

# Meeting Minutes

## September 23, 2010

**Chair:** Chris

**Notes:** Kathleen

**Attending:**

s.15

s.15

*Roberto*

s.15

### **Minutes:**

#### **1. New Staff**



s.15

Roberto,

s.15

were introduced.

2.

s.14

#### **3. Review Refunds – Chris**

- A chart has been drawn up to consult regarding review fee refunds.

*Action: Kathleen to send to teams*

4.

s.14

#### **5. Hearing Rooms and Headsets – Chris**

- Setup of these is still in progress.
- Headset mouthpieces cannot be used with different bases. The plan is to have adjudicators use the same headset part, but switch in the mouthpiece that's available in the hearing room. Alcohol swabs will be available for disinfecting mouthpieces.

#### **6. Proofreading Issues – Kathleen**

- Reviews are still coming back with many easily preventable errors (spelling, grammar, incorrect dates & addresses). Adjudicators should check their own work before submitting it.

**7. IRPs Start Monday September 27 – Chris**

- s.15 will be doing the first oral review.

8.

9.

s.14

**10. Filing – Kathleen**

- Files are being improperly stored in the file room.
- Files are organized according to the month written on the folder, and then in numerical order.
- This is important because files go into storage, and sometimes need to be retrieved.

**11. Adjournments – Chris**

- These should only be given for valid reasons. A lawyer “not having had time” to go over the evidence, when disclosure was done weeks ago, is not a valid reason.

**12. Grounds for Demand – Chris**

- These aren't relevant in over .08 or warn/fail files.

*Action: Kathleen to send language for when grounds are argued in these files*

**13. Time of Demand – Chris**

- Its absence does not mean revocation in a fail or refuse case – can extrapolate that demand was made “as soon as practicable”

14.

s.14

**15. Workstation Requests – Kathleen**

- Staff were canvassed regarding these.

*Action: Kathleen to advise Kathy of unfulfilled requests*

16

s.14

# Meeting Minutes

## November 18, 2010

**Chair:** Chris

**Notes:** Kathleen

**Attending:**

s.15

s.15  
*Roberto*

**Reagents:**

s.15

### **Minutes:**

#### **1. Administrative Issues – Chris and Kathleen**

- Ensure letters are faxed to lawyers, decisions mailed to clients
- Correctly name & store decisions on W:\drive
- Correctly spell client names (in part, to aid searches for incorrectly stored decisions)
- Keep adjudicator notes out of files
- Contact both team leads when sick
- Email team with sick names
  - There has been a request that we do this; however, the team consensus is not to do so
- Voicemail – everyone now has it
- Phone relief:
  - check to ensure you will be here on your day
  - let team leader know if you will not be available
  - frequently check voicemail during the day
- Revocation/extension procedures – will be sent out soon
- What to do with cancelled IRP file ← same as ADP, but no refund
- Update appeal registry schedule when you take someone else's file
- Extensions are ok – don't rush to get things done
- No longer need to give lawyers chance to get client to send in evidence

#### **2. Review File Allocation – Chris**

- Appeal registry tries to allocate files evenly. Let Chris and Kathleen know if you feel this is not happening. They will attend future appeal registry meetings and can try to address this.
- In the meantime, please feel free to pass files over to other adjudicators as required to balance workloads. Just remember to update the appeal registry schedule when you do so.

#### **3. Revocation Letters – Chris**

- There is some confusion over the level of detail required in these.
- Kathy said she wants to see some analysis, but there doesn't need to be much. The reason for essentially no analysis on some of the "driver" ones was that we did not know exactly what our policy was.

s.14

s.15

**5. Other Questions – Chris and Kathleen**

- What happens when submissions do not address a blatant error in officer's evidence – do we revoke or ignore it?
  - Depends on error. Can you make common sense inference (times, slight misspellings) or does it affect a crucial issue (expiry, same ASD twice)?
  - Please bring copies of reports with police errors to Team Leaders.
- IRP's with the same time for everything from driving to ASD tests ← Can make common sense inferences. There may be wording available from other adjuds – please ask.

**6. Vacation – Chris and Kathleen**

- A seniority list has been produced.
- We haven't yet determined how many adjudicators must be on staff at one time. We hope to give everyone their vacation requests. If too many people want the same time period off, we will look at the question then.
- The schedule for vacation choices will be circulated soon.
- The teams will be amalgamated with respect to assigning vacation. Because there are almost no 3-7-30 reviews, the teams are being treated as one for most purposes.

## **Round Table**

s.15 - Meeting was helpful and informative. Kathleen and Chris will be attending future appeal registry meetings. These meeting exchanges should be useful.

s.15 - Do adjudicators need to change their voicemails/set out of office e-mail responses?

- This is helpful, but not mandatory.

s.15 - Do adjudicators have to share their calendars?

- That's optional.

s.15 - Do we still send extension letters by registered mail if we've faxed/called the lawyer?

- Yes. We are responsible for notifying the client in a timely way and cannot rely on the lawyer to do so.

s.15 - Is receiving a lot of expert reports with regard to IRPs.

- The rest of the team are receiving these as well.

s.15 - Please use the adjudicator checklist, everyone.

s.15 - Revocation procedures document is helpful but lengthy, and needs work.

- We are working on both revocation and extension procedures, and hope to send them out shortly. We don't want to send out interim versions as they contain errors and omissions.

s.15 - Will someone else be handling the vehicle impoundment part of revocations in the future?

- Unfortunately not. This is a lot of work, but will get easier as we do more of them.

# Meeting Minutes

## December 16, 2010

Chair: Roberto

Notes: Kathleen

Attending:

s.15

s.15

Chris

Regrets:

s.15

### Minutes:

#### 1. Statistics Table – Roberto

- Many thanks to s.15 for offering to create the statistics table and for the hours of work he put into it.
- Adjudicators will input data directly into the table as part of their decision-making process in order to maintain an accurate record of the decisions made by the office

#### 2. Procedures Documents – Roberto

- Many thanks to s.15 for all the work he has done on these documents, and to s.15 for his assistance with them.
- These documents will be posted on the W:\ drive and password-protected. Just click "Open Read-only Copy" to open.
- s.15 will continue to add further details to the document as they become necessary
- Suggestions or questions? Adjudicators will speak with s.15 and/or Roberto or Kathleen

3.

s.14

4.

s.14

s.14

5. **Reminders to Team Leads** – Roberto and Kathleen
  - Adjudicators were asked to remind Roberto and Kathleen of any questions or issues they may have missed.
6. **Team Lead Vacations** – Roberto and Kathleen
  - 
  -

s.22

# Meeting Minutes

## December 30, 2010

**Chair: Roberto**

**Notes: Kathleen**

**Attending:**

s.15

s.15

Chris

**Regrets:**

s.15

### **Minutes:**

1. **15-Minute Mouth Alcohol Time Frame – Roberto**
  - Adjudicators should continue to use this time frame when dealing with mouth alcohol issues.
  - The policy department is preparing a Superintendent's Report on the issue that is intended to be drafted by mid-January.
2. **ASD Serial Numbers – Roberto**
  - Adjudicators should continue to revoke where these are absent.
  - At the present time, we should also revoke where they are not the standard 6-digit number. The reason for this is that without a proper number, applicants cannot get ASD calibration records.
  - Chris will speak to police liaison regarding the 3-digit numbers we have been seeing. As well, there is now an issue with 5-digit numbers. Police may simply be omitting a zero at the beginning, but we don't know this.
  - s.15 suggests we may be expected to provide calibration logs at some point. s.15 suggests police could keep these with the ASDs.

*Action: Roberto/Kathleen to speak to Bima about the above issue.*

3. **Refunds – Roberto**
  - Please fill in the section of the refund form labelled "Select from the drop down menu" with information about the reason for the refund.
  - Even IRPs may have refunds associated, such as a licence reinstatement fee or the IRP penalty fee.
4. **Reviews with Missing Documents – Roberto**
  - There is a backlog in the fax server because some employees have left.
  - Staff are working hard to clear this.
  - There may be a reason why adjudicators should not check the faxes tab in the ADP/VI system for additional documents when they do reviews. Chris will check with Kathy regarding this.

*Action: Chris to ask Kathy the above question.*



**5. Vacation Schedule –Kathleen**

- The vacation schedule will be posted by January 31. Please make your vacation choices as soon as possible.

**Round Table**

- s.15 - If evidence of mouth alcohol is accepted, should an adjudicator revoke?
  - Not if there is sufficient evidence that the ASD result would have been caused by blood alcohol (i.e., admission/witness evidence of consumption)
- s.15 – 30-day penalty
  - If the person doesn't pay the administrative penalty within 30 days, his or her licence will be cancelled.
  - s.15 is working on the letter to be sent to clients and the procedures for adjudicators to follow on this issue.
- s.15 – has received 1 file with no disclosure, and 1 with wrong evidence in the file.
  - There is concern amongst adjudicators that clerical errors may be happening more often.

# Meeting Minutes

## January 20, 2011

**Chair: Roberto**

**Notes: Kathleen**

**Attending:**

s.15

**Reagents:**

s.15

**Minutes:**

1.

s.14

2.

s.14

3.

**4. Statistics Table -** s.15

- s.15 updated our group on the new fields that he has added to the table. He indicated that he has been working with Bima Ribeiro (police liaison) and s.15 from the VI team in an effort to create a data collecting system that can aid our office in maintaining accurate records of "the life of a file".

**ACTION:** adjudicators will now also provide information on the location (police detachment) where IRP or ADP is given.

**5. Requests from Appeals Registry – Arnie**

- Arnie (Appeals Registry Team Leader) indicated that when Appeals Registry staff prepares JR files, they prefer documents remain in the order in which they were received by our office AND that adjudicators not staple documents.

**ACTION:** adjudicators are still free to use whatever documents they need when reviewing files but should place documents back into file in order they are received prior to filing away. Also, they should use paper clips instead of staples.

**6. Rehearings – Roberto**

- In some circumstances, a petition may not go to Judicial Review as our office may grant a rehearing. In those cases, the rehearing will be done by a different adjudicator than the one who made the original decision. This is to follow the principles of natural justice and avoid any apprehension of bias.

**7. April Retreat – Kathleen**

- The Superintendent will be coming to one of our meetings this February to discuss ideas for the retreat.

**ACTION:** adjudicators were asked to think of suggestions for the Superintendent.

**Round Table**

- Intake agents have been telling callers adjudicators have 7 days to make a decision. This is the time limit for application, not for making the decision.

# Meeting Minutes

## February 8, 2011

**Chair: Roberto**

**Notes: Kathleen**

**Attending:**

s.15

**Regrets:**

s.15

### **Minutes:**

1. **Refund Form – Roberto**
  - Application for review form must be attached
  - If there are several refund forms, you can attach them together with one application form
  - Written review fee is \$100, not \$50
2. **ICBC Training Refresher – Kathleen**
  - The training refresher is set for Tues Feb 15.
  - Due to staff departures, we have 2 open spots.
  - s.15 wishes to be added to the list.
3. **Superintendent to Feb 17 Meeting – Roberto**
  - Steve Martin will be coming to our Feb 17 team meeting.
  - He will be looking for our ideas on the staff retreat.
4. **Supervisor Essentials course – Kathleen and Roberto**
  - Kathleen and Roberto discussed what they learned in the course, and its application to their work.
5. **Staff Departures – Kathleen and Roberto**
  - s.15, s.22 is leaving us for a great new job with s.22
  - s.15, s.22 s.22 have gone to a temporary assignment with Driver Fitness.
  - All three will be very much missed.
6. **New Post-Review Team – Roberto**
  - s.15 will be our new post-review team.

**7. Long Service Awards – Kathleen and Roberto**

- s.15, s.22 received her 5-year pin.
- s.15, s.22 received his 5-year pin.
- s.15, s.22 received his 15-year pin.
- s.15, s.22 received her 15-year pin.

**Round Table**

- s.15, s.22 says, "Thanks for the memories."
- Question from adjudicators: If confirming, do you have to let RDP know?
  - s.15 says No – They review statuses every 2 weeks and will find out.
  - Q: Why do we let them know when we revoke?

**ACTION:** s.15 to clarify.

- s.15 asked for clarification that service of the IRP Notice crystallizes the right to a 2<sup>nd</sup> ASD test.
  - Kathleen and Roberto confirmed this is correct.
  - Roberto says that police are now being trained to continue the conversation with the client after service of the Notice.

# Meeting Minutes

## February 17, 2011

**Chair:** Roberto

**Notes:** s.15

**Attending:**

s.15

**Regrets:**

s.15

**Guests:**

*Steve Martin*

*Stephanie Melvin*

*Kathy Anderson*

### **Minutes:**

1. Steve/Stephanie
  - They are concentrating on 4 major areas of OSMV operations: organizational health, training and development (job related as training funds are low right now), foundational systems (eg. Core Operating System), and quality assurance.
  - Stats – Roughly the same number of clients are applying for reviews as with the old programs. Hard to predict whether or not the numbers will increase over time.
  - March 28: the date of the first court challenge on IRP. Several cases, not one in particular, are being heard in Victoria.
  - Stephanie is preparing a package of instructions regarding reviews for ICBC to hand out, to make it easier for them and our clients.
2. Steve/Stephanie
  - Are looking for ideas for retreat activities such as speakers, topics, etc.
  - Retreat will be one day only, held at Ambrosia on Fisgard Street.
  - Want to hear through our supervisors if we have any issues/concerns.
3. Steve/Stephanie
  - OSMV Open House will be held May 3, 2011, the morning for OSMV staff only, the afternoon for the rest of the Ministry.
  - Will have some of our partners there including police, STROH, etc. to demonstrate DriveAble, Ignition Interlock, etc.

### **Round Table**

s.15

- Asked about the Minister's visit with the hospitality industry over the impact the new programs are having on the industry. Steve replied: The Minister made some comments to the media about possible changes to the programs. However, the Minister cannot just make changes without buy-in from government who created the legislation.

s.15

- Asked whether or not there would be a lessening of sanctions for first offenders. Steve replied: The sanctions were designed to hit hard and swift to change client behaviour and to try to prevent recidivism. Public education is vital, acknowledge there is a lot of confusion as to how much people can drink and still be under the limit for sanctions.

# Meeting Minutes

## March 3, 2011

**Chair:** Roberto

**Notes:** s.15

**Attending:**

s.15

**Regrets:**

s.15

### **Minutes:**

#### **1. Appeals Registry**

##### **a) Adjudicator Pools**

The Appeals Registry will categorize adjudicators into two pools, in order to distribute files to people with the most time. The groups will be as follows:

Group 1: those who do not do post reviews, Segers and/or special projects;

Group 2: those who do post reviews, Segers and/or special projects.

The files will go to everyone in group one until each of these adjudicators has two files. If there are more files that have to go out, they will be given to people in group two.

The purpose of this procedure is to avoid overwhelming anyone who is already busy with group one activities, and to ensure that everyone in group two has enough to keep him/her busy.

##### **b) Completing 24-hour Files**

Files involving 24-hour prohibitions do not have legislatively assigned decision deadlines, but they should not sit in your inboxes indefinitely. Please review your 24-hour files and if anything has been sitting for over a month, give it higher priority than ADP or IRP files that are not facing impending deadlines.

##### **c) File Turnaround Policy**

We are encouraged to aim for the following turnaround times on these files:

- Segers files = a week,
- post-review = two weeks,
- re-hearing = seven days from hearing.

#### **2. Delegating Responsibilities**

Further to s.22 departure, Kathleen and Roberto have taken over the team lead responsibilities of the VI group until further notice. This means that they have less time to



dedicate to their ADP/IRP responsibilities. Accordingly, this is an opportunity for adjudicators to learn new things by welcoming tasks that are assigned by Kathleen and/or Roberto.

### **3. Peer Review**

In the spirit of skill development, adjudicators are asked to volunteer to be peer reviewers, as two more people are needed, due to the departures of s.15, s.22 Please express your interest to Kathleen and/or Roberto as soon as possible.

### **4. Statistics**

Management has asked us to estimate how long it takes to complete a decision. from the time that we get the file to the time that we send the decision letter out. s.15  
volunteered to coordinate this effort and will email adjudicators with directions in the near future.

In the meantime, please start keeping track of how long it takes to complete the following phases of a decision, with the objective of gathering this information for five files:

- Pre-hearing review,
- Oral hearing (if applicable),
- Reviewing evidence,
- Reading case law,
- Considering the issues (drafting the letter),
- Time in peer review,
- Revising, printing, mailing (and system work).

s.15 will provide additional/revised directions on this process.

### **5. EPDPs**

These are to be finalized by the end of March. If you would like to add comments to your EPDP, please do so prior to your 1 x 1 meeting with your team lead, so that you can finalize the content discussion at that meeting.

### **6. Kathy A. to Attend March 17 Meeting**

Kathy will explain the purpose behind direction from executive on legal interpretation and review issues.

### **7. Roundtable**

s.15

s.14

s.15

s.14

s.15

# Meeting Minutes

## March 17, 2011

**Chair: Roberto**

**Notes:** s.15

**Attending:**

s.15

**Regrets:**

s.15

**Guests:**

*Kathy Anderson*

### **Minutes:**

1. Kathleen proposed that Team Meeting minutes be assigned alphabetically by last name each week. No one expressed any concerns.
2. **Staff Retreat** - Kathy the retreat is scheduled for April 12 at Ambrosia Conference and Event Centre at 638 Fisgard Street. The theme of the retreat is Past, Present and Future and will include the history of the Branch. Each team is to create a 10 minute presentation on what we do, in various forms such as, a skit, song, poem, etc. Share your thoughts/ideas with your team members and by next meeting, have something in place. Kathy will be participating with us.
- 3.

s.22

s.22

s.22

s.22

s.14

s.14

s.22

s.14

### **Round Table**

s.15 Asked about contingency plans in the event of a natural disaster and we are unable to come to work because the building is inaccessible for some reason. **Answer:** Every Ministry has Business Continuity Plans that will be invoked in the event of such an emergency.

s.15 Raised the issue of the inaccuracy of media reports, for example, it has been reported recently that there is no avenue of appeal for IRPs. **Answer:** The media gets things wrong all the time, and there is a lot of misinformation on Twitter and the internet about our programs.

# Meeting Minutes

## March 31, 2011

**Chair:** Roberto/Mark

**Notes:** s.15

**Attending:**

s.15

**Regrets:**

s.15

### Minutes:

1. **Segers Files:** s.15 are handling Segers files and will not be on the review schedule for awhile, as they work through the backlog.
  - Some of the Segers files have no other documents in them, except the letter from the client. Appeal Registry will try to obtain copies of the police documents to put in the file prior to assigning it to an Adjudicator. Documents can be located on the ADP/VI system for ADPs and IRPs, but they will have to approach ICBC for copies of 24 hours.
2. **Peer Reviews:** of letters have been taking a bit too long as workloads increase so two additional Adjudicators will be helping out s.15 are now joining s.15 in doing peer reviews. Will assess in two weeks to see how this is going.
  - Suggestion made that Adjudicators do not leave too many files for review on Fridays since most of the reviewers are off on Fridays.
3. **Adjournments:** If you need to adjourn a file, please return it to s.15 or in her absence s.15 to have it rescheduled, unless you are only adjourning for a short period (ie that same day or the following day). You can also reschedule it yourself if you are rescheduling for a time not normally booked for oral reviews (eg. afternoons) to avoid a scheduling conflict.
4. **Comments in ADP/VI:** Always put clear comments in the ADP/VI system so that other staff members reading the comments will understand exactly what occurred with the file/where to find it.
  - Some of the comments made in ADP/VI by Appeal Registry staff are not clear/difficult to understand. Also, an Adjudicator had a file recently with a Lawyer involved but no submission received. Waited several hours for a submission then finally checked comments to learn review had been cancelled days before but no one let the Adjudicator know.

**ACTION:** Team Leads will discuss our concerns regarding the comments with Team Lead of Appeal Registry.

5. **24 Hour Reviews:** Need to get the backlog of 24 hour reviews cleared up. Starting April 4, 2011, turnaround for 24 hour reviews will be 2 weeks. We'll see how this goes.

- Starting now, all 24 hour review files should be logged in the peer review log, marked with date expected back, and placed under the appropriate date rather than being placed at the back of the folder as previously.

6. **Afternoon Oral Reviews:** Oral reviews are booked for 12:00 pm and 2:00 pm daily which makes it difficult to get the files completed if a quick turnaround is necessary. Can be even more problematic particularly at the end of the work week, and/or if we have a team meeting in the afternoon. Have seen days where there are few orals booked in the regular slots, but some are booked in the afternoons.

- Prior to April 2010, oral reviews were only done in the mornings. Afternoon reviews became necessary, due to the high number of oral reviews being requested. Suggested closing these blocks until/unless they are needed.

**ACTION: Team Leads will ask Appeal Registry to eliminate the 12:00 pm and 2:00 pm oral review blocks.**

s.14

8. **Refunds of Towing/Storage Fees:** Discussion around the directive that Adjudicators will be refunding the towing and storage fees on successful IRP reviews. General consensus is that Adjudicators do not have access to the CAS

financial system, do not have the ability to look up supplier numbers, STOBs, etc. and lack the training and basic financial background necessary for financial clerks who perform this function for government.

**ACTION: Team Leads to discuss with Finance (Invoicing) Facilities Team on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor.**

# IRP Team Meeting

April 14, 2011  
2:30 – 3:30 p.m.  
940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A

## MINUTES

**Chair: Roberto/Mark**

**Scribe:** s.15

**Attendees:**

s.15

1.	Border Patrol Officer - Roberto	No authority for border patrol guards under MVA to issue IRPs due to the definition of 'peace officer' which does NOT include CBSA. They have authority to conduct a criminal code investigation, and can administer ASD for criminal investigation and for purposes of being a witness, but cannot issue IRPs or ADPs. For us this means if we see an IRP/ADP that looks to be substantially prepared by a CBS Agent, we must revoke them. For border patrol purposes, they can begin an investigation and detain drivers but must call police if they want to issue an IRP or ADP.
2.	Closing of 12:00 pm and 2:00 pm blocks for reviews - Roberto	Starting April 18, 2011, no more IRPs scheduled for 12:00 or 2:00. Will continue with this for two months and revisit. s.15 suggested keeping some schedule flexibility at certain periods of the year, such as at Christmas.
3.	Segers's, Post Reviews and General Correspondence Status Update, How are we doing?	s.15 noted she has a lot of Segers, but no post reviews. s.15 noted the minimal staff we will have during the summer and inquired whether a growth position could be created for Segers and post-reviews. Roberto said he would look into this.
4.	Peer Review Status Update, How are we doing?	s.15 noted the addition of more adjudicators to share this task has helped, and individual peer-review workloads have dropped. Roberto asked about 24 hour backlog. s.15 noted he had seen only two 24-hours that came through peer review last week.
5.		

s.14



		s.14
6.	Referral to driver fitness – Mark	If information comes to us in the course of a review about medical issues that may potentially affect a driver's ability to drive, we should notify driver fitness staff with either a copy of the letter that indicates the medical condition; if the information arises during an oral review, send an email to the driver fitness unit. REMINDER: include D/L#, photocopy to driver fitness – bin is in reception
7.	Properly filing IRP's and other files in File Room - Mark	Reminder to file files regularly, at least once a week. If we find monthly filing overlaps, we can email s.15 in the appeal registry to address that. s.15 noted some reasons for the monthly overlap.
8.	Towing & storage refund – Roberto	New refund forms distributed. Some discussion about the propriety of us, as adjudicators, undertaking financial task and the need for fee/tariff schedule for certain items, and the potential for applicant disputes over amounts reimbursed. Nonetheless, refund calculations remain one of our related functions. s.15 inquired about how to ensure we name the property parties on cheques: are cheques always sent to registered owners, and in the case of companies, are cheques sent to head offices, branch offices, etc? Mark is meeting with Management Services to discuss issues and steps.
9.		s.14
10	Team Lead help - Roberto	Roberto noted that he has an open door policy, and if it his door is closed, it is because it must be at the time. Roberto noted that it is always helpful to come to him with suggested solutions to issues we may have.
11	Round Table/Retreat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>s.15 asked if we can change team meetings to another day in the week, or to an earlier time on Thursdays, due to urgency of matters that must be completed by end of day Thursday for those who flex on Fridays. COMPLETED: biweekly meeting times changed to 1.30</li> <li>Some general discussion around permanent/auxiliary staffing positions</li> <li>s.15 asked about policy direction on the extent to which we flesh out reasons in revoke decision letters. <b>Roberto suggested we table this for the next meeting</b></li> <li>s.15 revisited the refund forms</li> </ul>

# IRP Team Meeting

April 28, 2011  
1:30 – 2:30 p.m.  
940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A

## MINUTES

**Chair: Roberto/Mark**

**Scribe: Mark**

**Attendees:**

s.15

1.	stats help on Monday	s.15 working on last-minute compiling of stats for policy – needs help on Monday, s.15 volunteered
2.	Email re: voting	May 2 election day – time allotted to BC Gov employees – expect email giving specifics
3.	Friday flexers	with staff departures, increasing workload, closed time slots, etc – workload has increased, # of adjudicators available on Friday has decreased – however s.15 will be returning the possibility may arise for volunteers to move flex from Friday to Monday (or other desired day)
4.	highlights on templates	when decisions are printed, highlighting used in drafting is still coming through, this is up to each individual's computer settings, default word settings ACTION: remove highlighting from original templates saved on W: and redistribute these templates to adjudicators to work with
5.	file folder contents	reminder to remove emails, adjudicator notes etc from files once decision done & file is put away also ADP/VI system comments, they should not remain on file – Mark will ask intake not to print & insert ADP/VI comments into files before presenting them to adjudicators
6.	update on Segers/post-review	general discussion on progress, workload etc s.15 also volunteered to take on Segers/post-review duties – to be trained Roberto fielded the idea about everyone being trained on Segers/post-review, then it can be shared more evenly Mark/Roberto will follow up soon
7.		

s.14

		s.14
8.	info re refund for towing and storage receipts	adjudicators will not process refunds, this will be management services adjudicators are asked to develop standard wording/clause which can go into revoke decisions as standard instructions to a client in these circumstances action: adjudicator(s) volunteer to develop this wording
9.	roundtable	s.14

**IRP Team Meeting**  
**May 12, 2011**  
**1:30 – 2:30 p.m.**  
**940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A**

**MINUTES**

**Chair: Roberto**

**Scribe:** s.15

**Attendees:**

s.15

**Guests: Tony Esposito, Kathy Anderson, VI Team**

Announcement by Tony and Kathy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• s.22</li><li>• s.15 will be helping Mark with Team Leader duties in s.22 absence and all 3 Adjudication teams will report to both.</li></ul>

s.14

s.14	
New Seger's team (Mark)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>s.15 are now going to be assisting with Segers reviews. Everyone who had previously been taken off the regular review schedule has been put back on.</li> </ul>

#### Roundtable:

**Kathy:** There has been a request for all of the decision letters written for April 2011 and asked for a volunteer to assist with this task. s.15 volunteered to help.

s.15 Timelines have been tight due to the Easter holidays and some team members temporarily off the schedule. If you get into trouble, ask a co-worker if they will take some of your files, do not approach the Appeal Registry to ask that they be reassigned.

s.15 Will be on the schedule starting Tuesday, May 16. s.15 will be mentoring her.

#### Roberto:

s.14

s.14

# IRP Team Meeting

June 3, 2011  
1:30 – 2:30 p.m.  
940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A

## MINUTES

**Chair:** Mark T.

**Scribe:** s.15

**Attendees:**

s.15

VI corresponding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion around trying to determine if vehicle has been released. Mark T. to discuss with s.15 as to direction since we are not allowed to look in comments.</li> </ul>
	s.14
Disclosure of Supt Report ASD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to confirm that report was disclosed. Look on adjudicator checklist. If it is not in the file check with appeal registry to ensure it was sent out. --- (a date field has been added for this purpose on the worksheet)</li> </ul>
ADP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please ensure you are using the ADP template for these decision letters --- pls refer to ADP throughout</li> </ul>
Training/learning development needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Let Mark T. know what your training/learning needs are specific to this program by June 10, 2011.</li> <li>Case law / revoke letters / evidence /</li> </ul>
DRAFT procedure manual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Procedure Manual is located on the "w drive". It has not been signed off by Steve yet, but it has been finalized. This is a living document that is subject to updates. Please check the date to ensure that you have the most recent version.</li> </ul>
	s.14
COS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Operating System is coming out in September. This will replace ADP/VI. We will see some changes with how we do things.(no paper files; reviews assigned electronically.</li> </ul>
Stats log	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24 hour review data from September 20 to December needs to be added to the stat log.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Also, the date client applied for review will need to be added.</li> </ul>
	Templates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Templates are still in progress.</li> <li>There was a discussion/confusion as to whether we need to add the new stuff in the templates (re: ignition interlock, paying towing and storage etc). Someone stated that it is not our jurisdiction and outside the sections of the Act that we deal with. Mark T. will look into this.</li> </ul>
	Re-hearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration on whether to proceed to JR is whether it is well-reasoned enough to defend; LSB may suggest a re-hearing, Tony/Kathy will decide if that is the way to proceed</li> <li>Team leader will talk to the adjudicator about the issue so that all issues are addressed</li> <li>Generally one week from the date of the hearing to provide decision</li> <li>New evidence may be introduced; monitor on case-by-case basis (though rare)</li> </ul>
	OSMV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team leaders will be meeting with Stephanie and Steve on a monthly basis to discuss new initiatives.</li> <li>Update on new initiatives:</li> <li>U3: Windows 7 to replace Vista – early 2012?</li> <li>E-ticketing – recent meeting with stakeholders to determine interest</li> <li>Drug impairment initiative is coming up.</li> <li>Motorcycle legislation is in the works.</li> </ul>
	1X1 meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mark T. will try to sit down with each of us on an informal or formal basis. He's looking for feedback on the new program specifically on what went well what didn't go well.</li> </ul>

# Meeting Minutes

## June 23, 2011

**Chair: Mark T.**

**Notes:** s.15

**Attending:**

s.15

*Kathy* s.15

**Regrets:**  
s.15

**Minutes:**

s.14



s.14

**2. Rehearings**

files to team lead Mark first and he'll discuss with the assigned adjudicator. If re-hearing comes to adj. without talking to team lead first, please see him prior to hearing.

**3. Decision Letters 'Auto-text'**

Re: same paragraphs in multiple decisions with similar issues – recently a lawyer presented differing decisions with identical clause – all decisions are now FOI'd so 'cut-and-paste' discouraged – exceptions with instances of hardship, e.g. – though try to avoid taking older decisions 'cut-and-paste' into newer ones – keep the substance of each decision unique in language relevant to each individual scenario

#### 4. **FOI Requests & Adjournment**

Some applicants and/or their lawyers are requesting information on ASDs from the police, which delays their ability to make submissions for the review. Use your discretion when authorizing extensions (or adjournments, if still within the 21 day window). Look to evidence that the person actually made the request – avoid extensions due to this plea from a client. Keep team leader apprised of situation.

#### 5. **CPIC Notices**

FYI: there are four situations requiring us to send CPIC Notices:

- (i) IRP is cancelled (Appeals Registry (AR) will send Notice);
- (ii) Adjudicator revokes IRP (adjudicator sends Notice);
- (iii) Adjudicator stays IRP (AR sends Notice (??)); and
- (iv) Prohibition is added back to Drivers when stay complete.

When a CPIC Notice does not come back from the police in 24 hours, let Bima know and copy Mark T in the email. Michael Labelle is working on template forms which require data entry simply before printing/faxing.

#### 6. **Appeals Registry Reminders**

- a) Don't put comments into the ADP/VI system indicating that the decision has been made until you are ready to send the decision out – only after peer review.
- b) When you take over a file from another adjudicator, please be sure to note the change on the list on AR's bulletin board. This makes it easier to track down files when information has to be added, etc. a quick email to AR as well.
- c) s.15 requested that when emails are sent out from AR asking about files, that both the name of the driver and the IRP number be given in the email. s.15 said she would bring this up.

#### 7.

We should consider how much weight we attach to this type of evidence. For now, we should look at these on a case by case basis. Mark T. will follow-up in future meetings.

8.

s.14

s.15

9. **Yes/No/Photo**

There is a spot on the Notice with boxes to be checked for "Yes", "No" and "Photo". If the driver's licence is seized and it is a photo ID, both "yes" and "photo" will be checked. If "yes" is checked, but "photo" is not, it indicates that the licence was interim and was not a photo ID.

10. **Roundtable**

**Kathy** advised us that on Friday, June 24, 2011, 25 police officers are coming to OSMV for a tour. These people are new contacts within the regions to assist in the flow of information to and from the detachments. Bima and Kathy will remain OSMV's contact with these officers.

s.15 asked what we do with weird things that we encounter in the police evidence, which don't fit into the prohibition log categories. Mark T. will put out a basket, into which we can place copies of these oddities for Bima's perusal.

# IRP Team Meeting

July 7, 2011

1:30 – 2:30 p.m.

940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A

## MINUTES

**Chair:** Mark

**Scribe:** s.15

**Attendees:**

s.15

1	DRIVERS updates	Reminder to remove status code "0IRPR" in DRIVERS when file completed; remove "prohibition" in DRIVERS' SUS
2	Peer review urgency	Don't hesitate to ask anyone to peer review your files including Team Lead
3	Discussions with lawyers	No need to engage lawyers in small talk/chit chat – no need to answer questions re: process here ("I can't discuss.") – don't digress when speaking to lawyers
4	New doc: Police Supplemental File Report	Watch these carefully as their new – raises a disclosure issue and timeliness concerns
5	Email vs. CanadaPost	Adjudicator discussion: PRO: customer service: prompt and efficient delivery of decision CON – clients' inbox is filtered, so decision treated as 'spam'; security; easier for clients to reply quickly and angrily; COS will be sending letters via BCMail anyway
6	Peer review input	Team lead asking for team input – time scheduled soon for individual feedback on the peer review process, a "peer review of the peer review"
7		s.22
8	Minimize date usage	No disclosure date in decision letters: it's difficult to assess FULL disclosure; potentially lawyer/client could think something was missed. No VI date – potentially wrong date(s) are entered, again creating confusion
9		s.14
10	CPIC template	s.15 will send CPIC update fax form around, a simple template adjudicators can use
11	Stats log changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Only enter Segers/post-review data into 'Master/Prohib Stats Log' – no need to keep a separate log on this now</li><li>No need to track general correspondence (e.g. a 'more info' letter on Segers) – ADP/VI is fine for this purpose</li></ul>

# IRP Team Meeting

August 18, 2011

1:30 – 2:30 p.m.

940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A

## MINUTES

**Chair:** Roberto

**Scribe:** s.15

**Attendees:**

s.15

**Regrets:**

s.15

*Mark T*

s.15

1. **Change of Meeting day:** Agreed to change bi-weekly meeting day to Tuesdays at 1:30 pm, rather than Thursdays to provide more time at the end of the week to complete files due over the weekend. Next meeting should be Tuesday, August 30.
2. **Quality Assurance:** Team Leaders are selecting one adjudicator each week and reviewing 5 – 6 of their completed files at random. They will also be selecting one file per day from peer review. They will read through the files and provide feedback to the adjudicator. They are looking for consistency in approach; whether or not they are accurate as to the facts; checking to ensure decisions are made on the evidence, not assumptions; ensure the submissions being understood/interpreted correctly; and, ensuring that all the issues have been addressed. The point is not to be punitive, but to see if they can provide advice and guidance. The adjudicator will be notified of which files are being looked at ahead of time so they can review the cases prior to the discussion with the Team Lead.
3. **Judicial Reviews:** Team Leaders have not been consistent in alerting us when our files are being JR'd but their goal is to develop a consistent approach. This may mean just a quick email to the adjudicator involved, when they receive a petition. Some of the most common issues they are seeing on JR are: the adjudicator saying there is no evidence before them when there clearly is; ambiguity – sometimes there is no indication as to who said what in the letter; lack of reasons/not being specific about why they are rejecting evidence.

**Roundtable:**

s.15 Brought an idea being considered by the Social Committee for a fund-raiser at Hallowe'en to raise money for the annual winter party. s.15 will send the team a note about it asking for input. He also mentioned that the Social Committee would like more representation from Adjudication, at least one more team member. Interested? Please let s.15 know.

s.15 OSMV mailbox: s.15 and s.15 will look after the mailbox from August 29 – September 9, while s.15, s.22 is on holidays.

s.15 asked that more team members are trained to work on Segers and post-review files as they are often receiving 2 per day on top of their normal workload.

s.15 a lawyer submitted that a strong odor of liquor on a driver's breath is indicative of recent consumption, not that the individual consumed a large quantity of alcohol. Mark wondered if anyone else had seen that argument before (didn't appear that anyone had). However, the general comment was that without scientific evidence to support the lawyer's assertion, it is hard to find that odour of liquor in the driver's mouth is in fact indicative of recent consumption. Mark indicated that he would do more research to get more information in order to address this lawyer's argument.

s.15 had a case where the lawyer ticked the box that the client blew a "warn" but then noted that in the VI documents, the officer wrote that the ASD showed a digital reading and the sample was under 60 mg% (the reading was 0.051). As noted in the Superintendent's Report on ASDs, any reading under 60 mg% is a "pass". s.15 revoked on that basis even though the MVA defines a warn as follows:

**"warn"** means an indication on an approved screening device that the concentration of alcohol in a person's blood is not less than 50 milligrams of alcohol in 100 millilitres of blood.

The recalibration that ASD's underwent back in November of 2010 is the factor to be considered. Team also recognized that this is different for a 24 hour prohibition, where a "pass" is still below 50 mg%.

**IRP Team Meeting**  
**August 30, 2011**  
**1:30 – 2:30 p.m.**  
**940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A**

**MINUTES**

**Chair: Roberto/Mark**

**Scribe: s.15**

**Attendees:**

s.15

1		
2		s.14
3	Inform adjudicators about JRs	Currently 123 JRs, most coming from Jeremy Carr's office. We are getting 6-8 at a time. Many do not have issues with the adjudicator reasoning/conclusion, but are simply added to the constitutional question proceeding. This may be partly to preserve right to a stay in the event the current Charter challenge is successful. Most frequently cited reasons for JRs: 1) lack of reasons; 2) improper weighing of evidence; 3) improper weighing of credibility, although there have been fewer of these lately. Note if a Notice of Constitutional Question is in a file, we don't need to worry about it, as a copy will have been served on the AG.
4	Quality Assurance	Team Leaders will pick one adjudicator per week and randomly review their decisions. Will be looking to create a more consistent approach and higher standard in decision-writing; provide feedback and support. One of the main issues arising in JRs is adjudicators' accuracy in summarizing evidence. Adjudicators need to be accurate about who is

		saying what and when. Reminder that quality assurance sessions are not criticism, and provide feedback to adjudicators.
5	New teams – peer review – Segers/post reviews	<p>Peer Reviewers are to be s.15 If necessary, Mark and Roberto will be available to assist peer review process. PR responsibility will eventually rotate, and all adjudicators will be given peer review responsibility, although TLs will aim to balance the interests of those who may not be comfortable with PR with those who are ok with it.</p> <p>The PR checklist has been modified to include new criteria, and PRs should make comments on the checklist form if there has been an issue. Ultimately accountability still rests with adjudicators, and PRs not accountable for adjudicator error.</p> <p>There was some discussion regarding the standard of what PRs note up in the checklists; e.g., for punctuation, only “glaring” punctuation issues should be noted. Generally if PRs and adjudicators are in disagreement, they should speak to TLs.</p> <p>For Segers/Post review s.15 Roberto noted that from a professional development point-of-view, it will be good eventually to have all the adjudicators involved in these, particularly post-reviews, as it is interesting to learn what the public sees as the problems with adjudicator’s decisions. A reminder of timelines on these as well. Segers/post reviews are to be recorded in Prohib spreadsheet.</p>
6	Workload issues	If adjudicators receive files two to three days before deadline and feel there may be difficulties in writing the decision in time, they should let the TLs know. This is so appeal registry can be informed about scheduling difficulties, but also to assist adjudicator in managing workload. Adjudicators can use discretion on this.
7	Extensions	If adjudicators are extending the deadline for making a decision, they must inform TLs.
8		s.14
9	roundtable	<p>s.15 raised notion of supplemental training for adjudicators. Roberto noted that once all staff are back from vacations etc, we will look at in-house refreshers. s.15 noted that the Prohib log is a “event log”, and so it is not limited to decisions</p>



		on applications for review -- may include Segers, post-reviews, re-hearings, etc.
--	--	---

# IRP Team Meeting

September 27, 2011  
1:30 – 2:30 p.m.  
940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A

## MINUTES

**Chair:** Roberto/Mark

**Scribe:** s.15

**Attendees:**

s.15

s.14

1		
2	Disclosure of Supt Reports on ASDs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow-up from directive emails sent May 20, Sept 15, Sept 23</li> <li>Q: can report be made available from OSMV website? TL check on answer</li> </ul>
3	DIP adjudicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DIP adjudicators will handle replies to Segers files; cannot do IRP/ADP post-reviews</li> <li>Post-reviews with s.15 move towards more condensed/formalized response to letter</li> <li>DIP adjudicators added to prohibition log</li> </ul>
4	Adjudicator procedure manual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some of this manual still in draft form – still missing forms and templates – not officially signed by superintendent yet</li> <li>As of September 30 2011 – manual is on w:</li> </ul>
5	ADP/VI comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not check these when deciding a review – if you need to retrieve information re: disclosure or misc, please ask a colleague or appeal registry staff</li> </ul>
6	Temperature	Poll results show most people “generally cool” in the office; long-standing building structure issue – suggestion to wear sweaters, easier to stay warm or lose layers – requests have been made
7	Email subject line	Official guideline is to use client surname and program area ONLY in subject line
8	Random survey	May be a random survey coming to some adjudicators regarding copyright issues – this is government-wide
9	Quality	TLS want to ensure this process is transparent

	assurance	<p>Purpose: to achieve and maintain a level of consistency and quality to the letters among all</p> <p>Hope that by second round of quality assurance meetings the issues are minimized – however it may become a performance issue over the long term</p> <p>TLs will keep copies of the letters to help adjudicators remember prior sessions</p>
10	Schedule block times	<p>Aim to avoid situations similar to summer where all adjudicators were facing weeks of narrow timelines</p> <p>May open afternoon review times – TLs will monitor</p>
11	Extensions	<p>TLs realize that extensions WILL happen – justification for an extension is still needed – important to communicate extension need to TLs as soon as they arise</p>
12	Roundtable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request for more info on JR files – TLs will attempt</li> <li>• Re-hearings: adjudicators will be advised that one of their files is being reheard and why</li> <li>• Constitutional challenge: no word on ruling yet</li> <li>• TLs want all adjudicators to know they should be proud of the work and impact they have made t date. The premise pushing the program forward is a good and important thing. Congrats on a job well done.</li> </ul>

**IRP Team Meeting**  
**October 25, 2011**  
**1:30 – 2:30 p.m.**  
**940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A**

**MINUTES**

**Chair: Roberto/Mark**

**Scribe:** s.15

**Attendees:**

s.15

1		
2		s.14
3	Open Information Initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As per recent announcements in the press generally, government intends to publicly disclose our decision letters;</li><li>• As our decisions will be further scrutinized, we need to be more consistent;</li><li>• Keep an eye on sloppy errors and formatting – it'll be out there for all to see;</li><li>• At this stage, it is not known whether adjudicators' names will be disclosed; no firm guidelines on new use of aliases</li></ul>
4		s.14
5	s.22	s.22 s.14 s.22

<p>s.22</p> <p>s.15</p> <p>s.14</p>		
6	Halloween	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are encouraged by management to have fun with costumes; contest on that day</li> </ul>
7	Q.A. Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The TLs have finished the first round of QA reviews and are starting the second round;</li> <li>• TLs seeing interesting new arguments; TLs seeing how styles differ</li> <li>• Roberto expressed that this process is a two-way street, that they are interested in how our writing is progressing, but that it is also an opportunity for adjudicators to ask for more guidance, if needed;</li> <li>• The meetings should be shorter in the second round</li> <li>• The TLs will provide QA meeting feedback in the form of a summary or rehash of what was discussed in each adjudicator's meeting'</li> <li>• Roberto noted that, while the GOAL of the QA is not to amass evidence against each of us to our detriment, if anyone has an ongoing issue that isn't going away, it will have to be addressed . . . maybe in the EPDP;</li> <li>• The issue arose regarding how to deal with submissions containing an abundance of irrelevant information; we are encouraged to summarize the submissions, but also to cover everything; if the applicant is really off base with submissions, we are encouraged to address these in preliminary matters, to show that we read the point(s).</li> </ul>
8	EPDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the first phase of EPDPs, TLs will sit down with each adjudicator over the next few weeks;</li> </ul>
9	Roundtable	<p>s.15</p> <p>s.15</p> <p>s.14</p> <p>s.15</p>

**IRP Team Meeting**  
**Feb 14, 2012**  
**11 – 11.30**  
**940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A**

**MINUTES**

**Chair: Mark**

**Scribe: Mark**

**Attendees:**

s.15

1	Red flag files	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- e.g. applicants wife made submissions to OSMV, unbeknownst to the applicant</li><li>- e.g. a 7day (2<sup>nd</sup> IRP Warn) made its way to review, file contained previous 3day paperwork</li><li>- INSTRUCTION: have a look at files prior to oral reviews, anything seeming not right check with s.15 or Team Leader or Manager</li></ul>
2	Peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Continue to use small checklists for now, expanded lists still in draft</li><li>- Logout book is done away with</li><li>- Peer reviewers change (below) – s.15 helps w/ ADP</li></ul>
3	Data entry	s.15 led demonstration of simplified entry system <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Use COMMAND buttons instead of red x-ing out of active windows (use 'SAVE and EXIT')</li><li>- Revisions or corrections: you'll need to enter the Prohib Log and manually edit (columns/rows)</li></ul>
4	Round table	Question re: Segers meeting in afternoon – it's just an information session so all adjudicators know what Segers is about BCCAT follow-up meeting on Thurs: to answer original question posed by Kathy at session IRP ASD Fail files – should they come your way, they will be extended to June 30 2012

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark

s.15

s.15

**IRP Team Meeting**  
**Feb 27, 2012**  
**130 - 230.**  
**940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A**

**MINUTES**

**Chair: Mark**

**Scribe:**

**Attendees:**

s.15

1	Template committee	Mark will call for volunteers to form a 'template committee' – ideally 3 – 4 to look at templates thoroughly and make recommendations
2	<p style="text-align: center;">s.14</p>	
3	Oral decisions	Good practice to not make a decision in an oral hearing – if asked, provide the applicant with "I have 21 days in which to make a decision"
4	<p>s.22</p> <p style="text-align: center;">s.14</p> <p style="text-align: right;">s.22</p>	
5	Rescheduling ASD fails	Direction given last Thursday regarding AR handling the extension has been superseded -- * Mark will provide guidance update
6	Consider non-essential office furniture	With space restrictions increasing, there may be a call for items to be removed from aisles/walkways.
7	<p style="text-align: center;">s.14</p>	

[

s.14



**IRP Team Meeting**  
**January 12, 2012**  
**2:30 – 3:30 p.m.**  
**940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A**

**MINUTES**

**Chair: Roberto/Mark**

**Scribe: Mark**

**Attendees:**

s.15

1	Changes to legislation	Brainstorm --- a chance to meet with policy sometime in the next couple of weeks re: IRP and changes to legislation, issues that come up in reviews
2	Peer review --- collect decisions	Collect good, well-written decisions, those that outline or discuss an issue really well – peer reviewers will handle this on an ongoing basis
3	Decision-writing workshop	Actual decisions used -- Mark will go over each decision with the adjudicator ahead of time
4	Refusals – concluding language	In the works, passed on ASAP – AR will assist in ascertaining correct dates
5	accolades	Roberto

**IRP Team Meeting**  
**Mar 29, 2012**  
**9 - 10**  
**940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A**

**MINUTES**

**Chair: Mark** s.15

**Scribe:** s.15

**Attendees:**

s.15

1		s.14
2	AK reminder re: holidays	Just a reminder to send a note to the Appeal Registry a week in advance of going on vacation.
3	Protocol for oral reviews	Protocol for oral hearings: call once and if possible to leave a message stating that you had an appointment to talk to the applicant and you will call again in 10 minutes. On the second call, if still no answer, leave the message that since the applicant was unavailable, the review now reverts to a written. You can give them a deadline in which to make written submissions and provide a fax number/your name so they can send them to you directly.
4	Good notes: ADP/VI	Reminder to put clear notes in the ADP/VI system, to assist other staff who rely on them, eg. If we are paying for towing/storage, ensure you are clear as to what date we will reimburse them up to and including. Also please indicate 'letter sent' when decision made. It assists appeals registry and DSCs.
5	Ideas for team-building and education	Please send Team Leads your ideas on team building/educational activities that you would like to do, at no or perhaps minimal cost.
6	Adjudicator	Adjudicator meetings to discuss files/issues will be starting

	Meetings	within the next couple of weeks, just working out the protocols.
7	Info sessions with other groups	If there are other areas of OSMV that you want to visit/learn about (eg MOC, RDP, Driver Fitness, etc.) send your ideas to Team Leads. We're not that busy right now so this is an ideal time to learn about what other areas do.
8	New IRP training	The training at Saanich PD that was originally scheduled for January will take place, once the new IRP legislation and forms are ready.
9	Rehearings	Reminder: rehearings must be peer reviewed by Team Leads.
10	s.14	
11	Extensions	Reminder that extensions must be discussed with the Team Leads, please also let them know when you have files with a tight turnaround time. No need to let Team Lead know if you are extending a file to disclose the BAC Report.
12	CPIC Notice "serve 7 day"	There has been a file where a PO served an individual with a 7 day IRP, solely based on a CPIC notation to serve the person with a prohibition. There was no evidence individual was even in a vehicle. Not likely to see many of these but just be aware that it can happen. Bring to a Team Lead if you suspect this is the case on a file.
13	EPDPs	Mark will be setting up EPDP meetings with all Adjudicators in the next month or so. NOTE: 'MyPerformance' has not replaced EPDP --- more info will follow.

# ADP/IRP Team Meeting

May 17, 2012

11:00 – 12:00

Boardroom 4A

## AGENDA

**Chair:** s.15 /Mark

**Scribe:** s.15

### Attendees:

s.15

s.15

*Kathy*

1		s.14
2	Peer Review Checklists – Modification Ideas	If anyone on the team has any modification ideas please forward to s.15 before Thursday May 24 <sup>th</sup> .
3	Training on ASDs/Forensic Alcohol Issues	All day workshop at the Sussex building on May 31 (Thursday) with Brian Image from RCMP Forensic Alcohol Lab and Kevin Jones of Abbotsford RCMP.
4	Workload in July	IRP set to go live June 15, 2012, and police are planning on serving 3000 IRP'S in July. Historically only about 10% apply. Summer and peak vacation period are coming so we will have to strategise on how to handle the workload. Suggestions included: shelf current projects where possible; relax deadlines on 24 hours, post-review correspondence, Segers, etc. approve overtime, do extensions, worst case scenario: if no other option, revert back to no flex for summer. Please let Team Leads know if you have any other ideas.
5	Mail Merge - Adjournment Letters	It is likely the decision on remedy for s.15 will not be received by June 30 so we will need to further extend our files. Setting up a mail merge now would make this easy, particularly if we do get busy. Simple process through MS Word, Mail Merge Wizard.

6

s.14

7	OOP/Foreign Driver's Licences	The Out of Province DLs are destroyed at ICBC and the foreign DLs are sent to their corresponding jurisdiction.
8	Adjudicator Meeting Notes	They must be kept as brief as possible as they are subject to Freedom of Information (FOI) requests. A possible remedy is to be very diligent in keeping your own notes.
9	Case Law	In your decision letter be very clear when case law is cited as to whether the lawyer has provided the cases or not. Kathy suggested that when a lawyer cites case law in an oral hearing and it is not one of our cases (Superintendent's) tell the lawyer to send it in if he/she wants it considered and give the lawyer an opportunity to fax it in by a reasonable time
	Round Table	s.15 asks whether or not late police evidence is accepted as we are now accepting late submissions from clients. The answer is yes, we would adjourn and disclose additional police evidence to an applicant but not adjourn on a late client submission.

# ADP/IRP Team Meeting

April 26, 2012

10:30 – 12:00

Boardroom 4A

## AGENDA

**Chair:** s.15 **Mark**

**Scribe:** s.15

### Attendees:

s.15

### Optional:

*Kathy Anderson*

*Tony Esposito*

s.15

*Danielle Piercy*

1	Extensions for Disclosing BAC Report	Initially we said that Team Leads do not need to know when an extension has been granted to disclose the BAC Report but yes, please just send a quick note when you have to extend for that reason.
2	Police Ride-Alongs	Ride-alongs are not mandatory, so no time off to participate in a ride-along but they are very educational and a lot of fun. Bima is doing all of the ride-alongs and he looks for possible impaired drivers to ensure that staff see things pertaining to our work. If you do not want to stay for the full time, you can get him to drop you at your vehicle at any time.
3	Turn-Around for 24 Hour files	Just a reminder that 24 hour reviews have a 2 week turn-around. Appeal Registry staff tell clients that decisions are made within 2 weeks and often they call back wondering when the decision will be made.
4	Policy on Accepting Late Submissions	OSMV is implementing a new policy: we will now accept late submissions up to the time the decision has gone out. In the case of new evidence/submissions from the client, do not stay the prohibition. If you need more time, send a letter to the client stating that you will accept the new information and provide the new date your decision will be sent by.
5	Adjudicator Meetings	Adjudicator meeting attendance is mandatory and all must take turns as Chair and Note Taker, no exceptions. If you flex on Mondays, it is acceptable to send the agenda to the Team on Tuesday mornings. Please add Danielle Piercy to your distribution list for the meeting announcements/agenda.
6		

s.14

		s.14
7	Certificate of a Qualified Technician	We should no longer be seeing requests from Appeal Registry staff to police asking for a "complete" Certificate of a Qualified Technician if the lot number or anything else is missing. If you do, bring the file to a Team Lead.
8	MyPerformance	MyPerformance is replacing the former EPDP. We are all required to create a profile for 2012, so that the EPDP for 2011/2012 can be finalized.
9	Adjudicator Procedures Manual	Will have to be updated once the new version of IRP becomes legislation. The changes stemming from the decision are the only changes being made at this time. s.22
10	Space Pressures	The office has grown considerably and there is pressure to find more space for new people. We do not have any storage space so items are being stored wherever possible. Unfortunately, there are no other options.
11	Roundtable	<p>A question was raised about challenges to the new legislation. Yes, this program is very much in the public eye so new challenges are expected.</p> <p>Some discussion as to who should be cancelling them in the event that police send in a request to cancel a prohibition served in error.</p>

# ADP/IRP Team Meeting

September 25, 2012

1:30 – 2:30

Boardroom 4A

## MINUTES

**Chair:** s.15 /Mark

**Scribe:** s.15

### Attendees:

s.15

### Optional:

*Kathy Anderson*

*Tony Esposito*

s.15

*Danielle Piercy*

1	Comments in ADP/VI	Indicate location of file; check if VI review – send a note to VI team or check their review schedule (VI review application fees will get refunded)
2	Rehearing Procedures	file MUST go back to Appeal Registry – developing a new re-hearing template – date on letter for prohibition re-start is not firm, not established in drivers, though MAY HAVE been decided by way of consent order
3	Irrelevant Grounds	Don't need to specifically list them, though in some cases this might be appropriate – Mark read suggested wording which will follow via email
4	Yes, provide reasons on revocations, but not a lot of detail	
5	TOL Policy	Mark read the official policy, will follow with email
6	Economic/Compassionate VI Reviews	Training on Oct 4 for all IRP adjudicators; IRP adjudicators will be overflow when VI adjudicators are flooded with these types of files
7	Tight Timelines/Afternoon Review Blocks	Opening up from week of October 1 – decided on 12 and 1pm time slots – to alleviate narrow timeline files – discussion of how narrow timeline files arise
8	ASD Report – Suggested Revisions	Mark will schedule a session for this – gathering input currently – needs to happen soon
9	Q and A Document - Revisions	Mark will schedule before mid-October – need input on further issues to add or revise – will try pairwork approach that we did previously
	Round Table	



**IRP Team Meeting**  
**November 20, 2012**  
**230 - 330**  
**940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A**

**MINUTES**

**Chair:** s.15 /Mark Thiessen  
**Scribe:** s.15

**Attendees:**

s.15

**Special Guests:**

*Steve Martin*

*Stephanie Melvin*

*Tony Esposito*

**Absent:**

s.15

1		
2		s.14
3	Vancouver narratives, police reports	
4		s.14
5	s.22 update	s.22 letters regarding new hearing dates are ready to go and will be sent next week. The letters indicate that the prohibition stay will remain in effect until a decision has been made.
6	Rehearings	New process regarding rehearings: Team Leads will do both peer reviews on them unless there are really complex issues/it's high profile.

Issues/Concerns:

1. Challenges of continuing with our current workloads
2. Heading into the holiday season
3. Trying to manage the workload on the s.22 backlog
4. The increasing complexity of the arguments being made on IRP 2.0 reviews and facing tight timelines in getting those decisions written and out the door.

# ADP/IRP Team Meeting

January 29, 2013

2:30 – 3:30 pm

## MINUTES

**Chair: Mark**

**Scribe:** s.15

**Attendees:**

s.15

1		
2		
		s.15
		s.14
3		
4	Vacation calendar	Vacation schedule has been completed and approved.
5	MyPerformance	M will send out 'Key Work Goals' for adjudicators to input into profile
6		
		s.14

**IRP Team Meeting**  
**Jun 4, 2013**  
**230 - 330**  
**940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A**

**MINUTES**

**Chair: Mark**      **Scribe:** s.15

**Attendees:**

s.15

*Kathy Anderson on issue 4*

1	s.22	
		s.14
2	s.22      rehearing	Re-hearing is done. Unique file; interesting issue of the effects of self-generated alcohol in the body. It was noted that expert evidence indicated ASD does not distinguish between sources of alcohol, nor does the Act distinguish between the sources of alcohol leading to a WARN or FAIL.
3	More on for oral reviews	s.15      will be starting oral review this week.
4	IRP 2.0 compared to previous version	Kathy will be giving a presentation next week, but needs to have information prepared for ICBC customer services reps by this

		Thursday. Kathy asked for some input on what has changed between IRP 1.0 and 2.0. Some discussion about the presence of driver's abstracts/records in the files and what information reps can provide applicants. Suggestion that ICBC not schedule reviews so close the end of the 21 day period. Complexity of files in view of expanded grounds is one major difference between old and new IRP versions. If we think of anything further before Thursday to mention to ICBC, email Kathy.
5	Prohib log	Mark initiated some changes – "ground for review" list will be eliminated, and the order in which to input information will be changed.
6	New adjudicator June 10	s.15, s.22 to start this date.
7	Round Table	s.15 will change the auto dial on fax machine so as to prevent sending docs to wrong offices.

**IRP Team Agenda**  
**June 11, 2013**  
**1:00 –**  
**940 Blanshard Boardroom 4A**

**Chair:** s.15

**Scribe:** s.15

<p>s.15</p> <p style="text-align: center;">s.14</p>	<p>s.15     <u>An idea/suggestion for the prohibition log.</u></p> <p>s.15     suggested a possible modification to the "prohib log" to enable it to be used by adjudicators as decision a search tool.     s.15     advised that decision contents can be searched through the search function available in Windows.</p>
---	---