problem. But there's much  
21 more nuance that goes into actually addressing that  
22 underlying problem.

23 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay. So, now  
24 -- now that we're on the large vehicle study, let's --  
25 let's go to that, if -- if you don't mind. I have

1 some questions.

2                   There's been some questions put to MPI  
3 either by Bike Winnipeg, CMMG, or -- or Board counsel  
4 with regards to, in light of the large vehicle study,  
5 do you have any programs in place.

6                   And as I just read you the answer to  
7 the CMMG-2-6, was does not have any programs planned  
8 related to large vehicles because it has decided to  
9 prioritize issues of seatbelt use, distraction,  
10 speeding, and impairment. And -- and the same answer  
11 is given -- similar answer is given to Bike Winnipeg,  
12 Bike Winnipeg 2-8.

13                   At Bike Winnipeg 2-8, page 2 of 3, the  
14 second paragraph in:

15                   "MPI is aware of existing research  
16 on the role of vehicle size on the  
17 safety of others involved in a  
18 collision."

19                   A 2019 study from the Insurance  
20 Institute of -- for Highway Safety, IIHS, states that  
21 today's SUVs aren't a major threat to occupants of  
22 smaller vehicles.

23                   And I know that everyone can read from  
24 the screen, but I'm just making sure this is on the  
25 record.



1 "As a result of vehicle design  
2 changes that took place since the  
3 1980s and 1990s, since which time  
4 SUV designed -- SUV design posed a  
5 higher risk to smaller vehicles.  
6 The same study found that pickup  
7 trucks have not benefited from  
8 similar design changes and were two  
9 and a half times as similar to be  
10 involved in a crash that was fatal  
11 for a car or minivan driver, other  
12 cars or minivans.  
13 Studies on the effect of -- of  
14 vehicle size are not able to account  
15 for differences in vehicle  
16 behaviour."

17 So, this report that has now been cited  
18 in -- in Bike Winnipeg 2-8, the 2019 report, that's  
19 not referred anywhere in a large vehicle study that  
20 MPI prepared. Is that fair to say?

21 MR. BRYCE DOELL: The 2019 study  
22 you're referring to is from the Insurance Institute  
23 for Highway Safety.

24 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: But on the  
25 exercise that MPI was directed to do by this Board on

1 large -- on the large vehicle study, there's no  
2 reference to this report in that.

3 Is that fair to say?

4 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: Can I ask you  
5 to clarify? With respect to this specific paragraph  
6 or...?

7 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Anywhere. So,  
8 the 2019 Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, it's  
9 -- I'm suggesting that MPI talks about this report,  
10 saying that there's existing research on the role of  
11 vehicle size and the safety of others involved in a  
12 collision.

13 And it seems to me that you're actually  
14 undermining the large vehicle study that you prepared,  
15 and you being generally MPI, by referring to this 2019  
16 study to support while you're -- why not -- while  
17 you're not going to put programs in -- or after the  
18 large vehicle study.

19 So, MPI is relying on this -- this IIHS  
20 now, or in this -- in this IR?

21 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I -- I appreciate  
22 the clarification. So, I guess I would disagree with  
23 the characterization that this undermines the large  
24 vehicle study.

25 I think to the contrary, the findings

1 are consistent with the large vehicle study, being  
2 that SUVs do not pose a larger risk to -- to smaller  
3 vehicles or to vulnerable road users. That finding is  
4 consistent with MPI's large vehicle study.

5 The 2019 study from the IIHS indicates  
6 that pickup trucks have a higher likelihood of being  
7 involved in a crash, of course, with the caveat that  
8 they don't account for driver behaviour.

9 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay.

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: And that is also  
11 reflected in MPI's large vehicle study. So, I do  
12 think the two (2) studies are consistent in that way.

13 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay, so. And  
14 -- and still with this IR, a few paragraphs down, my  
15 understanding to this response is -- is, essentially,  
16 on a request from Bike Winnipeg whether any  
17 programming will be -- will come as a result from the  
18 large vehicle study.

19 MPI states it's chosen not to provide  
20 road -- road safety programming target at pickup  
21 drivers at this time because it has determined that  
22 high-risk driving behaviours, non-seatbelt use,  
23 distraction, speeding, and impairment are the root  
24 causes of traffic fatalities and serious injuries in  
25 Manitoba.

1                   So, going back to the discussion we're  
2 having on that particular point -- and, again, I  
3 likely misinterpreted this answer -- but it seems to  
4 me that there's no more debate on what the root cause  
5 is here, that MPI has determined that these are the  
6 root causes and this is where this bend is going to be  
7 full stop. Is that fair to say?

8                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:     That's more or less  
9 accurate, with the caveat that -- the specific nuance  
10 of each of those problems and what we need to do about  
11 it. There's still some ambiguity there, and that's  
12 why we're engaged in this ongoing research and  
13 analysis.

14                   But it is correct to say that seatbelt  
15 use distractions, speeding, and impairment are our  
16 priority areas.

17                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:   And -- and to  
18 support that position that going to be focussing on  
19 that, in the answer -- in the IR, BW-MPI-2-8, MPI  
20 refers to research conducted by internal organizations  
21 find that using a seatbelt cuts the risk of death or  
22 serious injury in collision -- in a collision by half.

23                   "MPI's data shows one (1) in five  
24                   (5) fatalities in Manitoba result in  
25                   non-seatbelt use. Research

1           conducted by MPI shows that the --  
2           the problem of non-seatbelt use is  
3           most concentrated in rural areas, 85  
4           percent usage rate compared to 96  
5           percent usage rate."

6           The next paragraph:

7           "Research conducted by external  
8           organizations finds that distraction  
9           by electronic device increases the  
10          likelihood of a collision by a  
11          factor of three (3)."

12          That paragraph goes on and talks about  
13          MPI data to support that. And, again, with research  
14          conducted by external organization, finds that as a  
15          vehicle speed increases, the likelihood of severity of  
16          a collision increases.

17          MPI's data shows that, if speed is a  
18          factor, one (1) in four (4) out of every fatal  
19          collision. MPI is currently undertaking research to  
20          better understand the problem of speeding.

21          And you're underscoring this because  
22          this is -- these are statistically significant  
23          findings that have led MPI to determine what root  
24          causes of traffic fatalities and serious injuries are,  
25          correct?

1                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    As a data analyst by  
2 training, I might quibble with the term 'statistically  
3 significant', but I think that's probably getting more  
4 into the details than we need to.

5                   But the bottom line is we're being  
6 driven by what the data's telling us about where the  
7 issues are.

8

9                                       (BRIEF PAUSE)

10

11                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:    Okay. I've  
12 always been told don't ask questions that you don't  
13 know the answer to, so I won't quarrel with the --  
14 someone with your expertise. But one (1) in five (5)  
15 is -- is important as far as numbers go for seatbelt  
16 use?

17                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    Yes, that's an  
18 important number for understanding --

19                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:    And for fatal  
20 collisions, distraction being one (1) of three (3) is  
21 -- is important?

22                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    Yes.

23                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:    And with  
24 regards to vehicle speed increases, the data shows  
25 that speed is a factor one (1) out of four (4) fatal

1 collisions. And that's important, as well?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, it is.

3 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And it's that  
4 important information and data that's led you to focus  
5 on these particular items?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's  
7 accurate.

8 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: If -- if we can  
9 go to CMMG-2.6, please, and page 1 of 4 of the  
10 preamble in particular.

11 And again, this is in the large vehicle  
12 study, and this is taken from the large vehicle study  
13 itself. And My Friend at CMMG put this -- this in the  
14 preamble, but it talks about comparing the incidents  
15 where pick-up trucks are involved and the incidents  
16 where pick-up trucks are not involved.

17 The first bullet:

18 "The average incident costs where  
19 pick-up trucks are involved is ten  
20 thousand seventy -- seven hundred  
21 and thirty-five dollars and thirty  
22 cents (\$10,735.30). The average  
23 incident costs where pick-up trucks  
24 are not involved is eight thousand  
25 four seventy-five and sixteen --

1 sixteen cents (8,475.16)."

2 And the difference is significantly --  
3 statistically significant. Next bullet again talks  
4 about the differences being statistically significant.  
5 The next bullet again, we talk about the difference  
6 being statistically significant. Two (2) bullets  
7 down, we talk about the difference is statistically  
8 significant.

9 And again, we talk about when pick-up  
10 trucks are involved and drivers in the pick-up trucks  
11 are one point six (1.6) times more likely to be at  
12 fault than the drivers in the other vehicles. We  
13 don't have language of 'statistically significant',  
14 but based on our discussion we had earlier, I would  
15 say that's an important stat. Is that fair? And that  
16 is MPI's own data?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That is MPI's own  
18 data, that's correct.

19 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And so its own  
20 data is -- is noting statistically significant facts  
21 coming out of this report. And then at the very  
22 least, I think at -- at part 9, 'Loss Prevention - LP-  
23 2.2', MPI acknowledges that, at a high level, the  
24 analysis shows that vehicles -- vehicle size does  
25 impact collision claims costs, with larger vehicles



1 having higher average claims costs.

2           So either your data show -- your data  
3 shows that there's some statistically significant  
4 points here for large vehicles, or at a high level it  
5 shows that vehicle size does impact collision costs.

6           So the question is this, and a long,  
7 rambling question is: Despite MPI finding  
8 statistically significant data points in a large  
9 vehicle study that would point to vehicle size having  
10 an impact on collision claim costs, and keeping in  
11 mind that MPI is -- is focussed on data-driven  
12 understanding of root causes of traffic fatalities and  
13 serious injuries, why in light of all this would MPI  
14 maintain that it will not provide road safety  
15 programming targeted at pick-up trucks and drivers?

16           Isn't it based on -- on your own road  
17 safety strategy that's data driven that this data  
18 points that this ought to be pursued?

19           MR. BRYCE DOELL: I do appreciate  
20 where you're coming from with that comment. I think  
21 maybe to start it's important to draw the distinction  
22 between what we mean by 'statistically significant'.

23           So when we -- when we say the  
24 difference is statistically significant, what we're  
25 talking about is the precision of that estimate, and

1 it really has no bearing on the real-world  
2 meaningfulness or utilization of that difference.

3 All it tells us is that if you were to  
4 have a bunch of random situations, you would  
5 eventually -- pardon me, you would have -- that the  
6 difference cannot explained by randomness. It would  
7 not be an appropriate tool to prioritize road safety  
8 issues as it doesn't speak to the magnitude of the  
9 problem or really the root cause issue.

10 So when we do look at the rate of large  
11 vehicle involvement in collisions with vulnerable road  
12 users and fatalities, we don't find that large  
13 vehicles are over-represented in those fatalities.  
14 What we do see is one (1) in three (3) fatalities, for  
15 instance, being due to distraction.

16 So when we set our priorities, we're  
17 more concerned with which issues are causing the most  
18 fatalities than we are with the statistical  
19 significance of a particular measure.

20 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And when we  
21 were looking over Bike Winnipeg-MPI-2-8, you quibbled  
22 with statistically significant, and we landed on  
23 'important', and that one (1) in five (5) fatalities  
24 with regards to seatbelt is important, one (1) in  
25 three (3) fatalities with regards to distracted

1 driving is important.

2                   And would you agree with me that, even  
3 by your own Loss Prevention filing, the analysis shows  
4 that vehicle size does impact collision claims costs,  
5 with larger vehicles having higher average claims  
6 costs? Wouldn't that, if not being statistically  
7 significant, at least be important?

8                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: Our opinion is that  
9 it is far less important than those other issues that  
10 we've highlighted, being distraction, impairment,  
11 speed, and seatbelt use. Given the holistic view of  
12 the data and the issues, that is simply a lower  
13 priority with respect to the other items that we've  
14 talked about.

15                   So basically, what we're saying and is  
16 -- was in the IIHS study, is that studies of vehicle  
17 type can't account for driver behaviour. And the  
18 analysis that we have done and that Mr. Triggs  
19 referenced with the 2021 fatality analysis is telling  
20 us that our focus needs to be on drivers less so than  
21 vehicles so.

22                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And so -- and I  
23 apologize to belabour the point. The IIHS report,  
24 which is referred to in -- in Bike Winnipeg-2-8, is it  
25 applied in any manner in the large vehicle study that

1 the Board directed you to do?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No. MPI developed  
3 its own methodology using its own data to do the large  
4 vehicle study.

5 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And -- and was  
6 MPI aware of this 2019 IIHS study when it did the  
7 large vehicle study at the direction of the Board?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No, not at the time.

9 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And sitting  
10 here today, does that 2019 report have an impact on  
11 the methodology of -- of the MPI large vehicle  
12 analysis that was done at the direction of the Board?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Can you clarify the  
14 question? I'm not sure I follow.

15 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: No problem. It  
16 happens often. Sitting here today, is your evidence  
17 that what you now know about this 2019 report which  
18 you didn't have at the time that you did Board report,  
19 does it have a bearing or an impact on your findings  
20 in the Board-directed report to the point that it  
21 should be redone?

22 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Oh, I understand.  
23 Thank you. No, it doesn't. Like I said, I -- I think  
24 our results are consistent with the IIHS study, so, to  
25 us, there's no reason to repeat the study using a

1 different methodology.

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5

MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: During the

6

opening submission on October 19th, My Friend Mr.

7

Scarfone, on behalf of MPI, stated -- and this can be

8

found at page 97 of the transcript. There's really no

9

need to go there. We can have it subject to check --

10

referred to an ideal financial state where MPI would

11

never need to seek another rate increase.

12

And he further stated that:

13

"Absent exceptional circumstances,

14

if two (2) criteria existed -- that

15

is, namely, that the Corporation had

16

sufficient capital..."

17

And in his defence, my understanding

18

was that that was the most important of the criteria.

19

The second one was:

20

"...and expenses had to always fall

21

below 4 percent."

22

Would you agree that that was part of

23

the opening submissions?

24

MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes, I agree.

25

MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay. And

1 looking at the 4 percent expenses, would you agree  
2 that that's an important consideration for MPI when it  
3 prepares its budgets?

4

5

(BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: The MPI -- I  
8 guess it really comes down to what you're talking  
9 about, you know, with budgets, per se. You know --  
10 you know, the -- the Road Safety budget is -- is a  
11 very small component of MPI's overall budget, its  
12 operating expense budget, its claims budget, and so  
13 forth and so.

14 So I'm assuming that you're talking  
15 about the development of our budgets and, no, actually  
16 4 percent is not a factor that comes into the  
17 development of the road safety budget.

18 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: That's exactly  
19 where I was going, Mr. Triggs. Thank you.

20 So that -- that 4 percent expenses  
21 criteria is not applied to the creation of the budget  
22 for road safety?

23 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: No, it's not.

24 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Still,  
25 regretfully for you folks with the large vehicle

1 study, Board Order 176/'19 provided at 13.17 that:

2 "The Corporation shall conduct an  
3 analysis of whether larger vehicles  
4 such as pick-up trucks are causing  
5 as disproportionate amount of  
6 damage."

7 The smaller vehicles and vulnerable  
8 road users report back on it -- its findings in twenty  
9 (20) -- 2022 GRA. And, in response to CMMG-MPI-2-4,  
10 MPI states that its position that:

11 "The large vehicle study has  
12 achieved its objective in analyzing  
13 whether larger vehicles are causing  
14 a disproportionate amount of damage  
15 to smaller vehicles and vulnerable  
16 road users."

17 Is it safe to say that, the only reason  
18 MPI proceeded with this analysis is because the Board  
19 ordered to do so in Board Order 176/'19?

20 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's fair.

21 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And sitting  
22 here today, MPI takes the position it's satisfied  
23 what's been ordered in 176/'19, full stop?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

25 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And because of

1 that position from MPI, it doesn't need to do any more  
2 on this particular subject. Is that fair to say?

3 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I'll answer it.  
4 I think we've, you know, we didn't -- didn't do a  
5 direct study on this but one of the fall --  
6 consequences or facts was determined from when we did  
7 an analysis of the -- the 2021 fatalities.

8 Is when you start looking at the  
9 vehicles involved that -- in these -- the -- the fatal  
10 collisions, we found that the -- whether it's a large  
11 vehicle, whether it's a passenger car, SUV, motorcycle  
12 or -- or what -- whatever the vehicle, that -- the  
13 proportion of those vehicles in those collisions  
14 mirrors, almost identical, to what the general fleets  
15 -- the -- the break-up of the fleet, so -- and, you  
16 know, I'll be off my numbers, but you'll get the idea.  
17 Is like 23 percent of the fatalities involved -- true  
18 -- large vehicles and 23 percent of the fleet in  
19 Manitoba is large vehicles. So there's that  
20 correlation there.

21 So, that study reaffirmed -- confirmed  
22 the conclusions that were made from the road -- the  
23 large vehicle study.

24 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: I'd like to ask  
25 you some questions about winter tire use. In -- in



1 Bike Winnipeg, MPI -- sorry, 2-4, MPI was asked  
2 questions about winter tire use and enhancing  
3 legislation with respect to winter tire use.

4                   And I'd first like to clarify MPI's  
5 evidence regarding the use of winter tires in  
6 Manitoba.

7                   In Bike Winnipeg 2-4 at C(I), it was  
8 asked if MPI agreed that Manitoba along with  
9 Saskatchewan had the lowest average use of winter  
10 tires in Canada.

11                   And MPI's response to that was that MPI  
12 can neither agree nor disagree with this statement  
13 because the research on cross-provincial winter tire  
14 use is inconclusive.

15                   Would you at least agree that with the  
16 statement that Manitoba has a low rate of winter tire  
17 use relative to the rest of Canada?

18                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    So, as stated in the  
19 -- the IR response, given the methodological  
20 limitations of the Tire and Rubber Association of  
21 Canada Study, it's not possible to draw such  
22 conclusions from that study, given the large margins  
23 of error.

24                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:   All right.  
25 I'll give you one more chance with the same question.

1 Would you at least agree with the statement that  
2 Manitoba has a low rate of winter tire use relative to  
3 the rest of Canada?

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Again, that -- I  
5 think we've made clear here, we're data driven people  
6 and that I'm not comfortable making conclusions that  
7 aren't rooted in the data.

8 And I would say, in this scenario,  
9 essentially what it is -- is the Tire and Rubber  
10 Association of Canada, they run this study every year  
11 where they do phone sampling across Canada. The  
12 sample sizes in Manitoba are simply too small to draw  
13 an accurate estimate of the use of winter tires in  
14 Manitoba which is the reason why the Tire and Rubber  
15 Association lumps Manitoba in with Saskatchewan,  
16 because, by definition, when the sample size is too  
17 small to draw conclusions from.

18 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: All right.  
19 Well, let's move away from -- from that source and  
20 let's go to the source, MPI.

21 If you can go to CAC-MPI-1-75, Road  
22 Safety Strategy, page 7, under objective 4. Thank  
23 you.

24 If you look at the second bullet under  
25 objective 4, this is objective 4 of MPI's Road Safety

1 Strategy, conduct a research to understand the reasons  
2 for Manitoba's lower rate of winter tire use relative  
3 to the rest of Canada and define -- identify options  
4 for increasing adoption of this proven safety  
5 technology.

6 So, would you at least agree, now, if I  
7 put it to you Mr. Doell, that MPI is of the view that  
8 Manitoba has a low rate of winter tire use, relative  
9 to the rest of Canada?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sure. But, again, I  
11 would exercise caution about the precision of the  
12 exact estimate for Manitoba.

13 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Certainly. But  
14 relative to the rest of Canada, we're low.

15 And would you at least agree with the  
16 statement that Manitoba's use of winter tires is not  
17 in line with the national average?

18 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Like -- the data  
19 does indicate that Manitoba is lower than the national  
20 average, but again, we're talking about wide margins  
21 of error, so we have to be careful about the precision  
22 of that estimate.

23 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Right, but if I  
24 were to suggest to you that was found in -- in the  
25 road, that statement was found in -- in the Road

1 Safety Strategy for Manitoba Hydro (sic), you wouldn't  
2 resist that statement?

3 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sorry, for Manitoba  
4 Hydro? Like --

5 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Sorry. I'm in  
6 another movie, I apologize.

7 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Okay.

8 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Manitoba --  
9 Manitoba Public Insurance.

10 That Manitoba's use of winter tires is  
11 not in line -- line with the national average. Would  
12 you agree with that statement?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Generally speaking,  
14 yes. That's true.

15 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And, would you  
16 agree with the -- with the statement that winter tire  
17 use is a proven safety technology as is found here in  
18 your objective 4?

19 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

20 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And returning to  
21 Bike Winnipeg 2-4(a), Bike Winnipeg asked the question  
22 does MPI agree in supporting (INDISCERNIBLE)  
23 legislation to support improvements to road safety.

24 And the response to the question was,  
25 all changes to legislation are made at the discretion

1 of the provincial government. MPI continuously seeks  
2 to improve road safety and remains committed to making  
3 data driven programming decisions that are in the best  
4 interests of Manitoba.

5 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Expect a -- a  
6 lawyer wrote that.

7

8 CONTINUED BY MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:

9 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And you'd agree  
10 that the question wasn't who makes the changes to  
11 legislation, the question was is MPI -- would it  
12 support a change to legislation.

13 Do you agree with that?

14 MR. BRYCE DOELL: The -- I -- I think  
15 we would suggest that the decisions around, you know,  
16 changes to legislation are -- are the purview of the  
17 provincial government.

18 You know, obviously, MPI taking a data-  
19 driven approach, you know, it provides advice to the  
20 provincial government and but I would also say that  
21 the -- the -- the nature of that advice, the  
22 discussions that we have with provincial officials,  
23 are -- are subject to -- usually cabinet  
24 confidentiality. Especially if we're talking about  
25 considerations about what may -- decisions --

1 decisions that might be made on provincial  
2 legislation.

3 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: I appreciate  
4 the comment about cabinet confidentiality, but we  
5 don't need to go there.

6 I -- I -- the -- the question would be  
7 as follows: When you have a proven road safety  
8 technology, like winter tires, and if independent of  
9 MPI, our friends on Broadway decided to make winter  
10 tire use compulsory, would MPI as an insurer support  
11 such legislation?

12 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yeah, so MPI's,  
13 you know a creature of statute, we're a part of the  
14 provincial government. So, I mean if -- in -- in your  
15 question, if the government were to introduce  
16 legislation, MPI would -- as part of that government,  
17 I think, be supportive of that.

18 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay.

19 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I -- I'm -- I'm  
20 not sure if I'm fully answering your question though.

21 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: I understand  
22 the predicament that my question is putting this panel  
23 in and it's not intending to be intentional in that  
24 regard.

25 And perhaps we can go about it this

1 way. At -- Bike Winnipeg-MPI-2-3 -- Bike Winnipeg put  
2 a series of questions to Manitoba Public Insurance  
3 with respect to the City of Winnipeg's Road Safety  
4 Strategic Action, in particular, with regards to  
5 changing road safety culture and that it's a shared  
6 belief system.

7 And at page 2 of 3, Answer B to the  
8 question was -- is -- I'll read the question first and  
9 we'll get the answer.

10 "Is MPI able to estimate how much it  
11 would cost and over how many years  
12 to significantly change a shared  
13 belief system and associated actions  
14 of Manitoba drivers with respect to  
15 a single issue, such as driving too  
16 fast for conditions?"

17 And MPI provides the following answer:

18 "MPI is not able to estimate the  
19 cost or time-frame required to  
20 achieve the road safety culture  
21 changes described in the City of  
22 Winnipeg's Road Safety Strategic  
23 Action Plan. MPI believes that  
24 social change requires the ongoing  
25 commitment of all road safety

1 stakeholders, focussed on targeted  
2 education and awareness, dedicated  
3 enforcement, effective legislation  
4 and policy, and safe infra --  
5 infrastructure, in order to  
6 significantly change driver  
7 behaviour."

8 So, at the very least, I'll suggest to  
9 you that MPI recognizes that effective legislation is  
10 part and parcel of road safety?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

12 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Thank you, and  
13 MPI -- back at MPI-2-4, page 3 of 3, Reply Number 2,  
14 MPI states that:

15 "There are no new programs plan --  
16 planned at this time, beyond  
17 existing MPI wint -- Winter Tire  
18 Financing Program.

19 As part of its efforts in Phase 2 of  
20 the road safety strategy, MPI may  
21 develop new programs to in -- in --  
22 to increase winter tire use."

23 Sitting here today, does MPI know of  
24 any other programs for winter tire use, other than --  
25 in -- in -- in Canada, other than financing or



1 compulsory use by legislation?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: MPI is aware that  
3 some insurers -- some private insurers in Ontario do  
4 offer small discounts for individuals who use winter  
5 tires. To my knowledge, that's the only program  
6 available, beyond the ones that you've described.

7 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: I'd like to ask  
8 some questions about -- and -- and, Madam Chair, I'd -  
9 - I'd noted I said thirty (30) minutes to forty (40)  
10 minutes. I misled the Panel. I -- I have, I'd say,  
11 another twenty (20) minutes of questions. Thank you  
12 for your courtesy.

13 I'd like to ask some questions about  
14 Objective 5 of Phase 1 of the road safety strategy and  
15 that can be found, if need be, at page 7 of CAC-MPI-1-  
16 7, Appendix 1.

17 In particular, the document identifies  
18 key actions and one of them being supporting  
19 municipalities that are interested in implementing  
20 speed management strategies and reducing speed limits,  
21 traffic calming measures by partnering with -- on  
22 pilot projects, and by providing data analysis.

23 And at Winnipeg-MPI2-5, some questions  
24 were asked about this of -- of -- of the Corporation.  
25 MPI was asked for a list and overview of the

1 initiatives and, from what I see, that list now is  
2 four (4) such ini -- initiatives. That was provided  
3 September 27th.

4 Are there any -- any more to be added  
5 to this list, as of today?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No.

7 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And MPI was  
8 asked about the nature of traffic calming measures in  
9 that -- in that IR and MPI was asked if this included  
10 changes to roads and infrastructures and the response  
11 was, yes, municipalities can choose to make changes to  
12 road and infrastructure to implement traffic calming  
13 measures.

14 And -- and, again, you'd agree that  
15 that wasn't the question, whether municipalities can  
16 choose. The question was if that in -- if that  
17 included changes to road infrastructure.

18 It's safe to say, by that response,  
19 that MPI's view is that it's -- it's up to  
20 municipalities to make those changes? Fair?

21 MR. BRYCE DOELL: MPI does not have  
22 the ability to make infrastructure changes, as you  
23 know, but, in keeping with the strategy, we can  
24 support municipalities through the use of our data.

25 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And that's

1 really where I was getting with that and I appreciate  
2 the answer.

3                   So, when you say, in Ob -- Objective 5,  
4 Phase 1, that MPI, and I say you being MPI, will be  
5 supporting municipalities that are interested in  
6 implementing speed management strategies (reduced  
7 speed limits, traffic calming measurements), this  
8 support is limited to providing data or funding for  
9 research, not for the actual traffic calming measures  
10 that a -- a municipality might want to put in to  
11 place?

12                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    Though -- though MPI  
13 is not able to fund infrastructure changes, we do have  
14 the Speed Reader Display Program -- the Speed Display  
15 Boards Program, which is included in the IR Response.

16                   So, that is an example of where MPI is  
17 able to provide funding to a municipality to provide a  
18 traffic calming measure. Now, those boards are where  
19 the municipality installs them and they show drivers  
20 their speed. It will flash at them, if they're  
21 driving over the speed limit.

22                   So, those are the type of examples  
23 where it may be able to provide funding to them. It's  
24 for that sort of thing.

25                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:   Okay. So, in -

1 - in your answer, at MPI-2-5, page 3 of 3, Answer C,  
2 in response to traffic calming measures:

3 "Traffic calming measures are a  
4 temporary permanent infrastructure,  
5 designed to reduce vehicle and  
6 bicycle speeds on roads and  
7 streets."

8 Would that be possibly your signs  
9 you're referring to?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. The signs  
11 would be one type of traffic calming measure.

12 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: All right. And  
13 examples of traffic calming measures include speed  
14 humps and narrowing.

15 That's not in your wheelhouse; fair to  
16 say?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. That's fair to  
18 say.

19 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Just,  
20 generally, questions on budgeting. Is -- is it safe  
21 to say that, if data suggested to MPI to spend more on  
22 road safety, it -- it would?

23 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes. We'd  
24 definitely consider that.

25 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And, as -- as -

1 - as we canvassed earlier, it's safe to say the road -  
2 - the road safety budget has been relatively flat for  
3 the last four (4) or five (5) years? Fair to say?

4 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: It's fair to say.

5 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And it was  
6 relatively flat during the 2017/2020 Road Safety Plan?

7 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

8 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And, as noted,  
9 MPI's efforts to drive down fatalities and serious  
10 injuries during the time-frame of that plan plateaued  
11 and weren't going down any further?

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sorry. Can you  
13 repeat the question?

14 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: MPI's efforts  
15 to drive down fatalities and serious injuries during  
16 the 2017/2020 road safety plan plateaued? Fair?

17 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I think that it -  
18 - it's fair to say that about fatalities, that they  
19 had plateaued. I think, for serious injuries, from  
20 2017 to 2020, there was a decline.

21 I have data here, showing that -- that  
22 serious injuries declined from 442 in 2017 down to 318  
23 in 2020 and 320 in 2021 but there might be some  
24 overlap with the -- the reduction in traffic volume  
25 that we saw during the pandemic.

1 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay, but we're  
2 at least on the same wavelength, that fatalities  
3 plateaued?

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sorry. I'm nodding  
5 yes.

6 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: I'm not wearing  
7 my glasses. So, I can barely see, so that's -- and --  
8 and, so, the fact that these fatalities plateaued on --  
9 -- on a pretty stagnant budget, wouldn't that be data  
10 or an indicator that, perhaps, increased spending  
11 should be considered?

12 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Well, as I -- as  
13 previously said, you know, you're not going to spend  
14 money just for the sake of spending money. You want  
15 to have a program that you believe is going to be  
16 meaningful and have some impact and -- and that's why  
17 we're kind of, you know, starting over with our  
18 analysis of the data, as that's going to be the  
19 driving points to -- to see where we can, you know,  
20 focus in our -- our efforts and develop programs to be  
21 addressing those particular areas that our data points  
22 to.

23 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: But more money  
24 spent to support more programs that have been  
25 prepared, based on the appropriate data and the

1 appropriate research, would you agree that, if those  
2 underpinnings are there, there is a better chance that  
3 it would allow for greater impact on road safety?

4 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: If you go to  
5 existing programs that we -- we have in place, you  
6 know, we've -- we've referred to this earlier this  
7 morning was that we've done an analysis of those  
8 programs.

9 Some of those programs say, yeah, we  
10 should expand the -- the spending on -- on that.  
11 Others say, you know, the status quo is good. Other  
12 say, yeah, maybe we actually should eliminate that  
13 program. It's not effective at all.

14 So, we're in the process of, you know -  
15 - the initial draft has been done. I'm reviewing it,  
16 I have questions about it, and then we go back and  
17 make decisions on that.

18 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: So, we talked  
19 today about this -- the -- the earmarked funds of 2 --  
20 \$2 million independent of -- not independent, but part  
21 of the budget increase. And -- and it's -- it's not  
22 tied to anything.

23 Is the rest of the budget done by -- by  
24 zero-based budgeting that Hydro's done -- MPI has done  
25 in the past?

1 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes, it is.

2 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay. And so,  
3 the exercise now would be your zero-based budgeting  
4 and then you would top up with the \$2 million to be  
5 there for -- for, I wouldn't call it discretionary  
6 spending, but appropriate spending in a timely  
7 fashion?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

9 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Is there --  
10 does -- does a zero-based budgeting process impose a  
11 budget ceiling when it comes to determine scope and  
12 scale of the program?

13 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Not from my  
14 perspective.

15 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And if that's  
16 the case, is it fair to say that the budget for road  
17 safety has been flat or consistent for the last four  
18 (4) or five (5) years and even further.

19 Was that by design, using the budget --  
20 the zero budget -- the zero-based budgeting that it  
21 always came in around a certain amount throughout all  
22 these years?

23 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I can't really  
24 speak to, you know, how it was developed in -- in  
25 previous years on that. I can speak to with my



1 experience it's been since I've taken on  
2 responsibility for the area.

3           And, you know, I asked the -- the hard  
4 questions. We have, you know, four (4) staff who are  
5 administering all these programs and I kind of went,  
6 well, what do these guys do and what are these  
7 programs involved.

8           And so we did -- I require that they do  
9 a really in-depth analysis of each of the programs.  
10 And again, that comes back to, you know, a report I  
11 just, you know, made reference to. I was pleased to  
12 hear that the staff are actually busy working hard and  
13 they got more on their plate to do than they actually  
14 have time in the day.

15           So, that is -- it is good that they are  
16 busy and there's work for them. You know, you're  
17 just, you know -- I -- I said many times I -- I want  
18 to make sure that we spend money appropriately, but  
19 I'd be happy to spend -- I'd be very pleased if we can  
20 spend \$2 million in the coming year on new projects,  
21 because that means we've identified programs,  
22 initiatives that we think are beneficial.

23           MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:   And -- and are  
24 we still in the research analysis phase or are we  
25 talking -- has MPI really come to a landing on -- on

1 what the root causes for fatalities are?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, we are still in  
3 the research and analysis phase. As we mentioned this  
4 morning, it -- the phases do overlap, so we did  
5 complete the seatbelt and distraction study last year,  
6 which gave us brand new insights into the depth of  
7 those issues.

8 So, on those two (2), for instance, we  
9 have been able to act like we talked about with the  
10 seatbelt campaign and the shifting of funds for  
11 distraction towards the city. But generally speaking,  
12 there's still work -- more work to be done on phase 1,  
13 research and analysis.

14 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And -- and if  
15 there's more work to be done and we're still in phase  
16 1, isn't this the proper time to increase the  
17 investment at this phase to allow MPI to come back  
18 with a much clearer understanding of the strength and  
19 weaknesses of Manitoba's drivers, their knowledge,  
20 their behaviours, and their attitudes?

21 Isn't -- the data is king here.

22 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Right.

23 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And this is  
24 where we -- we should be front loading those  
25 resources.

1 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: That's what we're  
2 doing.

3 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Is any of that  
4 \$2 million going to that?

5 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: The \$2 million is  
6 being spent on -- it's earmarked for initiatives that  
7 we're going for. But if, you know, we decide in -- in  
8 this process that we look at and say, hey, we need to  
9 do more research in area 'X', and we need to, you  
10 know, spend money on it, we will do that.

11 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: I'd like to ask  
12 some questions about the new rout -- the new road  
13 safety program development team. In February of 2021  
14 the Road Safety Program development team joined a  
15 newly created department within MPI.

16 It was loss prevention, planning, and  
17 analysis. And that's under the direction of the  
18 registrar of motor vehicles. At PUB-MPI-1-35C, page 4  
19 of 4 it says there are twenty-four (24) full-time  
20 employees dedicated to the road safety administration.

21 Now, sitting here today, are you able  
22 to advise if that's an increase from the previous team  
23 road safety or employs more folks?

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No, MPI has  
2 increased its analytical capacity to tackle road  
3 safety issues with the addition of -- of four (4) FTEs  
4 over the past fifteen (15) or sixteen (16) months.  
5 You'll have to forgive me if the precision on that  
6 could give or take a month.

7 That's what -- with respect to that  
8 exact number of twenty-four (24), I don't think we  
9 have the historical record at our fingertips or  
10 exactly what that number looks like going back.

11 We'd have to take that away, but we  
12 have increased the analytical capacity that's  
13 available for road safety analysis.

14 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And sitting  
15 here today, do you have an -- an idea of what the  
16 increase in costs were for a human resources  
17 perspective is to the road safety budget with  
18 (INDISCERNIBLE) employees?

19 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Could you repeat  
20 the question again, I didn't quite hear you.

21 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Certainly. Of  
22 the new road safety budget, what is -- is there an  
23 increase in human resource costs, employee costs  
24 associated with the hiring of additional staff. And  
25 if so, what -- what is it?

1 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Okay. If you're  
2 referring to the -- this upcoming budget in the fiscal  
3 year '23/'24, no, we have not hired any new staff into  
4 the departments.

5 There were -- as Mr. Doell had said,  
6 four (4) new staff were hired within the last fifteen  
7 (15)/sixteen (16) months.

8 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Thank you.  
9 Let's ask some questions about social costs, although  
10 given the evidence that I heard earlier today, I -- I  
11 think I know the answer, but I'm gonna -- I just want  
12 to clarify some responses to Bike Winnipeg at 2-1 from  
13 -- from the Corporation.

14 And at Bike Winnipeg MPI 2-1(b), MPI  
15 was asked a question:

16 "Is the loss prevention analysis  
17 team mandating qualified to do a  
18 social cost analysis of road  
19 collisions and road safety  
20 programs?"

21 And in response, the following answer  
22 was given, that:

23 "The social costs of collisions from  
24 Manitoba are provided by Transport  
25 Canada. The loss and prevention

1 analysis team is mandated to  
2 analysis MPI's road safety programs  
3 and are qualified to do so."

4 So, if we're safe to say that the loss  
5 prevention and analysis team are not mandated or  
6 qualified to do social costs analysis on road  
7 collisions, correct?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, the social cost  
9 of collision analysis involves some pretty heavy duty,  
10 and if you'll excuse the term, economic analysis. We  
11 don't have a team of economists that are able to do  
12 that.

13 Now -- but what the team is capable of  
14 is taking those results from Transport Canada and  
15 using them analytically if we were able -- if we  
16 needed to do that. But that is a difference from  
17 actually doing the economic analysis of social cost of  
18 collisions.

19 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Sure. And --  
20 and I think we're on the same page here, is -- is that  
21 they're not qualified or mandated to do it, because  
22 you get that information from Transport Canada, right?

23 And I'll take it one (1) step further.  
24 The evidence we heard today is that there isn't really  
25 much concern for social costs when it comes to road

1 safety, fair?

2 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Well, I think --  
3 we'll clarify. It's -- we're developing our program  
4 and what drives our decision making. That social cost  
5 number is not a -- a key factor. The fact that this  
6 is happening to -- to people and the economy and so  
7 forth, that is -- yeah, we -- we -- I can't remember  
8 the exact words you said, but, you know, we -- it is a  
9 concern for us there.

10 But to make our decision points, we're  
11 not deciding to spend money because it has to reach a  
12 -- a plateau of 'X' number of dollars of social costs.  
13 It's the fact that we want to save lives.

14 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay. And I  
15 want to make sure the transcript will bear what it  
16 bears out, but I want to make sure that I haven't  
17 misrepresented anything, so I said, "concern."

18 The notes here show, Mr. Triggs, in  
19 responses, you're not motivated by social costs when  
20 it comes to the Road Safety Program, fair?

21 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Correct.

22 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Okay. And when  
23 I say, "you're not motivated," that means MPI --

24 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: (INDISCERNIBLE).

25 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: We had -- the

1 Road Safety Technical Conference, we had a  
2 presentation about that today.

3                   Sitting here today, does MPI have any  
4 views or positions on how that technical conference  
5 process can be changed or improved?

6                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Thank you for  
7 asking. The biggest concern we have with it is the  
8 amount of time and effort and resources that go into  
9 preparing for this.

10                   We estimated that it took half an FTE  
11 to prepare all the materials for the -- for the  
12 technical conference. That's half an FTE that could  
13 be working on other matters of road safety. So that -  
14 - that's our -- our concern with this. It's not a  
15 time and effort that goes into just providing  
16 information as opposed to working on the Road Safety  
17 issues.

18                   Absolutely 100 percent agree we need to  
19 get the data and information out to stakeholders, to  
20 the Interveners, to the PUB, the public as a whole.  
21 What we want to do is find a better way of -- of doing  
22 that as opposed to getting into a -- a process that  
23 involves, you know, cross-examination of witnesses and  
24 -- and so forth. You're not having collaborative  
25 discussions about issues.



1                   There's -- Bryce can speak to it or --  
2 and Patrick can speak to some of the things that we do  
3 have initiatives in place to collaborate with the  
4 other stakeholders and get the information out there.  
5 We can improve on that. I -- I just feel that there's  
6 a better way of getting the matter out. This is not  
7 the most effective use of resources is really what it  
8 comes down to.

9                   THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON:    Mr. Monnin, I  
10 just note that it's two o'clock.

11                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:    And -- and,  
12 Madam Chair, I -- I would say, if I can quote My  
13 Friend Dr. Williams who's not here, I have a couple of  
14 short snappers, and I will be done.

15                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS:    In Mr. Monnin's  
16 defence, he did say (INDISCERNIBLE) questions, and  
17 counsel told me to keep my answers short, and I failed  
18 to do that.

19

20 CONTINUED BY MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:

21                   MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN:    On the summary  
22 portion of -- of the Technical Conference Report,  
23 there's the summary of MPI commitments and actions.  
24 And they're talking about benefiting the -- the  
25 process and -- and making some changes to -- to make

1 it more efficient or improve it.

2 If -- if the Board were to direct or  
3 suggest that those summary of MPI commitments and  
4 actions ought to be fulfilled and -- and provided to  
5 all participants ahead of the next conference,  
6 technical conference, is that something that would be  
7 reasonable to -- to MPI?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. Yeah.

9 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: And what about  
10 moving towards a model where having an expert like Dr.  
11 Hall who -- who, in addition to being a moderator, at  
12 the direction of the Board obviously, would take all  
13 the shared information and provide recommendations in  
14 the report more than -- than just a summary of what  
15 was said back and forth?

16 Is that something that -- obviously  
17 depending on terms of reference, is that something  
18 that MPI would be open to?

19 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yeah. I'm not  
20 sure we want to be solutioning on -- on the spot here  
21 with -- what we want to be doing is have a  
22 collaborative relationship with the stakeholders.  
23 There's a number of things that we currently do. If  
24 there's things that we can do to improve that, that'd  
25 be great.

1                   We just find that the -- this process  
2 here seems to be a lot of extra work that is -- we  
3 don't really see the benefits arising from that  
4 additional work that's coming from it. So we -- we're  
5 open to any sort of ideas, suggestions that  
6 Interveners and other stakeholders can agree upon to  
7 make things -- the process better. We just don't  
8 think that this process is very effective.

9                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    If I could just add  
10 to that response, with respect to specific solutions  
11 and actions coming out of those types of collaborative  
12 efforts, the External Stakeholder Committee on road  
13 safety is one (1) such forum that is set up to -- to  
14 handle those types of situations.

15                   So as you know, we meet on a quarterly  
16 basis with eighteen (18) organizations to discuss road  
17 safety issues, so share updates on what we're working  
18 on, identify common opportunities to work together and  
19 collaborate on specific issues.

20                   We also hold one-on-one sessions with -  
21 - whether it be Bike Winnipeg or CMMG. So we do think  
22 that there are other venues that are appropriate for  
23 working through specific solutions together, maybe  
24 more so than, you know, a bi-annual conference and set  
25 of recommendations.

1 MR. CHRISTIAN MONNIN: Thank you for  
2 your answer. Panel, thank you for your time and your  
3 patience.

4 Madam Chair, those are my questions.

5 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.  
6 Ms. Meek...?

7 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you, Madam  
8 Chair. Good afternoon to the Board and good afternoon  
9 to the panel.

10

11 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK:

12 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: My name is  
13 Charlotte Meek. I represent the Coalition of Manitoba  
14 Motorcycle Groups who I'll refer to as CMMG. I saw  
15 some of you at the Road Safety Technical Conference,  
16 so I'm looking forward to -- to talking about what we  
17 discussed there a little bit, too.

18 I'd like to start off today just  
19 looking at a -- an IR from CMMG from this year. If we  
20 could go to CMMG-1-29, please.

21 And so in this IR, CMMG had requested  
22 some information on motorcycle collisions. And if we  
23 look at Figure 1 on the second page, please, there's  
24 some data here provided by MPI. And at column B, we  
25 can see that represents the number of motorcycle

1 collisions that are single-vehicle collisions.

2 Is that correct?

3 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

4 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: And so for each  
5 of those years, you would agree with me, subject to  
6 check, that single-vehicle collisions make up over 50  
7 percent of the total collision losses for motorcycles  
8 in each of those years?

9 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

10 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you. And  
11 you might recall, during the Road Safety Conference,  
12 CMMG or -- or Doug Houghton, who was with me there,  
13 had raised some concerns about single-vehicle  
14 accidents.

15 Do you -- do you recall that line of  
16 discussion at all?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I can't say I recall  
18 the specifics of that discussion, no.

19 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Sure. Well,  
20 maybe we can go to the transcript and I can refresh  
21 your memory a little bit. So if we go to the Road  
22 Safety Conference transcript, June 23rd, page 85.

23 So it's not really a direct question by  
24 Mr. Houghton, but just kind of he was just relaying  
25 some experience and talking about some things that --

1 that have happened to him.

2                   So maybe we can zoom out a little bit,  
3 Kristen, because it's -- it's him kind of just  
4 discussing some concerns that he had. And maybe what  
5 I can do is just summarize it.

6                   He raised a couple of issues here. So  
7 he was talking about things like environmental or  
8 location factors that impact collisions, and  
9 especially for motorcyclists.

10                   Does that sound familiar to you?

11                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. Seeing it now,  
12 this is familiar.

13                   MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. Thank you.

14                   MS. KATHLEEN MCCANDLESS: If I could  
15 just jump in for one (1) minute.

16                   Just to be clear, the transcript from  
17 the Road Safety Technical Conference is non-  
18 evidentiary. So while Ms. Meek may use it as a  
19 context for asking the questions, I would just caution  
20 that the statements made by Mr. Houghton at that  
21 conference would not be evidence before the Board.

22                   MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Sure, and that's  
23 fine. If -- if any of it was necessary, I might just  
24 read in certain parts of it. But I'm not anticipating  
25 filing this as an exhibit, but thank you, Ms.

1 McCandless.

2

3 CONTINUED BY MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK:

4 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: So Mr. Houghton  
5 also referenced some other concerns about vehicle  
6 design. Does that sound familiar as well? I think he  
7 talked SUVs or trucks and their visibility, things  
8 like that. Does that sound familiar?

9 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, it does. We  
10 can see it in the transcript here as well.

11 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you. And  
12 then he also talked about something that I'm going to  
13 call avoidance collisions, or situations where a  
14 motorcycle avoids a collision with a car and as a  
15 result might get into an accident themselves.

16 Does that sound like something familiar  
17 that we spoke about as well?

18 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

19 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. Thank you.  
20 And if we could go down to I think the next page,  
21 please, Kristen, page 86. And again, I'm just using  
22 this as an aid so that you can recall, so kind of from  
23 lines 6 to 12 here

24 So what he's talking about -- I'm going  
25 to call this the avoidance collision as he's saying,

1 based on the way a motorcycle is set up, sometimes  
2 when a motorcycle tries to avoid a collision, you  
3 know, if you try and swerve or brake quickly, that  
4 might be result in the motorcyclist going down.

5 Do you recall that kind of discussion  
6 with Mr. Houghton?

7 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

8 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. So what  
9 Mr. Houghton's kind of identifying here is that  
10 there's an issue where a motorcyclist is actually  
11 avoiding a collision which may have been caused by the  
12 fault of another driver -- say for example they change  
13 lanes without shoulder checking.

14 But in the process of avoiding the  
15 collision, the motorcyclist is forced to dump their  
16 bike or fall off their bike, resulting in an at-fault  
17 claim to the motorcyclist.

18 Do you remember having that discussion?

19 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, I remember him  
20 raising that specific scenario.

21 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And so I'm  
22 appreciating -- what I understand then from our  
23 discussions at the Road Safety Conference is this is  
24 kind of a self-reporting situation. So in a situation  
25 where this happens to a motorcyclist, they might



1 report this to MPI, but there's no other data that  
2 necessarily is tracked in that regard.

3 Can you confirm that that's the case?

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: We don't track data  
5 on situations where a motorcyclist had to avoid a  
6 collision with another vehicle, no.

7 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. So, can  
8 you identify what kind of information is requested  
9 from a motorcyclist when a collision like this is  
10 called in to MPI.

11 Is there some sort of documentation  
12 about what happened in the incident, or can you give  
13 us some more information about what data is collected  
14 in this kind of collision?

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, the -- the  
19 claimant would -- would call in and report a claim  
20 using the standard first notice of loss process. So,  
21 they would report the circumstances of the collision  
22 to an individual in the contact centre, and those  
23 specific circumstances would be recorded in a text  
24 note.

25 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And so, is

1 that -- is there any sort of compiling of that data  
2 that -- that MPI would have? And I guess the point  
3 I'm maybe getting to here is we've talked about the  
4 new dashboard that's going to available coming in  
5 January/February.

6                   Would any information like that be  
7 available on the dashboard about self-reporting of  
8 circumstances? And I appreciate the limitations that  
9 self-reporting give us, but would that be available in  
10 that data and made public?

11                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: If I understand your  
12 question correctly, I think by definition kind of all  
13 collisions are self-reported, you know, with the  
14 exception of an incident maybe where someone's injured  
15 and unable to speak.

16                   MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Sure. So, I  
17 guess I'm -- I'm just trying to clarify. If -- if an  
18 individual reports that they were forced off their  
19 bike or avoided a collision as a result, would that be  
20 something that we'd be able to track or look at in the  
21 -- the dashboard that's going to be available?

22                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: It's -- it's --  
23 the dashboard is going to be something that's -- a  
24 process that matures over a period of time so.

25                   MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Right.

1 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: You know, maybe  
2 at some point in time, you get to that level of  
3 detail, but certainly not in the first iteration of  
4 that.

5 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. Thank you.  
6 So, going back to the discussions that we had with Mr.  
7 Houghton, he also identified a couple of other  
8 concerns he had relating to things like environmental  
9 concerns or location concerns, infrastructure,  
10 signage, et cetera.

11 And you'll agree with me that MPI  
12 acknowledged that location is a weakness in MPI's  
13 current data?

14 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

15 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And,  
16 again, for that information, MPI relies primarily on  
17 what customers tell MPI about the location of an  
18 accident. Is that correct?

19 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's in correct.  
20 In the circumstances of more serious collisions  
21 involving a fatality or serious injury, we may also  
22 have the police reports available on the specifics of  
23 the incident, but those are really the two (2) sources  
24 of location information that we have.

25 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. Thank you.

1 Does MPI have any plans to modify their collection of  
2 that information to better obtain location information  
3 regarding incidents?

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No, we have no plans  
5 for that at this time.

6 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And are  
7 you aware if any other jurisdictions have different  
8 methodologies they use for collection of collision  
9 location information?

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Can I ask you to  
11 repeat the question?

12 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Sure. I'm asking  
13 if any -- if MPI's aware of any other jurisdictions,  
14 if they have different methodologies for the  
15 collection of location information for collisions.

16 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I'm not personally  
17 aware of any others. There may be others at MPI who  
18 are aware of it, but I -- I can't speak to knowledge  
19 of other ways of collecting location data.

20 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And at  
21 some intersections there are cameras that are  
22 recording, like, flow of traffic, is that correct, in  
23 certain intersection locations throughout the city?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.  
25 The City of Winnipeg does have such cameras.

1 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And is  
2 footage like that ever used to assist MPI in  
3 evaluating collisions when a claim is made?  
4

5 (BRIEF PAUSE)  
6

7 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I'm not a hundred  
8 percent certain, but I believe, yes, it is, that that  
9 is a source of data that is collected when they're  
10 investing a claim.

11 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you.

12 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: It can be. Not  
13 in every --

14 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Not in every  
15 case, but sometimes?

16 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: -- case, but --  
17 yes.

18 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And does  
19 MPI have any information on how the decision is made  
20 for determining where those cameras are set up?

21 Is -- is it made based purely from City  
22 of Winnipeg perspective for traffic flows, or is there  
23 any input from MPI about concern collision  
24 intersections that might need some sort of camera  
25 footage that would help with collision claims?

1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No, MPI does not  
2 have input on those decisions.

3 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And I'd  
4 like to now turn to CMMG-1-30, please. And so, if we  
5 go to page 2, MPI -- or sorry, CMMG had asked MPI some  
6 questions about motorcycle training courses over the  
7 last couple of years.

8 And so, there are two (2) courses that  
9 are offered by the Safety Services of Manitoba.  
10 There's a basic course and a gearing up course.

11 Is that correct?

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

13 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And the  
14 basic course is one (1) day, or six (6) to eight (8)  
15 hour, course. Is that correct?

16 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

17 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And the  
18 gearing up course is a longer duration, it's sixteen  
19 (16) to twenty (20) hours and it occurs over multiple  
20 days. Is that correct?

21 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

22 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And it's  
23 true that the completion of the gearing up course, the  
24 longer duration course that occurs over two (2) days,  
25 provides the participants with a two hundred dollar

1 (\$200) rebate when they complete the course.

2 Is that correct?

3 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

4 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And so,  
5 from figure 1 here we can see that this is the one  
6 talking about the basic motorcycle course, so the six  
7 (6) to eight (8) hour training. And we can see that  
8 the basic motorcycle course has very high uptake with  
9 over 92 percent of classes being at full capacity.

10 Is that correct?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

12 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you. And  
13 in -- we can see in 2020, there's only a slight  
14 reduction in the number of the classes offered, right,  
15 down from 2019. So, there were fifty-one (51) classes  
16 offered in 2019 and forty-nine (49) classes offered in  
17 2020. Is that correct?

18 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

19 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And then  
20 in 2021, there were far more classes offered than the  
21 previous two (2) years with a hundred and twenty-eight  
22 (128) classes offered and a very high uptake with 97  
23 percent of those classes being at full capacity.

24 Is that correct?

25 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That is correct.

1 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And I know  
2 during your presentation this morning you talked about  
3 how there had been a dip of training in 2020 as a  
4 result of the COVID-19 pandemic, but can you give us  
5 some information on why there were so many classes in  
6 the 2021 year, just any background information that  
7 you might have on that?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sure. Maybe I'll  
9 start by clarifying one (1) of the points from this  
10 morning --

11 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Sure.

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: -- because that was  
13 with respect to class 5 training --

14 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: I see. Thank  
15 you.

16 MR. BRYCE DOELL: -- for a typical  
17 passenger vehicle, so the -- that's a little bit of a  
18 separate issue. What we saw with motorcycles during  
19 the pandemic was an increased demand for motorcycle  
20 training, and that's reflected in the additional  
21 capacity that was offered in 2021.

22 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And then,  
23 so if we look then at figure 2, that gives us  
24 information about the gearing up course. In 2019,  
25 there was fairly low attendance, with only 54 percent



1 of classes being at full capacity. Is that correct?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

3 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you. And  
4 in 2020 and 2021, there was much higher attendance in  
5 -- in those years. Is that correct?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

7 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: And are you able  
8 to discuss why there were not more courses offered in  
9 the 2021 year given the high number of basic courses  
10 offered?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I'm sorry, maybe I'm  
12 misunderstanding. The -- the data does show that  
13 there were additional courses offered in 2021.

14 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Yeah, there were  
15 additional courses. I'm just -- I guess what I'm just  
16 alluding to is that there are a hundred and twenty-  
17 eight (128) of the basic motorcycle class, which was  
18 far above what was previously offered, and there was  
19 only a slight adjustment to the gearing up motorcycle  
20 course.

21 So, I'm just wondering if there was a  
22 difference of demand or what information you could  
23 give us about that.

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Understood. Thank  
25 you. So, those decisions to increase the capacity of

1 those specific courses are made by Safety Services  
2 Manitoba, who delivers the training.

3           So, we don't have insight into specific  
4 decisions they made on each course. But generally,  
5 they're responding to demand that they saw from  
6 motorcycle training.

7           MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. So, we can  
8 probably assume then that there was much more demand  
9 for the basic course than the gearing up course then?

10           MR. BRYCE DOELL: I think that would  
11 be safe to say, yes.

12           MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And does  
13 MPI anticipate that the number of motorcycle training  
14 courses offered in future years will return -- remain  
15 similar to the 2021 year or do we anticipate it's  
16 going to go back to the previous averages?

17           MR. BRYCE DOELL: It's difficult to  
18 say with any uncertainty (sic) given the -- the times  
19 we live in, but I think our best guess would be  
20 returns to pre-pandemic levels, but, again, not a  
21 great deal of certainty.

22           MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. So, it  
23 will depend on demand then?

24           MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

25           MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you. And

1 now I want to ask you some questions about the large  
2 vehicle study. And I appreciate you've gone through  
3 that in a fair amount of detail with Mr. Monnin  
4 earlier.

5 So, you're aware that there was that  
6 large vehicle study ordered to be completed by PUB  
7 Order 176/'19. And if we could turn to CMMG-2-5,  
8 please.

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you,  
13 Kristen. So the directives from the PUB order read as  
14 follows:

15 "The Corporation shall conduct an  
16 analysis of whether large vehicles,  
17 such as pickup trucks are causing a  
18 disproportionate amount of damage to  
19 smaller vehicles and vulnerable road  
20 users, and report back on its  
21 findings in the 2022 GRA."

22 And then, in question 'A', what CMMG  
23 had asked here was MPI's rationale for why the  
24 evaluation was limited to the full cost of collision,  
25 rather than including third-party liability costs.

1 Is that correct?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

3 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And if we  
4 go back to MPI's response. So MPI is basically  
5 explaining that physical damage, injury cost, and  
6 vulnerable road user injury costs were included. But  
7 third-party liability was not included because it  
8 includes other costs that MPI deemed would -- would be  
9 misleading for the purpose of this study.

10 Is that correct?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

12 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And MPI  
13 felt that that was -- felt that way based on their  
14 interpretation of the Board Order, that they felt  
15 information would be ill-suited to addressing the  
16 directive. Correct?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I'm not sure it's  
18 MPI's interpretation of the Order as much as the Order  
19 was within the realm of road safety and decisions were  
20 made by many good faith attempt to answer the question  
21 within the sphere of road safety.

22 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. So I'm  
23 going to put it to you then that you interpreted the  
24 fact that the Board ordered this in relation to a  
25 response from a road safety technical conference, that

1 the idea was that this pertained only to road safety  
2 issues; rather than other issues relating to costs.

3 Would that be fair to say?

4 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct. For  
5 an analysis of this type, obviously, there's many  
6 decisions that need to be made about the methodology.

7 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Right.

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So we need to have a  
9 clear idea of objectives. And based on, kind of, all  
10 of the evidence that was available, the decision was  
11 made to develop that methodology with road safety in  
12 mind.

13 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you.

14 And you'll recall, at the road safety technical  
15 conference, Mr. Feaver of Bike Winnipeg, he'd asked  
16 you some questions about MPI's ability to break down  
17 the data in the study.

18 Do you recall that line of questioning?  
19 We can go to a reference if that might be easier.

20 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sure. This is the  
21 most recent technical conference you're speaking  
22 about?

23 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Yes. Yes. So  
24 let's go to the road safety conference transcript  
25 dated June 23rd, 2022, page 205.

1                   So starting at line 13 -- if we scroll  
2 down a little bit. So Mr. Feaver here was asking  
3 whether MPI could break down the costs in the  
4 collision. And so, at line 22, he says:

5                   ""So in each case, what was the  
6                   payout to the other party and to  
7                   look at it that way as opposed to  
8                   putting the whole cost of all the  
9                   parties together."                   "

10                   So he's basically asking if we can  
11 break down the costs between the vulnerable road user,  
12 the other party, the large vehicle that was identified  
13 and -- and given a breakdown of that information.

14                   Does that sound accurate?

15                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:       That does sound like  
16 what Mr. Feaver said.

17                   MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK:     Okay. And if we  
18 scroll into the next page, I think Mr. Feaver also  
19 asked -- so here, from line 3 on, we can see that he's  
20 asking:

21                   "It would also help somewhat to have  
22                   an at-fault category be used because  
23                   there may be cases where if --  
24                   there's got to be enough examples  
25                   where the end is so large to do that

1                   for all crashes and then for crashes  
2                   where the vehicle category is the  
3                   one at fault."

4                   So here, he's basically asking for  
5 another breakdown of the information in the large  
6 vehicle study to be provided based on fault in the  
7 collision. Is that correct?

8                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's what's  
9 stated here.

10                  MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. Thank you.  
11 And if we scroll down a little bit, I think what Mr.  
12 Patton responds with is -- here, he says:

13                   "We can try to unroll the data and  
14                   take a look at what is possible."

15                   And he says that would be very helpful.

16                   And so, to -- a long way around to come  
17 to this question. I'm just wondering whether MPI has  
18 any update in that regard; whether MPI has been able  
19 to break down this data and provide that; and -- and  
20 if it's been provided to stakeholders or if you're  
21 able to give us an update.

22                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sure. So I think  
23 what Mr. Patton alluded to at the conference was that  
24 what Mr. Feaver was asking for was fundamentally  
25 different from what had been provided in the large

1 vehicle study, and that it would take some effort to  
2 go away and understand, really, what's involved in  
3 what Mr. Feaver is asking for.

4                   So I think that's described in the  
5 response to the -- to the IR that a third-party  
6 liability cost analysis is fundamentally different  
7 from what was done here in the large vehicle study.  
8 And it would be kind of implausible to -- to split  
9 that cost out from the large vehicle study.

10                   MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK:    Okay. And I just  
11 want to clarify one (1) thing. The IR that CMMG had  
12 asked that -- that we just looked at -- was talking  
13 about third-party liability.

14                   And I think that is quite different,  
15 actually, from what Mr. Feaver was requesting here.  
16 So I just want to clarify that point because I -- I'm  
17 not asking about whether MPI would break down  
18 regarding a third-party liability claim. I appreciate  
19 that's different.

20                   I think what he's asking is just  
21 saying, With the numbers that you have here, you've  
22 given us a total collision cost, rather than more of a  
23 breakdown. And I'm wondering if -- if -- is there  
24 availability to try to -- that breaks it out for the  
25 at-fault vehicle versus the different -- the different



1 vehicles in the collision.

2                   So for example, if there's two (2)  
3 vehicles involved and a vulnerable road user, that  
4 there's a breakdown for total costs for each of those  
5 participants.

6                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    So you'll have to  
7 forgive me, but the vulnerable road user cost is split  
8 out in the large vehicle study.

9                   Is that distinct from what you're  
10 asking for?

11                   MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK:    I guess I'm  
12 asking for if there's other parts -- like, if there's  
13 two (2) vehicles involved in the collision and a  
14 vulnerable road user, we wouldn't be able to see that  
15 from the data as it's currently presented.

16                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    So the large vehicle  
17 study does include comparisons of vehicles involving,  
18 say, for example, pickup trucks to vehicles -- to all  
19 other vehicles and the associated physical damage,  
20 incident, injury, and vulnerable road user costs.

21                   So I think that analysis, as presented,  
22 does kind of get at the same fundamental question as  
23 what you're after.

24                   MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK:    But it doesn't  
25 break down, for example, the physical damage between

1 the large vehicle and a smaller vehicle, for example?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I have to apologize.  
3 I'm not sure what the -- what the distinction is from  
4 what's already available in the study.

5 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Sure. And -- and  
6 maybe this is something that we can go back to and  
7 have a discussion about. Because my, kind of, next  
8 question was going to be, clearly, Bike Winnipeg has  
9 some questions about the methodologies that were used  
10 in the large vehicle study.

11 Would you say that's fair to say?

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's fair to  
13 say.

14 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And would  
15 you agree that regarding -- information regarding the  
16 nature of analysis for a study is not easily conveyed  
17 through a Board Order. Would you agree with that?

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yeah, it kind of  
22 underlines the point I was trying to make earlier,  
23 that it's not the best forum for -- we want to have  
24 these collaborative discussions and that. It's the  
25 Board interpreting one thing that maybe Interveners

1 wish to have brought forward to the Board, and then  
2 MPI intervene it, and not really having those  
3 discussions.

4                   So we -- we prefer, you know, to have a  
5 very collaborative process working with the  
6 Interveners and other stakeholders to try and address  
7 these road safety issues.

8                   MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you. And I  
9 appreciate those comments.

10                   So my question then is, I understand  
11 that Bike Winnipeg requested to be involved in the  
12 methodology of this study and that wasn't taken up by  
13 MPI. Is that correct?

14                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.  
15 MPI developed the methodology based on what was  
16 ordered by the Board Order.

17                   MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. So my  
18 question is, given the conversation that we just had,  
19 why was Bike Winnipeg not involved in the methodology  
20 or other stakeholders of the large vehicle study?

21

22                   (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24                   THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: While that  
25 discussion is going on, Ms. Meek, can you give an

1 indication of how much longer you might be? Is this  
2 an appropriate time to take a break after you get an  
3 answer?

4 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: I -- I really  
5 don't expect to be that much longer. If you're able  
6 to hold on, I -- I would think maybe another ten (10)  
7 minutes.

8 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

9 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you.

10 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: We'll carry  
11 on.

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So to answer your  
16 question, I think it speaks to Mr. Triggs' point that  
17 when a Board Order comes through, you know, we are  
18 committed to meeting the specifics laid out in that  
19 Order. And there does become a conflict if an  
20 Intervener has a different idea for how that  
21 methodology might be developed.

22 So it is -- I do think it speaks to Mr.  
23 Triggs' point that we have a little bit of a conflict  
24 here between MPI having to follow the letter of the  
25 Order versus a more maybe collaborative approach, or

1 we'd be able to work more collaboratively with  
2 stakeholders.

3 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Yeah. And I  
4 think, Ms. -- you would appreciate that it becomes an  
5 issue of compliance, really.

6 So if we were to involve an Intervener  
7 in responding to that particular directive and then it  
8 later turned out that perhaps that influence had us in  
9 non-compliance with the directive. They would be  
10 looking at MPI for why it wasn't properly responded  
11 to.

12 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And I --  
13 I'm going to put it to you then that it -- it's  
14 possible and MPI has done in the past sought  
15 variations of previous directives, for example, to  
16 extend a deadline, if there was an issue like that.  
17 That's happened in the past.

18 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Sorry, to extend  
19 deadline on --

20 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: So, there's been  
21 examples in the past where MPI has requested a  
22 variation of a directive from the Board in order to  
23 allow, for example, an extension of a deadline in a  
24 Board Order. That's happened in the past.

25 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Oh, yes, I -- but

1 I -- I would draw a distinction between that and the  
2 content of -- of responding to a directive.

3 Absolutely.

4 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Well -- well, and  
5 I would put to you that MPI has also sought a  
6 variation of the content of a directive, as well.

7 Is that -- is that true?

8 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Let me just  
9 confer with -- with the panel --

10 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Sure.

11 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: -- and Mr.  
12 Triggs. I -- nothing jumps to mind, but perhaps.

13

14 (BRIEF PAUSE)

15

16 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Madam Chair, it  
17 might be a little bit longer than ten (10) minutes. I  
18 don't know if you'd prefer to take a -- a small break  
19 now and then I might have another -- it might be  
20 fifteen (15) minutes on the other side of a break, if  
21 -- if that's your preference.

22 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Mr.  
23 Scarfone...?

24 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Sorry, are we  
25 breaking?

1 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: How about if  
2 you answer the question and then we'll break.

3 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Mr. Triggs...?

4 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I -- I think, you  
5 know, there has been definitely situations in the past  
6 where, within the -- the thirty (30) days of the Board  
7 Order coming down, that if there was questions we had  
8 regarding an interpretation of an Order or -- or we  
9 didn't feel we could comply with that we asked the --  
10 the Board to review and vary those Orders, absolutely.

11 But if we look at it -- and were in  
12 those first, you know, number of days and so get -- it  
13 looks pretty clear to us -- we understand what it is,  
14 we're not going to be seeking a review and variance of  
15 it.

16 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Maybe we can take  
17 a break there, Madam Chair, if that -- if that works  
18 and I might follow up with that.

19 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: It's 2:30,  
20 could we be -- be back at quarter to 3:00 please?

21

22 --- Upon recessing at 2:33 p.m.

23 --- Upon resuming at 2:49 p.m.

24

25 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Meek...?

1 CONTINUED BY MS. MEEK:

2 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you, Madam  
3 Chair. Just to begin, I just want to respond very  
4 briefly to the conversation that I was having with Mr.  
5 Scarfone before the break and to assist me with that,  
6 I'd -- I'd just like to bring up part 6 DSR, appendix  
7 2 please, on the screen.

8 And I appreciate that this has nothing  
9 to do with road safety, but I would just like to draw  
10 your attention to the second page. MPI's response  
11 here and so this was in relation to a direction from  
12 the Public Utilities Board and at line 13 here, if  
13 someone could just confirm for me here, that this was  
14 somewhere where MPI had request the PUB defer an Order  
15 that was made previously because they were going to be  
16 working on GLM pricing framework. Is that correct?

17 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: That's correct.  
18 I had a discussion with Mr. Scarfone. He was confused  
19 with what your question was that you were asking. He  
20 thought it was when did we ever seek Intervener's  
21 input into whether we should IRV a matter.

22 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: I see. Okay.  
23 Thank you for that clarification.

24 So, then I would like to just move on  
25 with some -- just further information about a large



1 vehicle study.

2 If I could please go to PUB-MPI-1-138,  
3 page 2, figure 1. So here PUB had requested some  
4 information regarding the assignment of fault on  
5 various vehicle categories included in the large  
6 vehicle study. Is that correct?

7 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

8 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: And so, in the  
9 furthest right column here, we can see the categories  
10 -- category vehicles at fault, so the percent --  
11 percent category vehicle at fault in each of the  
12 collisions. Is that accurate?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's accurate.

14 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And so,  
15 heavy vehicles at line 7 we can see that their fault  
16 assignment was 72 percent. Is that correct?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

18 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay, and I think  
19 the large vehicle study phrased this slightly  
20 differently and they said that, "heavy vehicles were  
21 9.4 times more likely to be at fault than drivers of  
22 other vehicles." Is -- does that sound accurate?

23 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yeah, I suppose it  
24 does, yes.

25 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Subject to check,

1 you'd agree with that?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sure. Yeah.

3 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you. And,  
4 on this figure that we see on the screen in front of  
5 us, pick-up trucks had a fault assignment of 50  
6 percent. Is that correct at line 1?

7 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

8 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: And passenger and  
9 cargo vans had the third highest fault assignment at  
10 49 percent. Is that correct?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

12 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And so you  
13 would agree with me here that those same classes of  
14 vehicles that are more likely to be at fault, were  
15 also the vehicles that caused the most damage in  
16 collisions and with another vehicle or vulnerable road  
17 user, according to the large vehicle study?

18 Would you say that's fair to say?

19 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yeah. That's fair  
20 to say.

21 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you. And  
22 so, you would agree with me that in the large vehicle  
23 study, there was a category, as we see on the on line  
24 6 here, in front of us, for SUV's.

25 There was just one category for SUV's,

1 is that correct?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

3 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And you  
4 would agree with me that there are varying sizes of  
5 SUV's on the road, is that correct?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.  
7 Yes.

8 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. So for  
9 example, there's like full size SUV's and then there's  
10 compact SUV's, would you say that's fair to say?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's fair to  
12 say.

13 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And so a  
14 compact SUV would be more similar in size to a compact  
15 car, than a full size SUV.

16 Would that be reasonable to say?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Generally speaking,  
18 I think that'd be reasonable, yeah.

19 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you. And  
20 there was no differentiation between the size of the  
21 SUV's and the large vehicle study, is that correct?

22 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That is correct.

23 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. And so  
24 you'd agree with me that, given that the study is  
25 about examining the damage caused by different sizes

1 of vehicles, given the differing sizes of SUVs, the  
2 SUV category, doesn't really provide us with  
3 statistics that respond to the intention of the study.

4 Would you say that's fair to say?

5 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No, I would not.

6 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Could you  
7 elaborate on that?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sure, so I think  
9 we're maybe disagreeing on the precise difference  
10 between say a -- a Sedan and a small SUV, versus a  
11 small SUV and a large SUV.

12 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay.

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: The analysts doing  
14 the analysis determined that it was more appropriate  
15 to group SUVs together, as a whole, than say, for  
16 instance, a small SUV with a sedan.

17 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. Thank you.  
18 And now I'd like to return to CMMG-MPI-1-29 please.

19 Okay. And -- and in this IR, CMMG was  
20 requesting a breakdown of some of the information. We  
21 can scroll down a little bit so we can just see the --  
22 both the questions posed. Thank you.

23 CMMG was requesting a breakdown of some  
24 of the information included in the current study and  
25 then some additional information that had been

1 excluded. Is that accurate?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's accurate.

3 Yes.

4 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay, and so this  
5 brings us back to our conversation when we were  
6 talking about third-party liability.

7 And if we scroll down, we'll see that  
8 MPI refused to answer the question, but did provide  
9 some information as to why they weren't able to  
10 respond to the request.

11 And so, MPI had indicated that the  
12 Corporation, in this response, was willing to work  
13 with stakeholders on joint projects going forward,  
14 regarding the nature and analysis of MPI's data.

15 Would you agree with that?

16 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

17 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: And you would  
18 agree that the road -- the large vehicle study  
19 focused, as we talked about before, on -- from a road  
20 safety perspective, and so it wasn't really  
21 considering the rate-making side of the analysis or  
22 any impact that the findings might have on rates.

23 Would you say that's fair to say?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct. It  
25 was purely focused on road safety.

1 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you. And  
2 so you would agree that to include that kind of  
3 examination, that would require collaboration  
4 internally within MPI between the road safety team and  
5 maybe the ratemaking or the actuarial side of things.

6 Would you say that's fair to say?

7 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No. An analysis  
8 purely focused on road safety wouldn't necessarily  
9 require the involvement of the actuarial team.

10 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: So, sorry, let me  
11 rephrase my question. If we wanted to include some  
12 analysis regarding costs, so that other side of things  
13 that MPI said they weren't able to provide in this IR,  
14 it would require a -- a collaboration between road  
15 safety and the actuarial side of things to basically  
16 expand the study beyond just the scope of road safety?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, the road safety  
18 team is not qualified to do an analysis related to  
19 ratemaking.

20 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Right. So you  
21 would have to collaborate then with the actuarial side  
22 or the ratemaking side in order to provide a combined  
23 response. Would that be accurate?

24 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes. That's  
25 accurate.

1 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you. And  
2 then further, it would require collaboration between  
3 MPI and other stakeholders to address some of the  
4 concerns that stakeholders had.

5 Would you say that's fair to say?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: We're speaking in  
7 hypotheticals, so it's difficult to say. I -- I  
8 suppose it would depend on the nature of the question  
9 and the analysis being asked for.

10 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. I guess I  
11 can put it to you this way. If the Board were to  
12 direct MPI to re-do the large vehicle study, or to do  
13 a completely different study, with other parameters in  
14 collaboration with stakeholders like Bike Winnipeg or  
15 CMMG, for example, would MPI proceed with that?

16 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: The -- the  
17 Corporation would follow the direction of this Board,  
18 absolutely.

19

20 CONTINUED BY MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK:

21 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Perfect. Thank  
22 you. And I just wanted to follow up with some  
23 discussion that you had with Mr. Monnin today, talking  
24 about the large vehicle study and MPI's intention not  
25 to develop programming in response to the study.

1                   And, I think you said something and I  
2 think Mr. Triggs had provided some commentary here and  
3 I -- I just apologize, 'cause I just want to make sure  
4 I understood it correctly.

5                   There was a statement made that was  
6 something along the lines of, We don't find that large  
7 vehicles are over represented in the analysis.

8                   Was that -- is that a correct or  
9 accurate resuscitation of what you said?

10                  MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS:    Yes, it was and  
11 Mr. Doell could give a more detailed explanation of  
12 that, if you wish.

13                  MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK:    Sure. And maybe  
14 I can just add a little question on that. I'm just  
15 wondering if -- how you can clarify that with the  
16 findings of the large vehicle study, that large  
17 vehicles to impact collision costs.

18                  If you -- if you could provide some  
19 clarification.

20                  MR. BRYCE DOELL:    And so, in light of  
21 the questions that were asked in the IRs, we took a  
22 look at the large vehicle study and tried to better  
23 understand the relationship between large vehicles and  
24 fatal incidents involving vulnerable road users.

25                  And statistics that Mr. Triggs is



1 referring to is that the pick-up truck's involvement  
2 in vulnerable road user fatalities is proportional to  
3 their make-up of the fleet.

4 So, in other words, they get in fatal  
5 collisions with vulnerable road users at the same rate  
6 as other vehicles.

7 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay, so that  
8 doesn't change the finding of the large vehicle study  
9 that larger vehicles cause more damage, generally.

10 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Right the -- the --

11 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay.

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: -- it goes to --

13 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Two (2) different  
14 things.

15 MR. BRYCE DOELL: -- distinction  
16 between --

17 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Yeah.

18 MR. BRYCE DOELL: -- damage and  
19 fatalities and I think maybe speaks to what we were  
20 talking about this morning in terms of our strategy  
21 and our goals. That we are focused on reducing  
22 fatalities and serious injuries, less so on reducing  
23 damage.

24 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you. I  
25 appreciate that clarification.

1                   And, Mr. Triggs, you talked this  
2 morning about the addition of the \$2.3 million to the  
3 road safety budget, and that that's going to be made  
4 available to future road safety initiatives. That was  
5 something that you discussed in your presentation this  
6 morning and throughout questioning?

7                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS:    Yes.

8                   MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK:    And, can you  
9 advise -- do you anticipate there being any  
10 stakeholder engagement by MPI in determining the use  
11 of the \$2.3 million increase in the road safety budget  
12 as proposed?

13                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS:    I -- yes, we  
14 would be -- again -- following data first, and then  
15 obviously I think the stakeholders would be involved  
16 in that conversation, you know, with that -- 'cause,  
17 you know, for instance let's say the data is -- has  
18 been -- said -- some people had to work on -- some for  
19 motorcyclists. Well, that involved having to talk  
20 with CMMG. If the -- the data said, you know, having  
21 to work with police, we talk with the police and so  
22 forth and so on.

23                   MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK:    Okay. So you're  
24 basically thinking, you'd look at the data which might  
25 indicate something, you might be developing a strategy

1 for that, you would then involve the stakeholders that  
2 might be relevant for that strategy.

3 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Absolutely.

4 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Okay. Thank you.

5 And then -- and then finally, Mr. Triggs, you had  
6 talked about Denis L'Heureux who had lost his life  
7 recently on the Manitoba highway due to debris left on  
8 the road by farm equipment.

9 And I'm just wondering, in relation to  
10 that issue specifically, whether anybody on the panel  
11 can talk about what are the current safety protocols  
12 in relation to debris on the highway left by farm  
13 equipment? Can you speak to that at all?

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: So I think, to  
18 start, we might say that, in terms of, you know,  
19 maintaining the surface of the highway, obviously  
20 that's -- that's not what MPI's involved in. But I  
21 think I could speak a little bit about what we did  
22 following the accident.

23 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Oh, perfect.

24 That was going to be my next question, so thank you.

25 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: Oh. Sure.

1 So, you know, obviously we heard from Mr. Houghton and  
2 CMMG after that. We had also picked up, of course,  
3 the story in the media, and, you know, every tragic  
4 accident, and one that seems like one that could have  
5 been prevented.

6           And so following that, we discussed the  
7 matter with the Provincial Road Safety Committee, so  
8 our partners there in government, and we also -- you  
9 know, we -- we wanted to make sure that we were  
10 involving producers in that conversation as well.

11           So we also reached out to the keystone  
12 agricultural producers to really understand what does  
13 this issue look like from the -- the perspective of  
14 farmers who are using this equipment on the -- on the  
15 roadway.

16           What we heard -- you know, we  
17 understood that Mr. Houghton and CMMG had some  
18 suggestions in terms of interventions that could be  
19 effective.

20           I believe they proposed -- and this was  
21 in the media as well -- that they noted that maybe it  
22 would be helpful for producers to carry signage with  
23 them in their -- in their vehicles and the cabs of  
24 their -- their equipment that they could put out if  
25 they left debris on the roadway.

1                   When speaking with -- with CAP  
2 (phonetic) about that issue, I think there was some  
3 concern raised that simply putting out signs and  
4 signage on the roadway indicating that there was mud  
5 and debris left actually, you know, lessens the  
6 responsibility that's there in the Highway Traffic Act  
7 for anyone to leave debris on the road, right?

8                   There's an offence in the HTA for --  
9 you know, everyone has an onus to remove debris that  
10 they leave on a roadway, especially when it might  
11 cause a hazard to other road users.

12                   So we had these conversations with CAP.  
13 We talked with the Provincial Road Safety Committee,  
14 and, based on this, we -- you know, we also engaged  
15 our communications team to see if there were public  
16 messages that we could put out that would be helpful.

17                   I mean, one (1) of Mr. Houghton's  
18 specific concerns was that this happened relatively  
19 early in the fall, and that a similar accident could  
20 occur again. And so we wanted to do what we could to  
21 -- as quickly as we could to get messaging out to --  
22 to farmers and to the travelling public.

23                   We're still exploring other potential  
24 responses. I can tell you that that public messaging  
25 is now, you know, out. We are -- we have a campaign

1 that's ongoing right now. It's very targeted. It's  
2 social media-based. I'm just being told that the --  
3 the paid online ads started on Monday, but this was  
4 essentially as quickly as we could put that  
5 information out into the public realm.

6 In terms of other steps that we're  
7 taking, we're going to be collaborating more closely  
8 with keystone agricultural producers. We understand  
9 that they have a Farm Safety Council, and they've  
10 invited MPI to participate on that.

11 And we see that as a really positive  
12 opportunity to -- to have ongoing communication with  
13 the agricultural community around road safety issues.  
14 So I think a member of Bryce's team is going to be  
15 participating on that group, and Bryce may be called  
16 in to meetings to participate as well.

17 So, you know, we -- we certainly heard  
18 the concerns that were raised by CMMG around this  
19 accident, and we want to continue taking steps to --  
20 to make sure that we're doing everything possible to  
21 prevent similar accidents in the future.

22 MS. CHARLOTTE MEEK: Thank you very  
23 much. And I can advise CMMG's appreciative of  
24 collaboration in that regard.

25 Those are my questions, Madam Chair.

1 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms.  
2 Meek. Mr. Gabor...?

3 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: You'll be happy to  
4 know I have no questions about the large vehicle  
5 study.

6 Just sort of on a personal note before  
7 I go through your testimony, what is the -- do you  
8 know what the law is in relation to golf carts on  
9 roads?

10 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: Yes. Do you  
11 have a -- a specific question in relation --

12 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Well, I -- I won't  
13 --

14 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: I can -- I --

15 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: -- I won't name  
16 the area, but I -- I would say to you that this is  
17 something -- if you want to be proactive, the area  
18 where we have our cottage, I would say five (5) years  
19 ago had about four (4) -- four (4) golf carts for  
20 people who couldn't move.

21 I would say now we have probably forty  
22 (40) to fifty (50) golf carts, many of them being  
23 driven by ten (10) to twelve (12) year old children,  
24 one (1) of which ran into a telephone pole and almost  
25 killed the driver who's a child. I don't think

1 they're licensed. I don't think there's insurance on  
2 them.

3                   And I'm just wondering, if that's the  
4 case and if -- I realize it's not in bailiwick in that  
5 they would have to change the law, but I don't know if  
6 MPI is actually aware of this -- of this area because  
7 it's -- it's just a question of time before there's  
8 going to be a whole rash of accidents.

9                   In fact, I mean, I saw one where  
10 somebody was driving and almost got -- ran a stop sign  
11 and almost got -- I guess it's one (1) of the four (4)  
12 stop signs we have -- almost got nailed by a car.

13                   MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: Yeah. So I --  
14 I think we're aware of those situations out there. I  
15 think obviously golf carts aren't registerable.  
16 They're -- they're not plated, they're not insured  
17 through MPI, and I think our reading of the HTA is  
18 that they're not supposed to be operated on a roadway.

19                   And we are aware that there's a number  
20 of municipalities that have passed by-laws which, in  
21 their view, authorizes the use of some of these golf  
22 carts on the roads.

23                   And I think, you know, it's an offence  
24 to operate an unregistered vehicle or to operate a  
25 vehicle on a roadway that doesn't meet safety



1 standards, and these golf carts don't. They don't  
2 have doors, for one. They don't have seatbelts. They  
3 don't have proper lighting like a car would have.

4 And so I think I would agree with some  
5 of your comments that this is a -- a very risky  
6 behaviour that we're seeing out there, and it's one  
7 that's concerning for us at MPI.

8 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Okay. Thank you.  
9 Kristen, could you go to Exhibit 68, which is the MPI  
10 -- to page 4.

11 These statistics, they're -- they're  
12 Transport Canada's statistics?

13 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's right.

14 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: And do you have  
15 them for all provinces?

16 MR. BRYCE DOELL: We don't have them  
17 available at this moment, but we can get them --

18 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Right.

19 MR. BRYCE DOELL: -- for all  
20 provinces.

21 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: So I -- I'm just  
22 wondering, Mr. Scarfone, if I could get an undertaking  
23 that you would provide fatalities per hundred (100) --  
24 per ten thousand (10,000) registered vehicles and  
25 serious injuries per ten thousand (10,000) registered

1 vehicles and include in the graph Saskatchewan and BC  
2 'cause I'd like to see a comparison of those.

3 Do you have any idea -- sorry?

4 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: That is an  
5 undertaking that can be done only up to -- the data's  
6 only available up to 2020 --

7 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: That's fine.

8 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: -- I've been  
9 told.

10 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: That's fine.

11

12 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 28: MPI to provide fatalities  
13 and serious injuries per  
14 ten thousand (10,000)  
15 registered vehicles up to  
16 2020, including Manitoba,  
17 Saskatchewan, and BC.

18

19 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: My memory's a  
20 little faulty. In terms of fatalities in Manitoba,  
21 what happened between 2016 and '17? Or why was 2016  
22 so high?

23 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Short answer is that  
24 we don't have an understanding of exactly why. Our  
25 best understanding is that it's a statistical anomaly.

1 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Yeah.

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: We don't understand  
3 exactly why 2016 was so high.

4 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Okay. Page 15,  
5 Kristen. Eighty-four (84) percent of fatalities  
6 occurred outside Winnipeg, and I would just indicate  
7 to you, I think I've been doing this too long because,  
8 as a result of doing it, as soon as I hear an accident  
9 on the radio, I go through your four (4) key factors  
10 automatically.

11 And as soon as I hear it's rural  
12 Manitoba, I go -- I -- I have a pretty good idea what  
13 the vehicle was, and I'm waiting to hear whether they  
14 were ejected from the vehicle, and then you have a  
15 pretty good idea.

16 But on page 15, you've got that 84  
17 percent fatalities occurred outside Winnipeg. Any  
18 idea what the breakdown is of that, no seatbelts  
19 versus impaired versus distracted?

20 MR. BRYCE DOELL: We don't have those  
21 numbers available at our fingertips right now, but  
22 that's certainly something we can provide.

23 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Yeah, if you could  
24 as an undertaking. I'd be interested to know what the  
25 -- what the breakdown would be.

1                   Page 16. Now, on the right -- sorry,  
2 oh, sorry, I would ask as an undertaking, that you --

3                   MR. STEVE SCARFONE:     And I --

4                   BOARD CHAIR GABOR:     -- that MPI  
5 provide a breakdown of the 84 percent of fatalities  
6 broken down by the four (4) factors.

7                   MR. STEVE SCARFONE:     Yeah. I'm told  
8 that we can make that undertaking.

9

10 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 29:     For MPI to provide a  
11                                   breakdown of the 84  
12                                   percent of fatalities  
13                                   broken down by the four  
14                                   (4) factors

15

16                   BOARD CHAIR GABOR:     I would assume  
17 your data base is sophisticated enough to -- to  
18 provide that.

19                   Page 16. I'm interested in -- on the  
20 right-hand side, about the new model, emerging issues  
21 identified. It goes -- gets generated, and approval  
22 of the new programming occurs throughout the year.

23                   Who approves them? You've got the  
24 money. You've got the money set aside. You've got  
25 this process. But at the end of the day, is it an act

1 -- Mr. Triggs, is it you? Is it a committee? Is it  
2 the Board? Who -- who actually -- who gives the green  
3 light?

4 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: A lot would  
5 depend on the amount of money, but it would most  
6 likely be myself. I'd be the person who would approve  
7 it.

8 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Okay. And do you  
9 have authority up to a certain amount or...?

10 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes. I have  
11 authority up to I think it's a million dollars is what  
12 my authority is.

13 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Okay. Okay.  
14 Next, you talked about the survey that was done. And  
15 I -- I -- it was the road survey that was done. And  
16 you asked the question illegal and legal drugs. I --  
17 quite frankly, at the time, I was fascinated that  
18 people were going to acknowledge they had taken  
19 illegal drugs, but legal drugs, was there a breakdown?

20 Like, what was -- what was the question  
21 put to them in terms of -- like, what is a legal drug?  
22 Is it -- I take -- I take something for diabetes. Is  
23 -- would I be answering 'yes' if it was that, or is it  
24 -- or illegal drugs, I would assume, would have some  
25 impact of mood altering.

1                   Were the legal drugs the same or was it  
2 just a catchall and you don't know?

3                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    Good question.  
4 Perhaps the term 'survey' is a little bit misleading.

5                   BOARD CHAIR GABOR:    Yeah.

6                   MR. BRYCE DOELL:    So, we weren't  
7 relying on self-reporting of these substances.  It was  
8 through a saliva sample --

9                   BOARD CHAIR GABOR:    Okay.

10                  MR. BRYCE DOELL:    -- sent to a lab for  
11 testing.  So, illegal substances could include things  
12 like opiates or cannabis.

13                  BOARD CHAIR GABOR:    And legal would be  
14 -- legal, not illegal, legal would be what?

15                  MR. BRYCE DOELL:    So, for instance,  
16 opiates that are say --

17                  BOARD CHAIR GABOR:    So, we're talking  
18 prescription drugs --

19                  MR. BRYCE DOELL:    Cannabis.

20                  BOARD CHAIR GABOR:    -- that could have  
21 an impact on your ability to drive?

22                  MR. BRYCE DOELL:    Yes.  
23 Benzodiazepine, if I'm pronouncing that correctly, for  
24 instance, but also things like cocaine, which would be  
25 an illicit drug.

1 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Right. Right.  
2 Okay. You talked about the dashboard which is going  
3 to be ready for January/February.

4 What -- what does the dashboard look  
5 like initially and what are you hoping it looks like  
6 after you've had it running for a while? Like, what  
7 information can be obtained from it?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, the information  
9 that'll be obtained from it is similar to what's  
10 currently provided in the Traffic Collision Statistics  
11 Report. So, that's a PDF document with an array of  
12 tables --

13 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Right.

14 MR. BRYCE DOELL: -- that provide  
15 fatality and serious injury and collision counts  
16 across a number of different factors. So, things like  
17 major contributing factor, so, for instance, the --  
18 the count of individuals who died due to impaired  
19 driving, speed, distraction, seatbelt use, and so  
20 forth.

21 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Okay. And it will  
22 be interactive?

23 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's correct.

24 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Okay. Okay. And  
25 finally, into this area. As I understand it, I -- I

1 heard from the panel they want more collaboration,  
2 they want a better way, they don't want a technical  
3 conference.

4                   Essentially, what you're saying is you  
5 want something outside the hearing process where you  
6 meet separately with the stakeholders and provide them  
7 with information and have discussion. Is that right?

8                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes. As a high  
9 level summary, yes.

10                   BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Okay. And the --  
11 these sessions would be led by MPI?

12                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: That is, you  
13 know, to be determined if it's the best way of doing  
14 it. And I think it gets back to the -- you know,  
15 what's the goal that we want to achieve. And -- and  
16 it's the sharing of information. So talking with the  
17 various parties. Well, what is the best way of  
18 sharing the information to you.

19                   BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Okay. And who  
20 would set the goals?

21                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I think the --  
22 the high -- well, the first goal is the sharing the  
23 information. I think that is probably what would come  
24 out of all of the technical conferences, so that is  
25 the goal. And then we would then work with the



1 Interveners and other stakeholders and ask, well, you  
2 know, what information do you need, what's the best  
3 way of conveying it, and so forth and so on.

4 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Okay. And if  
5 Interveners were not satisfied with the process, what  
6 would their -- what would their recourse be?

7 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I'd say come back  
8 here and say, you know, MPI tried and it wasn't  
9 successful and this is a better process.

10 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Okay. Mr. Triggs,  
11 at one point, I believe I got this right, you think  
12 the panel should consider whether MPI is spending  
13 enough money to reduce claims costs.

14 That's what you saw the role of this  
15 panel to be?

16 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: It's -- well,  
17 part of the evaluation that we have to do for the  
18 appeal -- for the rate setting is looking at the  
19 expenditures that we -- we have. We have, you know, a  
20 \$14 million budget on that.

21 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Yeah.

22 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: If the -- the --  
23 I think part of the assessment of that amount is, you  
24 know, is it -- is it appropriate. And whether it's  
25 appropriate is whether it's too much or too little or

1 is it, you know, just right based on the information  
2 that's before the Board.

3                   And so, if the Panel came to a  
4 conclusion based on the information that it has before  
5 it that MPI should be spending -- pick a number, then  
6 that I think would be something they could state on.

7                   BOARD CHAIR GABOR:   And what would you  
8 envision the information the Panel would have before  
9 it?

10                   MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS:   There -- there  
11 would be details on, you know, the information that we  
12 have, you know, the programs that we're are planning.  
13 Choosing -- the programs that we are providing would  
14 be there; what our assessment of them; how we evaluate  
15 them; the money that is spent; and the return on it  
16 and our evaluation of it.

17                   So, we -- we do that now.   So, you  
18 would have that information on it so you could then --  
19 those programs, okay, yeah, this works, this doesn't.  
20 The -- the challenge we have is that each particular  
21 program, the -- the spend itself isn't really that  
22 material for the whole overall rate application.

23                   There's only one (1) of any real  
24 significance, correct if I'm wrong here, is the  
25 Enhanced Enforcement Program, which is around \$2

1 million itself, and everything else is spread out, so.

2 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: And -- and the  
3 process you envisage, would we be entitled to ask you  
4 questions?

5 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes. And it --  
6 it all comes down to -- it's the scope of the -- of  
7 how much effort -- time and effort goes into preparing  
8 for it and the -- the minutia of the detail of it.

9 We are talking, you know, a \$14 million  
10 program, and we're spending -- you know, half the time  
11 was spent on talking about Project Nova, so it's kind  
12 of...

13 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: Oh. Oh, I agree.  
14 But I guess the -- you -- I guess your comment was the  
15 costs were one half of a position for -- sorry -- for  
16 yours, for your budget. And I believe -- I'm just  
17 going based on what the President said, we're dealing  
18 with Project Nova. It went from 130 million to \$300  
19 million. It's a big ticket item, so.

20 Sorry. Sorry, your mic's off, Mike.  
21 Mike, your --

22 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yeah, just --

23 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: -- your mic's off.

24 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Thank you. And I  
25 would say this is kind of a smaller ticket item that

1 we're spending on this equivalent amount of time and  
2 resources dealing with it, so it's kind of  
3 proportionality. And, you know, this is --  
4 ultimately, it's the Board's decision on how it wishes  
5 to approach these matters.

6 BOARD CHAIR GABOR: On -- on the  
7 process that you would envisage, where you would be  
8 coming back to the Board, would the Interveners have a  
9 role at the hearing, as well?

10 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Ideally, I would  
11 hope that matters could be dealt with in the  
12 Information Request process. You know, there is a --  
13 you know, questions are asked on that, and the  
14 information should be provided, you know, going back  
15 to the -- what the role of the -- what the Board is,  
16 is -- you know, determine whether or not the rates  
17 that MPI is applying for are just and reasonable.

18 So does the questions and answers help  
19 the panel answer those questions? That would be the -  
20 - the key issue.

21 BOARD MEMBER GABOR: But I guess at  
22 the Hearing, if you have all of this consultation, do  
23 you envisage that the -- one of the roles the  
24 Interveners may play would be to have an agreed  
25 statement of fact or whatever, saying that they

1 supported the MPI programs?

2 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Actually, that's  
3 a great idea. I hadn't thought of that but, yeah,  
4 that's certainly something to think about.

5 BOARD MEMBER GABOR: Yeah. Those are  
6 my questions.

7 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.  
8 Ms. Nemec...?

9 BOARD MEMBER NEMEC: Thank you. Maybe  
10 I can ask Ms. Schubert to pull up the budget. I think  
11 it might be on page 18 of this document. Thank you.

12 And just a couple questions on the  
13 budget. This is a budget that is a program budget.  
14 So costed by program, I'm assuming.

15 And just wondering whether each program  
16 includes only direct costs or are there allocated  
17 costs from salaries, other types of overhead costs  
18 that actually get allocated among those programs?

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yeah. The  
23 salaries and administrative expenses are on the bottom  
24 line. They're departmental expenses.

25 BOARD MEMBER NEMEC: So that's 100

1 percent of your costs. Your direct FTEs and salary  
2 costs are in line -- they're departmental expenses.

3 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes.

4 BOARD MEMBER NEMEC: And the reason I  
5 ask that is, initially, I looked at 2018, '19, and  
6 '20. And 2.7 million and 2.9 million. And then, I  
7 saw the '23/'24 proposal at 2.2 million.

8 So I thought with additional staff and  
9 four (4) additional FTEs, I was just wondering if  
10 maybe some of that had been allocated, so that was  
11 where my question arose.

12 But is there a reason why it decreases?

13

14 (BRIEF PAUSE)

15

16 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: It's never a  
17 simple question -- simple answer.

18 There's a number of factors that input  
19 into that. Some of the -- you know, the effect of the  
20 pandemic on that. There's -- that resulted in some  
21 reduction in cost. There was different roles and, I  
22 guess, some of Bryce's staff, they performed DBA  
23 functions outside of the road safety component. So  
24 there's the allocation aspect of that.

25 And I -- I think that was the

1 explanation for it.

2 BOARD MEMBER NEMEC: But different --  
3 maybe people were allocated to other departments where  
4 now they're fully allocated into -- so would that be a  
5 change in FTEs, of assigned FTEs?

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: So my  
10 understanding is that there's -- there's four (4)  
11 analysts who do, kind of, policies to -- sort of work.  
12 And a number of years ago, the allocation between  
13 their work was 50 percent to the driver and vehicle  
14 licensing line of business and the other 50 percent  
15 was to the road safety analysis. And that has shifted  
16 currently --

17 BOARD MEMBER NEMEC: Okay.

18 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: -- a change.

19 BOARD MEMBER NEMEC: Thank you. And  
20 talking about those, are those the four (4) new FTEs  
21 that you spoke of that have just recently been added  
22 in the last twelve (12) to sixteen (16) months?

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yeah. So those  
2 four (4) additional FTEs, while they do do road safety  
3 work, they don't do exclusively road safety work. So  
4 they are included in this departmental expenses here.

5 BOARD MEMBER NEMEC: Okay. And  
6 really, where I wanted to talk about the four (4)  
7 FTEs, in the new updated strategy, I think you said  
8 2022 to 2025, where it's more data driven.

9 And it appears that you're, kind of,  
10 starting to get to the end of phase one (1). And  
11 there was a lot of data collection.

12 So I would assume in -- in phase one  
13 (1), you have a lot of the resources focused on data  
14 collection and probably costs that aren't truly  
15 associated with direct spending on program type  
16 initiatives.

17 So I'm wondering with moving into --  
18 further into phase two (2), whether your FTEs are  
19 going to change or your -- and part of that 2.0  
20 million that has been now allocated for programs, is  
21 that going to be totally spent on program-type costs  
22 versus data collection-type costs?

23 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: To answer --  
24 to answer the first question, we have no plans at this  
25 time to add additional FTEs. That \$2 million for



1 2023/2024 is primarily allocated for programming.  
2 That's not to say, though, that if we didn't have an  
3 idea put forth by a member of the team, where  
4 additional data analysis and collection would yield  
5 insights, we wouldn't, you know, decline that just on  
6 the nature of this is phase one (1) or phase two (2)  
7 of the strategy.

8                   But generally speaking, we're trying to  
9 make an impact with programming with that 2 million.

10                   BOARD MEMBER NEMEC:    And I guess I  
11 just bring that up because I know sometimes when you  
12 get into data, you can really get into a lot of data.  
13 And there's sort of the returns of more and more data  
14 isn't always as -- being an accountant, I know I can  
15 get myself into that myself.

16                   My next question related more on -- on  
17 maybe just a concept of developing baselines.

18                   You talked about some of the studies  
19 that you had performed in developing baselines.  And I  
20 see that as sometimes the start to be able to develop  
21 specific targets in the future.

22                   And I know how hard it is probably to  
23 go and get a \$2.0 million budget approved at your  
24 board of directors, without saying initially what that  
25 2.0 million is going to be focused on.  So sometimes

1 understanding what your success factors are,  
2 developing targets, meeting those targets. Then --  
3 that then shows success.

4 And have you thought about, in your  
5 2022 to 2025 plan, about developing such targets and  
6 then reporting them, perhaps in your dashboard, down  
7 the road?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So yes, that is  
9 something that's part of the strategy. You'll have to  
10 forgive me. I don't recall precisely where it is.  
11 But part of that first phase does include setting  
12 objectives and key results for those main focus areas.  
13 And that those would then be used to evaluate the  
14 success of the programs.

15 Those wouldn't be reported by that  
16 dashboard, but we do, as stated in the strategy, plan  
17 to have an interim report on the progress that would  
18 include some -- those metrics that we're talking  
19 about.

20 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.  
21 Mr. Bass...?

22 BOARD MEMBER BASS: Mr. Triggs, is the  
23 road safety budget allocated completely to the Basic  
24 line of business?

25 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes, the part

1 that we're talking today here is.

2 BOARD MEMBER BASS: Fourteen million  
3 or whatever.

4 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: Yes.

5 BOARD MEMBER BASS: Okay. Thank you.

6 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

7 Ms. Boulter...?

8 BOARD MEMBER BOULTER: I do have a  
9 question on large vehicles.

10 I always think you should look at all  
11 across Canada. And I'm wondering if you have done a  
12 study on -- or found out whether other Canadian  
13 jurisdictions -- what they are focused on; the actual  
14 vehicle or the actual behaviours.

15 So what are other Canadian  
16 jurisdictions doing besides Saskatchewan and BC?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yeah. So good  
18 question. We haven't spoke to other jurisdictions  
19 with respect to something as specific as the large  
20 vehicle study. But I can confirm that they're focused  
21 on similar issues as we are with respect to drivers.

22 So I'm going to sound like a broken  
23 record, but impairment, speed, distraction, and  
24 seatbelt use are common priority items across the  
25 country.

1 BOARD MEMBER BOULTER: Well, when you  
2 have your meetings with -- do you go to CCMTA? Yes.  
3 Okay.

4 Isn't this a topic on your agenda every  
5 year or twice yearly I think?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: You'll have to  
7 forgive me. I'm attending my first one in Ottawa next  
8 week. So, I can't speak to prior ones but I think  
9 that would be -- that would be accurate. Yes. Those  
10 are common themes. Yep.

11 MS. SUSAN BOULTER: Okay. So, that's  
12 something that would have been discussed in the last  
13 six (6) months and I believe you have monthly phone  
14 calls too? Yeah?

15 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: Forgive me. I  
16 -- we -- we don't have a CCMTA rep here. Bryce is  
17 going to be attending his first CCMTA meeting next  
18 week. I don't sit on CC -- CCMTA. So, unfortunately,  
19 I don't think we can speak to those discussions right  
20 now and I apologize for that.

21 MS. SUSAN BOULTER: Okay. Thank you  
22 very much. I do have some other questions.

23 Phase 1 of the new strategy is to  
24 develop baseline understanding of drivers whose high-  
25 risk behaviour results in fatalities and serious

1 injuries. I'll be perfectly frank. This has been the  
2 same, jurisdiction from jurisdiction, decade and  
3 decade.

4                   What on earth do you think you're going  
5 to discover that hasn't been unearthed already and  
6 discussed ad nauseam?

7                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's actually a  
8 really good question. So, what -- what sets Manitoba  
9 and MPI apart from others is that we've got the  
10 history on drivers from when they first take driver  
11 training to when they take their test to their entire  
12 history up until when they're involved in one of those  
13 collisions.

14                   So, when we talk about being data-  
15 driven, it's kind of rooted in that, that we've got a  
16 bit of an advantage there, if you will, in terms of  
17 the data that we've got on hist -- on drivers, going  
18 back for their entire history.

19                   MS. SUSAN BOULTER: Okay, but what I'm  
20 saying is that I think -- or what I'm asking is you --  
21 you've got all that data -- what -- and you've had it  
22 collected for years and years.

23                   What is this study going to uncover  
24 that's so unique that you have to pause or -- or  
25 rethink your approach? This is the same stuff. It's

1 the same group of people that cause all -- that cause  
2 most of the accidents.

3 MR. MICHAEL TRIGGS: I think the  
4 problem is that we haven't really analyzed it in  
5 detail to determine what the issues are. Take --  
6 take, for example, one of the things that we're going  
7 to be examining in the -- the near future is the  
8 driver education programs we have for high school  
9 students.

10 So, we haven't gone -- we do know every  
11 student who has participated in that high school  
12 driver education program. We know every student who  
13 has, in the current driver's ed. program, we know  
14 everyone who's been in an -- in -- in collisions. We  
15 haven't connected those dots in the past. So, that  
16 would be a -- a -- a -- just one simple example of a -  
17 - of a factor we would check.

18 So, if you analyze that data, I'm just  
19 going to make up stuff. It's that, if it determines  
20 that there's -- people who have taken high school  
21 driver education have never been in a fatal accident,  
22 highly unlikely that's the case, but, if we de --  
23 determine that, well, that would be information that  
24 would be very valuable. So, okay, how should we be  
25 pursuing the future?

1 MS. SUSAN BOULTER: Okay. Well, I'm  
2 going to look forward to your results. Thank you very  
3 much. MPI does not fund infrastructure but it does  
4 collect data on intersection collisions. Those  
5 traffic circles drive me crazy.

6 Do you have data on what's happening  
7 with those?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's not something  
9 that we've looked at, specifically, although I think  
10 the larger body of research on roundabouts is that  
11 they are effective measures for improving traffic  
12 safety but we don't have any specific numbers at our  
13 fingertips now that we can provide you on that.

14 MS. SUSAN BOULTER: Okay. Thank you.  
15 Let me see if there's anything else. Okay. That's  
16 about it for now. I'll think of more later, I'm sure.

17 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. I  
18 have one -- a couple of questions.

19 The first is, you just spoke about the  
20 data analytics with regard to driving behaviour that  
21 would be indicative of the likelihood of a person  
22 becoming involved in a serious or fatal collision.

23 So, is there any action that the  
24 Registrar can take, after looking at that data, before  
25 one of those accidents occurs, that can affect the

1 behaviour before the accident?

2 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: Yeah. Thanks  
3 for that question. That's -- I -- I think where we  
4 need to ask some more -- some more questions -- we --  
5 right now -- we've got one year of fatality data that  
6 we've reviewed. We want to make sure that we have a  
7 really good understanding. Bryce's team is going to  
8 look into past years.

9 But once we have, you know, a really  
10 good understanding of what the profile is of a driver  
11 who is likely to become involved in one -- a fatal  
12 collision, then that turns, you know, the question  
13 into what kind of interventions can we take, as the  
14 licensing authority at MPI, through our Driver Fitness  
15 -- Driver Improvement and Control Program.

16 And we want to make sure -- I know  
17 Bryce has spent a lot of time analyzing our programs  
18 but I -- I could see that, in the future, we'll  
19 probably want to be looking to make sure that we are  
20 making the best use of that program, make sure that  
21 the interventions that we take with drivers today,  
22 when we send people to courses, when we suspend a  
23 licence, are these having tangible effects in the real  
24 world or are there other interventions we should be  
25 taking with drivers, going forward, especially when



1 they have some of these red flags on their driving  
2 history.

3 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank  
4 you, and my last question is: Can you, please,  
5 describe the total penalties for a distracted driving  
6 conviction --

7 MALE SPEAKER: So, you'll --

8 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: -- not dollar  
9 value but all of the other things that are attached to  
10 that?

11 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: Yeah. So, you  
12 -- forgive me. I don't have it for all. So, this is,  
13 sort of, subject to check.

14 So, my understanding is, from my  
15 memory, that it's a \$672 ticket, for -- if it's the  
16 first offence. Then it's a three-day licence  
17 suspension. If it's a second offence, it's a seven-  
18 day licence suspension, and I believe the DSR penalty  
19 with that is minus five (-5) and, then, that was  
20 bumped up, through provincial legislation, a few years  
21 ago.

22 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: And is there a  
23 licence reinstatement fee, if a person's licence has  
24 been suspended for three (3) or seven (7) days?

25 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: Off the top of

1 my head, I'm not sure but I can find out, if you'll  
2 give me a moment.

3 THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Sure, and,  
4 while you're -- you're looking at that, my question,  
5 then, is: Given that the penalties for distracted  
6 driving are pretty substantial, I have never seen a  
7 campaign that informs the public of how substantial  
8 those penalties are and would that help to be a  
9 deterrent effect for people, in using their cell  
10 phones when they're driving, if they knew exactly what  
11 penalties they could be subjected to, if they were  
12 convicted?

13 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: Yeah. So,  
14 thank you for that. That's a -- I -- I agree. I  
15 don't think that there are. I don't think we  
16 specifically say what the penalties are in some of our  
17 anti-distracted driving campaigns.

18 So, I think we'd have to discuss that a  
19 little bit more with our communications team, and a  
20 lot of our communications -- we're -- we're -- we're  
21 really focussed on how effective those messages are.  
22 So, we are testing them, we're comparing different  
23 message, different tag lines, different target markets  
24 all the time, and we're become very -- we're becoming  
25 very, very tactical, in terms of how we use messages

1 and to who -- and who is going to be on the receiving  
2 end of them, especially through the use of the  
3 internet. It allows us to do really precise  
4 microtargeting.

5                   So, not to go on and on but just to say  
6 that it's a good suggestion and it's something that we  
7 can take back to our communications team to see if it  
8 is effective. Do we see a bump in the number of  
9 clicks or the -- the -- the number of people who  
10 report remembering the message or passing it on to  
11 others and, so, I -- I thank you for that.

12                   THE PANEL CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.  
13 Mr. Scarfone...?

14                   MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Thank you, Madam  
15 Chair. Oh, she's ahead of me. Thank you, Ms.  
16 Schubert.

17                   Oh, just before I begin with that, just  
18 to finish the story on -- on Mr. Gabor's question  
19 concerning golf carts, there was a development  
20 concerning those about ten (10) years ago. The  
21 Bridges Golf Course was sued and -- but not before the  
22 person injured in the golf cart had come to MPI,  
23 looking for PIPP benefits, and those were denied, on  
24 the basis, as -- as Mr. Sarginson has said, that,  
25 well, that's not something that can be registered.

1 It's not an insurable vehic -- vehicle.

2                   So, it was brought to court and Madam  
3 Justice Keyser decided that it was, in fact, an  
4 automobile, and was -- the injured person could  
5 qualify for benefits under PIPP and, then, you know,  
6 just to show you where the government's at, they went  
7 and changed our legislation, to exclude golf carts  
8 from, you know, so PIPP benefits aren't available,  
9 now, for someone who's injured on a golf cart.

10                   So, they're back to almost a no man's  
11 land. They can sue, in tort, I suppose, but they're  
12 not -- they're not -- they're excluded under the Off-  
13 Road Vehicles Act as well. So, they're in a bit of a  
14 no man's land, other than a tort action, at this  
15 stage.

16                   BOARD CHAIR GABOR: I appreciate that  
17 but I'm sort of with Mr. Triggs. I'm concerned about  
18 fatalities --

19                   MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Right.

20                   BOARD CHAIR GABOR: -- because, you  
21 know, the one (1) benefit of getting older is you  
22 could see it coming and we're going to have kids  
23 killed on golf carts and, unfortunately, if that's the  
24 case, what's going to happen is it's going to take  
25 that for them to change the legislation and to -- and

1 to deal with it and I don't know what the answer is,  
2 if they have to be licensed or whatever but, when  
3 you've got children, well under the age of sixteen  
4 (16) driving them, and some of these golf carts can  
5 move very quickly and they're driving them on public  
6 roads, you know, that's -- it -- it's just -- it's --  
7 it's going to happen.

8                   But, you know, I don't know if MPI can  
9 do anything about it, but it's -- it's sort of a sad  
10 state of affairs when you -- when you can see it  
11 coming and this -- you know, as Mr. Triggs said, I --  
12 I'm worried about people's lives being put at risk,  
13 that's all. So I appreciate your comment though.

14

15 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STEVE SCARFONE:

16                   MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Thank you. And,  
17 Mr. Doell, you'll recall that Messrs. Monnin and  
18 Klassen, I think both of them, put to you these four  
19 (4) high-risk driving behaviours that you see before  
20 you on the screen, being: distracted, driving speed,  
21 impaired driving, and occupant restraints or  
22 seatbelts.

23                   The goal of the new strategy as I  
24 understand it, sir, will be to -- to bring the  
25 Manitoba rate below that of the national average?

1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

2 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And is it fair to  
3 say that making some headway with respect to these  
4 four (4) key factors would serve that purpose?

5 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, that's exactly  
6 right.

7 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And what about  
8 making some headway with respect to just one (1) or  
9 two (2) of these factors; would it still serve that  
10 purpose?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: To a lesser extent  
12 it would.

13 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Yes?

14 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes.

15 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And then as it  
16 concerns the large vehicle study, does the Corporation  
17 know if reducing the amount of damages caused to  
18 smaller vehicles would serve that same purpose of the  
19 new strategy?

20 MR. BRYCE DOELL: No, it -- it would  
21 not serve the same purpose of the strategy. Reducing  
22 damage is not the same as reducing fatalities and  
23 serious injuries.

24 But reducing distractions, speed,  
25 impairment, and occupant increasing occupant restra --

1 restraints, excuse me, those will contribute to  
2 reduced fatalities and serious injuries.

3 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Okay. And we've  
4 just heard from Madam Chair that number 4 there -- or  
5 sorry, number 3 -- I'm sorry, number 1, distracted  
6 driving results in a ticket.

7 So that's a provincial offence?

8 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

9 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And so too is  
10 speeding?

11 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

12 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And so too is not  
13 wearing one's seatbelt?

14 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

15 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And impaired  
16 driving is, in fact, a crime?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's also correct.

18 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And so, is it  
19 fair to say that the cooperation of law enforcement is  
20 a critical factor in realizing success in reducing  
21 these factors?

22 MR. BRYCE DOELL: It absolutely is,  
23 yes.

24 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And so, when we  
25 heard Mr. Triggs make mention of, you know, making

1 full use of the road safety budget, and specifically  
2 he gave an example of the enforced enhancement.

3                   So maybe it's the -- my conservative  
4 world view, but wouldn't it make sense just to throw a  
5 whole bunch of money to the police and tell them to  
6 get after these four (4)?

7                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: No, for the reason  
8 you just explained, that it's not just a matter of  
9 throwing money at the problem, because they can't  
10 necessarily staff all the money we would throw at  
11 them.

12                   Really, the only solution is to be more  
13 targeted and precise with those enhanced enforcement  
14 dollars. And that's what we talk about when we talk  
15 about reallocating funds for distraction to the city,  
16 for seatbelts to -- Interlake and Parkland regions,  
17 for instance.

18                   MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Okay. Thank you.  
19 And also, in terms of taking the time as you indicated  
20 in your evidence, to decipher the data on fatalities  
21 and serious injuries, do I take that to mean that also  
22 involves waiting on any investigations that the police  
23 may be conducting with respect to those?

24                   MR. BRYCE DOELL: Sir, can I ask you  
25 to repeat the question?



1 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Sure. So, you've  
2 indicated in your examination-in-chief that with some  
3 of these recent fatalities that there is a -- a time  
4 lag of sorts where the Corporation has to decipher the  
5 data before acting upon any strategies?

6 MR. BRYCE DOELL: I understand. Yes,  
7 absolutely.

8 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Yes. And so, the  
9 question I guess would be: Does that also include a  
10 receiving from law enforcement the results of any  
11 investigations taken with respect to those accidents?

12 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That may be the case  
13 on an individual basis. Yes, (INDISCERNIBLE).

14 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Okay. And so  
15 again, law enforcement an important stakeholder for  
16 MPIC?

17 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, they're a key  
18 partner of ours, yeah.

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And -- and just  
23 lastly, the -- the same slide that's before us,  
24 there's a total of nine-three (93) fatalities.

25 Do those -- are those all individual or

1 is there some crossover with respect to those?

2 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Good question.  
3 They're not mutually exclusive. So, for instance,  
4 speed is often paired with impairment. So, it's  
5 possible a fatality could show up in both counts if it  
6 was due to both speed and impairment.

7 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And so the number  
8 is less than ninety-three (93) that we see there?

9 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yes, the -- it  
10 fluctuates on a year-to-year basis, but roughly  
11 seventy-eight (78) fatalities a year.

12 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Okay.

13

14 (BRIEF PAUSE)

15

16 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And the last  
17 question, My Friend Mr. Monnin spoke to you about  
18 providing information, I think as he called it, in  
19 real time here today at the General Rate Application.

20 Of course, information is also shared  
21 at the road safety technical conferences, correct?

22 MR. BRYCE DOELL: That's correct.

23 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And what other  
24 means, if any, or forms does the Corporation make use  
25 of to share information with its stakeholders?

1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, the Corporation  
2 shares information via the Provincial Road Safety  
3 Committee, which we've talked about today. It also  
4 shares information by the External Stakeholder  
5 Committee on road safety, and that's a quarterly  
6 meeting of eighteen (18) different organizations with  
7 a role to play in road safety.

8 And then we also hold a kind of ad hoc,  
9 one-on-one meetings with individual groups as issues  
10 arise. So, for example, we spoke with our colleagues  
11 at the CMMG with respect to the recent fatality with  
12 the agricultural equipment.

13 And then, we of course, regularly meet  
14 with law enforcement, municipalities, and other  
15 jurisdictions on road safety matters.

16 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: And, I mean, do  
17 people still make phone calls? Do you still get phone  
18 calls from these people?

19 MR. BRYCE DOELL: We do, yeah. We're  
20 not quite that futuristic, yes, but phone calls as  
21 well for sure.

22 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Okay. And -- and  
23 during these discussions whether it formal or informal  
24 is the budget information shared with the  
25 stakeholders?

1 MR. BRYCE DOELL: So, the budget  
2 information was shared via the GRA, if that's --

3 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: No, I'm talking  
4 outside of the GRA.

5 MR. BRYCE DOELL: Yeah, we do have  
6 informal conversations from time to time with  
7 stakeholders on what we expect to do with our  
8 programming.

9 So, if we were to have -- proposing an  
10 increase, we may have those informal conversations  
11 outside of formal proceedings.

12 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Okay. Thank you.  
13 Those are all my questions.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr.  
15 Scarfone. Yes...?

16 MR. PATRICK SARGINSON: I'm sorry, Ms.  
17 Hamilton, if I may. Might -- I just received that  
18 confirmation that -- earlier on the reinstatement fee  
19 for licenses, after distracted driving conviction and  
20 it's -- it is -- it does apply. It's \$50.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you  
22 very much. Thank you to the panel on road safety. I  
23 appreciate your attendance today.

24 And do you have anything further to  
25 file at this point, Mr. Scarfone?

1 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: I probably do,  
2 but I -- I don't know of it, so I'll learn about it  
3 when I get downstairs.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Worry about that  
5 tomorrow morning then.

6 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Yes.  
7 Tomorrow morning. And tomorrow we have Mr. Guerra  
8 making his return for information technology, value  
9 management, and benchmarking.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Okay. That's  
11 fine. We'll start tomorrow with IT benchmarking and  
12 value management at 9:00 in the morning?

13 MR. STEVE SCARFONE: Yes.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.

15

16 (PANEL STANDS DOWN)

17

18 --- Upon adjourning at 3:49 p.m.

19

20 Certified correct,

21

22

23 \_\_\_\_\_

24 Wendy Woodworth, Ms.

25