

2014 Common Lawyers list

Lawyer	Fax #	
Bert King	(250) 763-6123	155 Commercial St, Nanaimo, BC V9R 5G5
Brian Jurloff	(604) 504-5880	112-2669 Langdon St, Abbotsford, BC V2T 3L3
Cathryn Waker	(604) 637-1617	10-128 West Pender St, Vancouver, BC V6B 1R8
Cory Armour	(250) 762-3163	272 Bernard Ave, Kelowna, BC V1Y 6N4
Craig Sicotte	(604) 585-8964	200-10706 King George Blvd, Surrey, BC V3T 2X3
David Jenkins	(250) 565-8001	700-550 Victoria St, Prince George, BC V2L 2K1
Don Muldoon	(604) 974-8888	1650-355 Burrard St, Vancouver, BC V6C 2G8
Edward Chu	(604) 288-5198	305 South Tower, 5811 Cooney Rd, Richmond, BC V6X 3M1
Greg Cranston	(604) 608-5588	4247 Hasting St, Burnaby, BC V5C 2J5
Greg Diamond	(604) 938-0870	217-4368 Main St, Whistler, BC V0N 1B4
Jamie Butler	(604) 739-9888	3337 West 4th Ave, Vancouver, BC V6R 1N6
Jeffrey Amdt	(778) 455-3999	201-281 Canada Ave, Duncan, BC V9L 1T6
Kevin Filkow	(604) 370-2505	140-5800 Cedarbridge Way, Richmond, BC V6X 2A7
Lisa Helps	(604) 669-5558	606-815 Hornby St, Vancouver, BC V6Z 2E6
Lolita Rudovica	(604) 581-2017	200-10388 Whally Blvd, Surrey, BC V3T 4H4
Mark Cacchioni	(604) 872-0617	663B Market Hill, Vancouver, BC V5Z 3Z4
Mitch Foster	(604) 687-4299	420-625 Howe St, Vancouver, BC V6C 2T6
Paul Dutt	(604) 535-7699	111-15272 Croydon Dr, Surrey, BC V3S 0Z5
Paul Evans	(778) 395-6226	202-10706 King George Blvd, Surrey, BC V3T 2X3
Paul Pearson	(250) 480-0004	3-535 Broughton St, Victoria, BC V8W 1C6
Phil Cote	(778) 395-6226	202-10706 King George Blvd, Surrey, BC V3T 2X3
Richard Ballantyne	(604) 859-3361	2459 Paulline St, Abbotsford, BC V2S 3S1
Sarah Leamon	(604) 370-2505	210-837 Beattie St, Vancouver, BC V6B 2M6
Vincent Michaels	(604) 806-3687	N406-5811 Cooney Rd, Richmond, BC V6X 3M1

Lawyers working in the same office with the same fax#

Carr, Buchan & Company

Jeremy Carr	(250) 388-7327	520 Comerford St, Victoria, BC V9A 6K8
Sacha Roudette	(250) 388-7327	520 Comerford St, Victoria, BC V9A 6K8

Stern Albert Shapray & Associates:

Jennifer Currie	(604) 590-5626	1012, 7445-132nd St, Surrey, BC V3W 1J8
Michael Shapray	(604) 590-5626	1012, 7445-132nd St, Surrey, BC V3W 1J8

Acumen Law Corporation

Kyla Lee	(604) 685-8308	210-837 Beatty St, Vancouver, BC V6B 2M6
Paul Doroshenko	(604) 685-8308	210-837 Beatty St, Vancouver, BC V6B 2M6

**Ministry of Justice
IRP Review Extensions/RoadSafetyBC**

Questions and Answers – Dec. 08, 2014

1. What is happening?

- RoadSafetyBC is no longer accepting late applications for Immediate Roadside Prohibition (IRP) reviews.
- The seven-day deadline to apply to the Superintendent for an administrative review of their prohibition is legislated under the Motor Vehicle Act.
- This policy change in no way affects the overall IRP review process, which the B.C. Supreme Court recently found to be constitutional (*Bro v. British Columbia Superintendent of Motor Vehicles*). .

2. When is it happening?

- RoadSafetyBC will stop accepting late applications as of [DATE].

3. Why is it happening?

- The policy change will ensure fairness to drivers who do meet the legislated seven-day deadline.
- It will also allow RoadSafetyBC staff to make more timely review decisions for drivers who do apply for reviews of their IRPs within the legislated timeframe.
- The process to review late applications was time consuming and added to RoadSafetyBC's existing workload pressures.

4. How long does it take now to process a review and how much more quickly will they be processed under this new policy?

- Reviews are currently processed with a 21-day service standard set out in legislation
- Applications received beyond the 7-day deadline present a challenge to be completed within that 21-day window.

5. How many people will this affect?

- RoadSafetyBC's new policy will affect very few drivers.
- There are about 80 outstanding applications for extension that will be decided under the previous policy.
- But the vast majority of drivers who apply for a review of their IRP do so within the legislated seven-day timeframe.

- In fact, since the IRP program's inception in September 2010, RoadSafetyBC has processed approximately 550 applications for an extension and of those only 20 per cent, or 110, were granted an extension.
- Ultimately, just 27 of those IRPs were subsequently revoked on review.

6. What are some of the reasons why those 27 IRPs were revoked?

- These IRPs were revoked because the individual applications satisfied an adjudicator that the driver met one of the grounds for review as set out in the MVA.

7. If so few people are affected, why make the change?

- Although the policy change will affect very few people overall, it is important because it ensures fairness to drivers who do meet the seven-day deadline.
- It will also allow RoadSafetyBC staff to make more timely review decisions for the drivers who do apply for reviews of their IRPs within the legislated timeframe.
- The process to review late applications was time consuming and added to RoadSafetyBC's existing workload pressures.

8. Why not make the period to apply for a review longer than seven days?

- The legislation sets the seven day period for making application for review. We feel seven days is adequate.
- Again, the vast majority of people who apply for a review do so within that legislated timeframe.

9. What about people with medical reasons for missing the deadline?

- In a rare case where a driver might miss the seven-day deadline for a medical reason, they will continue to have access to a judicial review of their IRP in BC Supreme Court.

10. But that can be a considerable cost and hardship to a person – do you see court challenge to this new policy being upheld?

- The Superintendent of Motor Vehicles and Ministry Solicitors have worked closely together to formulate this policy decision, and I am confident that it will be upheld by the courts.

11. What if months later an FOI request shows that police made a mistake?

- In these types of situations the IRPs have been found to be invalidly issues, and subsequently cancelled.
- Drivers also have the ability to seek judicial review in such circumstances.

IRP REVIEW EXTENSIONS

ROADSAFETYBC

MANDATE: Public Safety

VALUE: Our tough laws continue to take drinking drivers off our roads and help continue to save lives.

TOP 3 MESSAGES:

- As of [DATE], RoadSafetyBC is no longer accepting late applications for Immediate Roadside Prohibition reviews to ensure fairness to drivers who do meet the seven-day deadline.
- The policy change will allow RoadSafetyBC staff to make more timely review decisions for drivers who do apply for reviews of their IRPs within the legislated timeframe.
- Drivers who miss the seven-day deadline continue to have access to a judicial review of their IRP in BC Supreme Court.

TWO SUPPORTING FACTS:

- The seven-day deadline to apply to the Superintendent for an administrative review of an IRP is legislated under the Motor Vehicle Act.
- This change in no way affects the overall IRP review process, which the court recently found to be constitutional.

IF ASKED ABOUT OUTSTANDING APPLICATIONS:

IRP REVIEW EXTENSIONS

ROADSAFETYBC

- I'm advised that there are about 80 outstanding applications for extension that will be decided under the previous policy.
- But it's important to note that RoadSafetyBC's new policy will in fact affect very few drivers.
- Since the IRP program's inception, only 110 drivers have ever been granted an extension – and of those, only 27 IRPs were subsequently revoked on review.

IF ASKED ABOUT DRIVERS WHO MISS THE DEADLINE DUE TO ILLNESS:

- In a rare case where a driver might miss the seven-day deadline for a medical reason, they will continue to have access to a judicial review of their IRP in BC Supreme Court.

IRP REVIEW EXTENSIONS

ROADSAFETYBC

BACKGROUND:

On [DATE] RoadSafetyBC will stop accepting late applications for reviews of Immediate Roadside Prohibitions (IRPs). This means RoadSafetyBC will no longer grant extensions for a review beyond the seven days from the date an IRP is served. The Motor Vehicle Act (MVA) says that an application must be made within 7 days of the date of the IRP.

The process to review late applications is time consuming and adds to existing heavy workload pressures. The policy change will allow RoadSafetyBC to make more timely review decisions in general and address workload efficiencies. It will also ensure fairness to drivers who have made their application within the legislated timeframe.

The change will affect very few drivers. Since September 2010, RoadSafetyBC has processed approximately 550 applications for an extension and only 20 per cent, or 110, of the applications were granted an extension. Of those, there were only 27 where the IRP was subsequently revoked on review.

There are 83 outstanding applications for extensions that must be decided. Legal Services Branch (LSB) advises

s.14

s.14

To ensure drivers are notified, advance notice of this policy change will be posted on the RoadSafetyBC website, will be given to law firms that routinely represent drivers who receive IRPs and will be communicated to applicants enquiring about late reviews by ICBC.

Until now, RoadSafetyBC has maintained a process that allowed drivers to apply for an extension of the seven-day window. It was based on the Segers decision (1999) related to the Administrative Driving Prohibition (ADP) regime. A recent B.C. Supreme Court decision (the Harrison case) impacted the process for reviews, making the decision process considerably more complex and placing an increased operational burden on RoadSafetyBC. If the Superintendent continued to consider extension applications, greater resources would have been diverted away from making review decisions for drivers who complied with the legislation.

The legal landscape around the extension application process is complex. The legislation governing the time allowed for applying for a review of an ADP, a 24 hour prohibition or an IRP is clearly worded in all three cases, and it only allows a person to apply for a review within seven days of being served with the prohibition.

IRP REVIEW EXTENSIONS

ROADSAFETYBC

Despite this clear language, the Segers decision found the Superintendent had discretion to extend the seven day time limit for ADP reviews in special and unusual circumstances.

s.13, s.14

s.13, s.14

In 2012 the B.C. Court of Appeal decision in MacNeil concluded that a decision by the Superintendent under the 24 hour prohibition legislation (s.215.1), which found that the Superintendent had no discretion to extend the time for applying for a review under that provision, was reasonable. Legal Services Branch has advised

s.13, s.14

This policy change will likely be met with criticism from defense counsel and negative media attention. Critics might question the sudden change of direction

s.13

Critics might also say the Superintendent is limiting access to an IRP review for drivers who may legitimately be unable to meet the seven-day legislated deadline. One example is a driver who may have been unable to apply for a review of their IRP for medical reasons, such as being in hospital. In such rare cases, the driver would continue to have access to a judicial review of the prohibition in BC Supreme Court.

Further, in some cases related to police errors discovered through Freedom of Information (FOI) requests, defence counsel have applied for extensions. Under the new policy, police errors can be addressed through an existing process under which police produce a Supplemental Report that indicates the prohibition was issued in error and requests that the Superintendent remove it from the driver's record, and refund associated penalties and fees.

**MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
RoadSafetyBC
BRIEFING NOTE**

PURPOSE: For INFORMATION for the Honourable Suzanne Anton, QC Attorney General, Minister of Justice

ISSUE: Information for the Minister on the implementation of a new policy for discontinuing extensions on the 7 day statutory timeframe to apply for a review of an Immediate Roadside Prohibition (IRP).

SUMMARY:

- RoadSafetyBC plans on implementing a new policy whereby RoadSafetyBC will no longer be accepting applications for extensions of the 7 day deadline for IRP review applications.

-

s.13, s.14

- The current process for IRP review applications which allows for an extension of the 7 day deadline is time consuming and adds to existing operational pressures.
- To ensure drivers are notified, this policy change with an effective date in early January 2015 will be posted on the RoadSafetyBC website. Notice of the policy decision will be sent to the appropriate affected parties.

BACKGROUND:

- Under the *Motor Vehicle Act* (MVA) a driver must apply for review of an IRP within 7 days of the date that the prohibition is issued.
- Until now, RoadSafetyBC has maintained a process that allowed drivers to apply for an extension of the 7 day window. Court decisions from 2012 and 2014 have advanced the jurisprudence in this area making the decision process considerably more complex and placing an increased operational burden on RoadSafetyBC. If the Superintendent continued to consider extension applications, greater resources would be diverted away from making review decisions for drivers who complied with the legislation.

- In response to legal advice,

s.13, s.14

s.13, s.14

s.13, s.14 In addition, advance notice of the upcoming change in policy will be posted on the RoadSafetyBC website, will be given to law firms that routinely represent drivers who receive IRPs, and will be communicated by ICBC to applicants enquiring about late applications.

- The change will affect very few drivers. Since September 2010, RoadSafetyBC has processed approximately 550 applications for an extension and only 20 percent, or 110, of

the applications were granted an extension. Of those, there were only 27 where the IRP was subsequently revoked on review.

-

s.13, s.14

- This policy change, whether implemented immediately or subsequently through legislation, will likely be met with criticism from defense counsel and negative media attention.

OTHER MINISTRIES IMPACTED/CONSULTED:

- Consultations have taken place with Legal Services Branch and Legislative Counsel.

Prepared by:
Brad Gerhart
Senior Policy Advisor
RoadSafetyBC

s.17

Approved by:
Sam MacLeod
Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
RoadSafetyBC
(250) 387-5692

Pages 10 through 11 redacted for the following reasons:

s.13, s.14

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, December 8, 2014 1:12 PM
To: Kirby, Katherine JAG:EX; Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Cc: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX; Smith, Curtis M JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX; Gerhart, Bradley JAG:EX; O'Neill, Robert JAG:EX
Subject: RE: BN Required MO - Segers Policy Change

All as discussed, except that Robert, Steve and I will add comments, but Sam will need to approve the BN. Thanks all.
Kathryn

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: s.17
Assistant - Anita Wilkinson: (250) 356-8640



RoadSafetyBC

This communication (both message and any attachment) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or email.

From: Kirby, Katherine JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, December 8, 2014 12:37 PM
To: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX; Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Cc: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX; Smith, Curtis M JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX; Gerhart, Bradley JAG:EX; O'Neill, Robert JAG:EX
Subject: RE: BN Required MO - Segers Policy Change

Hi Everyone,

Kathryn and I had a quick call to talk about the game plan:

1. There is no change in the approach, s.13
s.13
 2. It will be an information note that outlines this (I understand that there are several pieces from the IN and other sources that we can put together to cover this off).
 3. We will run our bn past Melanie in legal to make sure that we have adequately reflected legal advice.
 4. Then up to Kathryn, Steven and Robert for approvals.
- Recognizing that we will need to work quickly to meet deadlines--will that work for everyone..

Thanks to everyone in advance for your efforts in pulling this together,

Kathy

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Sent: December-08-14 12:24 PM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Cc: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX; Smith, Curtis M JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX; Kirby, Katherine JAG:EX; Gerhart, Bradley JAG:EX; O'Neill, Robert JAG:EX
Subject: RE: BN Required MO - Segers Policy Change

Thanks Corey. I'm not sure what you're referring to re giving work to the leg drafter. I'm not suggesting that he needs to be involved. The strategy remains the same s.13 I think we have all the information necessary to put the note together on a short time frame and all the thinking done – it is just that the MO now also wants a BN and we need to get that up so that we can implement this policy change.

Happy to discuss if we have crossed wires anywhere.
Kathryn

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: s.17
Assistant - Anita Wilkinson: (250) 356-8640



RoadSafetyBC

This communication (both message and any attachment) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or email.

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, December 8, 2014 12:11 PM
To: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Cc: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX; Smith, Curtis M JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX; Kirby, Katherine JAG:EX; Gerhart, Bradley JAG:EX; O'Neill, Robert JAG:EX
Subject: RE: BN Required MO - Segers Policy Change

Hi Kathryn,

We will work towards getting a draft to Melanie ASAP.

I have concerns with giving work to our drafter as he is busy working on a next draft and consultation draft for tomorrow. We have to have the legislation to the editors by Thursday to make our deadline. Also, s.13

s.13

s.13

I have asked Brad to take the pen on this note given David's absence.

CB

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, December 8, 2014 11:46 AM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Cc: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX; Smith, Curtis M JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX; Kirby, Katherine JAG:EX
Subject: RE: BN Required MO - Segers Policy Change

Corey,

I'm just off the phone with Melanie on this. She will be expecting the BN for review in short order. We are aiming to implement by Wednesday if possible and the legal advice is s.14 Please make this a priority.

As well, Melanie suggested that

s.13, s.14

s.13, s.14

Thanks

Kathryn

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: s.17
Assistant - Anita Wilkinson: (250) 356-8640



RoadSafetyBC

This communication (both message and any attachment) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or email.

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, December 8, 2014 11:33 AM
To: Kirby, Katherine JAG:EX; Bowness, Corey JAG:EX (Corey.Bowness@gov.bc.ca)
Cc: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX (Steven.Roberts@gov.bc.ca); Smith, Curtis M JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Subject: BN Required MO - Segers Policy Change
Importance: High

Kathy and Corey,

The MO has advised that they would like a BN on the policy change with respect to Segers applications. There is some urgency in getting this out given timelines for implementing the change. This is a note where the authority is the Superintendent's and the note should be for information of the DM and Minister.

Corey are you able to put together a first draft of this note on a priority basis? Steve's shop has a draft IN on the issue, there is a Sept., 17 policy paper on the strategy, and legal opinions from Aug. 19 and Nov. 27, 2014 that may assist. The IN from Steve's shop is likely the place to start – as it gives a good summary of the issues – and the Sept. 17 policy paper assists in terms of strategy.

In Shelly's absence, please let me know if you have any questions or concerns,

Thanks
Kathryn

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: s.17
Assistant - Anita Wilkinson: (250) 356-8640



RoadSafetyBC

This communication (both message and any attachment) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or email.

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Kirby, Katherine JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 9:18 AM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX; MacLeod, Sam JAG:EX; Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Cc: Coburn, David JAG:EX; Steinmetz, Susanne K JAG:EX; Fyfe, Alexander JAG:EX; Leavitt, Darlene JAG:EX; Murray, Melanie JAG:EX
Subject: Re: Segers legislation

Corey, thanks for your immediate attention to this. I support your recommendation. K

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 09:14 AM Pacific Standard Time
To: MacLeod, Sam JAG:EX; Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX; Kirby, Katherine JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Cc: Coburn, David JAG:EX; Steinmetz, Susanne K JAG:EX; Fyfe, Alexander JAG:EX; Leavitt, Darlene JAG:EX; Murray, Melanie JAG:EX
Subject: Segers legislation

Hi folks,

We received comments from legislative counsel on Draft 7 with respect to the Segers amendments. They feel that the

s.12

s.13

Please let me know if you have any concerns.

Corey

Corey Bowness
Senior Policy Advisor
Ministry of Justice
Ph: 250-356-5952
Cell: s.17
Fx: 250-356-5568



RoadSafetyBC

Pages 17 through 25 redacted for the following reasons:

s.12, s.13, s.14

s.13, s.14

s.14

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 9:46 AM
To: Coburn, David JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX; Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX; Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Segers - Next steps

Please see Kathryn's note below.

Thanks,

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX **On Behalf Of** Coburn, David JAG:EX
Sent: Friday, November 7, 2014 4:23 PM
To: Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX
Subject: FW: Segers - Next steps
When: Thursday, November 13, 2014 9:30 AM-10:00 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: Telephone Meeting (Corey, David and Shelly to call from Shelly's office)

Any chance this could wait until the 17th? s.22 If it does have to be on the phone on the 13th, could we do it at 8:00? That way I can take the call from the ferry – which is likely the least 'disturbed' time I'll have available that morning.

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Sent: Friday, November 7, 2014 3:54 PM
To: Coburn, David JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX; Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX; Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: Segers - Next steps
When: Thursday, November 13, 2014 9:30 AM-10:00 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: Telephone Meeting (Corey, David and Shelly to call from Shelly's office)

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2014 3:45 PM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Cc: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Segers
Attachments: Planning.Oct 9 2014.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Do you have the legal opinion and Sept 17 docs? As well, the attached draft may assist (part 9, page 10), Shelly and I began to map this out. Shelly may also have a more current version of the attached. I'll let her know you are starting to set out next steps.

Thanks you two,
Kathryn

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent
Office of the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: [s.17](#)
Assistant - Anita Wilkinson: (250) 356-8640

This communication (both message and any attachment) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or email.

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2014 3:39 PM
To: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Cc: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Segers

Sounds like a plan!

David – can you pull together a draft “next steps” for discussion with Shelly?

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2014 3:38 PM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Cc: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Segers

Wonderful. I think legal counsel mapped out, at least to some degree, next steps in their opinion and Sept. 17 discussion paper. If you are able to work with Shelly to set out in summary form what those next steps are and who will be responsible for each, we could perhaps meet next week to start to move this forward? What do you think?

Thanks so much for this,
Kathryn

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent
Office of the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: s.17
Assistant - Anita Wilkinson: (250) 356-8640

This communication (both message and any attachment) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or email.

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2014 3:36 PM
To: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Cc: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: Segers

Hi Kathryn,

As promised, I spoke with Sam this afternoon about this issue and he is good to move forward with the policy change now and follow up with legislative amendments. Happy to discuss in further detail if you'd like.

Safe travels!

CB

Corey Bowness
A/Director, Policy and Strategic Initiatives Branch
Ministry of Justice
Ph: s.17
Cell: s.17
Fx: 250-356-5568



RoadSafetyBC

Pages 29 through 40 redacted for the following reasons:

s.13

s.13, s.14

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Turner, Kimberley JAG:EX
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2014 1:33 PM
To: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: Segers
Attachments: s.14 FW Difference between Criminal vs Administrative charges.htm; FW Seger's guidance May 11 2011.htm; Policy statement for 7 day application for ADP and 24 Hour.docx; s.14
s.14 ; Segers Procedures.docx; Legal Opinion Request - s.1422
s.14

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello David,

As per our phone conversation, I have attached what we have in terms of policy or guidance regarding Segers. Would you also like me to forward you any other legal advice or opinions regarding Segers applications?

Cheers

Kim Turner

Team Leader of Adjudication, RoadSafetyBC

Ministry of Justice

PO Box 9254 STN Prov Govt | Victoria BC | V8W 9J2

Phone: (250) 356-5654

E-Mail: kimberley.turner@gov.bc.ca



RoadSafetyBC

Pages 42 through 45 redacted for the following reasons:

s.14

From: Piercy, Danielle JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2012 4:22 PM
To: Thiessen, Mark JAG:EX
Subject: FW: Difference between Criminal vs Administrative charges

Hey Mark,

Roberto had sent this info to the former DIP adjudicators...

From: Alberto, Roberto SG:EX
Sent: Thursday, October 6, 2011 12:00 PM
To: Banman, Shelly SG:EX; Dunstan, Lynne A SG:EX
Cc: Piercy, Danielle SG:EX; Thiessen, Mark SG:EX; Esposito, Tony N SG:EX; Anderson, Kathy E SG:EX
Subject: Difference between Criminal vs Administrative charges

Hi Shelly and Lynne:

As you go along with your training, you will find that one common topic applicants bring up in explaining why they failed to apply for a review within the 7-day period is that they confuse administrative prohibitions with criminal offences.

Many times, you will have to give a quick explanation about the difference between the two. Although you do not have to go through each one of the points I outline below whenever the subject comes up, here is some guidance on the key points you should keep in mind when speaking about it. You can prepare your own language on each point.

1. Although Administrative Driving Prohibitions and Immediate Roadside Prohibitions arise from the same type of incidents that can lead to criminal charges (i.e. driving while impaired), ADP's and IRP's are not criminal charges. The penalties a person faces when they are served with an ADP or an IRP are administrative in nature and different to those a person receives if criminally charged with a driving offence. Ergo, the process one must go through when appealing an IRP and ADP is also different than that used to defend against criminal charges. So, if a person says "if I am guilty, how come the cops never charged me criminally then?" You can say "criminal proceedings are different from the administrative penalty that you received".
2. However, despite the difference, because the events from which the ADP's and criminal charges arise are the same, a person may end up getting an ADP and the results of the ADP can be used to charge the person with criminal charges as well. However, remember: the two are still different. This means that even though the same facts are used for both, if a person ends up having the criminal charges stayed (i.e. "dropped" in American TV lingo) this does not mean that the prohibition under the ADP will be automatically revoked. Simply put: there is no mandatory or automatic revocation of an ADP when criminal charges cannot be proven even if the two arise from the same events.
3. You should note that if a person is charged with an IRP, police will NOT charge them criminally (well, they shouldn't anyways). So if a person says "after my IRP, I was waiting to go to court but I never had to so I thought the charges were dropped" you should explain that IRP's do not have anything to do with the criminal court proceedings.
4. The standards of proof are different: criminal charges have to be proven beyond a reasonable

doubt; administrative prohibitions are confirmed on the civil standard of "balance of probabilities".

This is not something you need to regularly inform the public about, but I am passing it on for you to have in case an applicant questions you about it.

5. You should always remind applicants to read the Notice of Driving Prohibition because it clearly outlines the procedure for review of the prohibition and the associated timelines and from that they can see that there is no association to court proceedings or anything of the sort.
6. Criminal procedures tend to take longer. Administrative prohibitions come into effect faster than criminal charges and their duration is less.

I hope this is helpful. If you have any other questions, let me know.

Regards,

Roberto Alberto
Team Leader of Adjudication

The Office of the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles | Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
PO Box 9254 Stn Prov Gov
Victoria, BC V8W 9J2
Phone-250 356-5654 Fax- 250 387-4891

 cid:image001.jpg@
01CB2FE5.BF8A9DE
0

From: Parker, Vicki JAG:EX
Sent: Thursday, May 3, 2012 8:42 AM
To: Thiessen, Mark JAG:EX
Subject: FW: Seger's guidance

Could this be the Roberto email you seek?

From: Alberto, Roberto SG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2011 9:01 AM
To: Parker, Vicki SG:EX; Trenchard, Hugh A SG:EX; Downs, Julie SG:EX; Taylor, Cheryl A SG:EX; Tousignant, Nanci L SG:EX
Cc: Thiessen, Mark SG:EX; Esposito, Tony N SG:EX; Piercy, Danielle SG:EX; Anderson, Kathy E SG:EX
Subject: Seger's guidance

Hi everyone:

Just wanted to inform you of a change in guidance in reference to Seger's files.

One usual argument applicants use is that they did all they could to file their application within 7 days but that their lawyer(s) failed to do something crucial that ultimately led to their application for a review to fall outside the 7-day deadline.

The usual response from us was:

"although this is unfortunate, it is through no fault of our own that this happened. The fact that your lawyer's office failed to take proper steps to file your application for a review in time does not make our process unfair or unreasonable".

The basis for this is that lawyers have a duty to carry their work to a high standard of competence and that if they fail to do this, the remedy available to their client is to place a complaint with the Law Society. However, in a recent case called s.22 our legal branch s.14

s.14

s.14

s.14 . So, with that in mind, here's the approach you should take in those situations:

- Analyze the evidence you have and ensure you have evidence that the person actually did take reasonable steps, had a bona fide intent to apply and that their application to have the 7-day deadline extended was brought as soon as practical.
- Then (and this is also very crucial) ensure you have evidence from the lawyer that supports their submissions and explanations for their error. In other words, if a lawyer says "we made a boo-boo", that's not enough. You need to have evidence of what occurred, what the client did, etc. So, for example, in the case of s.22 all the lawyers provided affidavits, s.22 also provided evidence of what had occurred and records actually matched their submissions. In other words, the evidence was compelling.

I hope this helps you guys.

Any questions? Just ask Mark or me.

Regards,

Roberto Alberto

Team Leader of Adjudication

The Office of the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles | Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General

PO Box 9254 Stn Prov Gov

Victoria, BC V8W 9J2

Phone-250 356-5654 Fax- 250 387-4891

Roberto.Alberto@gov.bc.ca

✕ cid:image001.jpg@
01CB2FE5.BF8A9DE
0

7-day limit to apply for an ADP, IRP, and 24 Hour review

OSMV Policy:

Throughout BC, Driver Licencing Centers, Government Agents, Appointed Agents, and the Office of the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles (OSMV) operate on regular business hours between Monday and Friday. Most Appointed Agents but few Driver Licencing Centers and Government Agents are open Saturdays. The hours of operation vary between agencies. The OSMV is not open Saturdays.

Given the variability of the offices that are open, and their hours of operation, on Saturday, in combination with the fact that OSMV is closed on Saturdays, the OSMV considers Saturday and Sunday to be non-business hours.

Therefore, in order to allow all clients to apply for a review within the prescribed 7-day deadline, if the 7-day deadline expires on a Saturday or Sunday then the time to apply for a review is extended to the Monday. If the 7-day deadline expires on a statutory holiday the time is extended to the next day business day.

When calculating the 7-day deadline, the first day the notice is served is not counted.

Updated January 24, 2011 – K. Anderson

Page 51 redacted for the following reason:

s.14

SEGERS PROCEDURES

A Segers adjudicator should familiarize themselves with the following case law when reviewing Segers files:

- *Segers v. Superintendent of Motor Vehicles*
- *Suprenant v. Superintendent of Motor Vehicles*

Under the *Motor Vehicle Act*, someone who is served with an Administrative Driving Prohibition (ADP), an Immediate Roadside Prohibition (IRP), or a 24-Hour, is allowed 7 days from the date of service to apply for a review of the prohibition. However, if a client misses the 7-day limit the Superintendent has discretion to extend the 7-day period where the circumstances warrant. The Supreme Court of British Columbia has said obviously injury or illness may interfere with a driver's ability to file a review within the 7 days and that the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles has a jurisdiction, to be used sparingly in special or unusual circumstances, to extend this time limit.

NOTE: 24-Hour Prohibitions are not considered by adjudicators for late application. This is based on the ruling *MacNeil v OSMV*, 2012 BCCA 360

The following are factors that the court indicated the Superintendent may consider when deciding whether or not to extend the 7-day period:

1. The Superintendent being satisfied that the driver at all material times had a bona fide intent to seek review within the 7-day limit, and
2. The Superintendent being satisfied that reasonable and appropriate steps were taken by the driver within the 7-day appeal period in furtherance of the intention to seek review, and
3. The Superintendent is satisfied that the driver's failure to meet the statutory deadline despite the foregoing is not caused by or contributed to by the driver's conduct or lack thereof, and
4. The Superintendent is satisfied that the driver has an appeal, argument or issue that is worthy of consideration, and
5. The application to seek extension of the 7-day limit is brought as soon as practical.

Note: not all factors need to be met in order to grant an extension of the 7-day limit. The overall test can be thought of as: *has the person established circumstances that warrant an extension?*

First determine whether it was impossible for the application to be made within the initial 7 days by looking at the first three criteria above. If you are satisfied that it was impossible for the driver to seek a review, then you can turn to factors 4 and 5. Provide an analysis of the factors considered in making your decision.

****Hardship is not a bona fide reason. The *Motor Vehicle Act* does not authorize the Superintendent to consider an individual's personal circumstances and transportation needs in the context of an administrative driving prohibition review.****

Types of letter:

SEGERS PROCEDURES

More info letter – To be used when it is not clear if the client has received and read the information sheet (*Did You Miss the 7-day Limit to Apply for an ADP Review?* sheet) regarding missing the 7-day limit. A letter is sent to the client with the info sheet giving the client an opportunity to make further submission.

Template found here:

W:\Correspondence Unit\adp_vi\Segers\More Info\Template - More Info.doc

Approved Segers letter – the letter sent approving the extension of time for a client to apply for review of their ADP or IRP. This letter advises the client they have been approved and gives another 7-day (generally) application period for the client to apply.

Template found here:

W:\Correspondence Unit\adp_vi\Segers\Approved\Template Approved Segers.doc

Denied Segers letter – the letter sent to the client when the adjudicator believes there are no special or unusual circumstances that warrant an extension of the time limit. An adjudicator will provide reasons to support their decision in this letter.

W:\Correspondence Unit\adp_vi\Segers\Denied\Template Denied Segers.doc

REVIEWING SEGERS FILES

- Incoming Segers files are forwarded to the adjudicator from the appeals registry;
- Double check the client has missed the 7-day deadline;

How to calculate 7 days:

There should be 7 clear 24 hour days. The service date is counted, as per Appeal Registry practice. For example: If an ADP is served January 15, and you add '8' using the Julian calendar, January 23 would be the last day. If the last day falls on a Saturday, Sunday or civic holiday and the local office is not open, the final day is the next business day. Holidays and weekends count towards 7-day limit. The only time you would extend the 7-day count is if the 7th day falls on a non-business day for the local office (Sunday or civic holiday).

For office policy on the 7 days, see office Policy Statement, also refer to the *Interpretation Act*.

MORE INFO LETTER

- Once you have determined the client has missed the 7 days then check ADP/VI system to see that client has been provided with the information sheet regarding missing the 7-day limit.

SEGERS PROCEDURES

- Go to ADP/VI system and look up client. Look in Comments. Review comments as generally there is a comment that advises the client was faxed/provided with the information sheet. Also, sometimes the client attaches the info sheet with their submission.
- If there are no comments and no info sheet attached to the submission, then send client MORE INFO letter. While the submission the client sends in may address missing the 7-day limit we need to ensure that the client was provided with the information sheet.
- Use template or most recent letter sent out and change date, address, prohib #, service date, lawyer info if necessary, etc.
- Save copy on W drive in Segers folder.
- Make two copies (one to send to client (lawyer if applicable) and one for file of which you will stamp "copy" on).
- Go into ADP/VI system and put a comment in under comments tab such as:

Letter sent to client today providing info sheet regarding missing 7-day limit

Client has until [date] to make further submission or contact appeals registry advising not making further submission and received sheet

File returned to Appeals Registry

- Put sticky note on front of file indicating waiting for further submission and submission deadline and file with Appeals Registry in the inbox marked "Segers".
 - Mail letter.
 - enter into Prohib stats log
- If submission is provided, Appeals Registry will return the file to the adjudicator.
- Review file & submission; make decision to approve or deny Segers extension. Follow APPROVED or DENIED steps as necessary.

APPROVED LETTER

Here are some reasons you may allow for an extension of time to apply for a review of an Administrative Driving Prohibition (this is not an exhaustive list):

- The driver is hospitalized during the 7-day term.
- The driver has left BC during the 7-day term.
- The driver has a disease that does not allow them to be in contact with others
- The driver was a hostage and has evidence of psychological trauma.
- ICBC/Driver Services did not provide client with correct review info (for example: ICBC tells client "you can't apply anymore" when the applicant still could apply or "you still have 2 days left" when the applicant in fact does not)
- Any reason where the person can't physically attend a DSC could be a valid reason.

SEGERS PROCEDURES

- ***The key thing to remember is that at all times, you must always be able to see that the applicant had a bona fide intent to apply within the 7 days***
- Use template or most recent letter sent out and change date, address, prohib #, service date, lawyer info if necessary, etc.
- Save copy accordingly.
- Make two copies (one to send to client (lawyer if applicable) and one for file of which you will stamp "copy" on).
- Go into ADP/VI system and put a comment in under comments tab such as:

"Application to extend 7-day application period approved – Mr. or Mrs. 'So-and-So' has until (-date-) to attend DSC and apply for review"

- Put sticky note on front of file indicating date client has to apply for review and bring to Appeals Registry where there is a box labelled "Seger's/7-day extensions" and place file in that box
- Mail letter.
- Enter into stats log.
- **You will also need to do a Notice to Extend letter notifying client of the extension to their 21 day decision turnaround – YOU NEED TO EXTEND FOR 7 DAYS from the day you send the letter out (which is also the date on which the adjudicator must render her or his decision)**

DENIED LETTER

- If an adjudicator finds there are no special or unusual circumstances that warrant an extension of the time limit, he/she will send a letter to the client denying the extension to apply for review.
- Use template or most recent letter sent out and change date, address, prohib #, lawyer info if necessary, etc.
- Write decision analysing evidence, submission, etc.
- Save copy in appropriate format.
- Make two copies (one to send to client (lawyer if applicable) and one for file of which you will stamp "copy" on).
- Go into ADP/VI system and put a comment in under comments tab such as:

"Application to extend application period denied – letter sent to Mr. or Mrs. 'So-and-So' advising of decision"

- Mail decision; log decision.
- File in cabinets (File by month and then in ADP # order); if that month has already been off-sited, give to Branch Support at reception.

Pages 56 through 133 redacted for the following reasons:

s.13, s.14

s.14

s.14, s.16

s.14, s.16, s.22

s.14, s.22

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2014 3:36 PM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX; Coburn, David JAG:EX
Cc: Campbell, Darrion JAG:EX
Subject: FW: For Action: Phase 2 RFL

FYI

Shelly Burchnall
Director, Administrative Justice
RoadSafetyBC
Ministry of Justice

Tel: 250-356-0601 | Fax: 250-356-5577



This communication and all attachments are intended only for the addressee and are privileged and confidential. Any distribution, disclosure, copying or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and destroy all electronic and printed versions. Thank you.

From: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2014 4:26 PM
To: Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX; Esposito, Tony JAG:EX
Subject: RE: For Action: Phase 2 RFL

I spoke with Melanie regarding
opinion on this issue soon.

s.14

She advises that Tim Quirk will be forwarding his

I don't have any other legal advice on any of the other issues.

Kathy Anderson

From: Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2014 4:52 PM
To: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX; Esposito, Tony JAG:EX
Subject: FW: For Action: Phase 2 RFL
Importance: High

Hi Kathy and Tony,

Corey has requested we provide him with any legal advice we may have pertaining to proposed amendments in phase 2 of the s.14 RFL. I have highlighted the amendments related to s.14 I will forward the

legal opinion I received pertaining to s.14 . Corey hasn't given a timeline; however, could we please try to have this information to him by the end of the week please?

Thanks,
Shelly

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2014 2:50 PM
To: Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX; Campbell, Darrion JAG:EX
Cc: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: For Action: Phase 2 RFL
Importance: High

Hi Shelly/Darrion,

Can you (or your team members) please provide me with any legal advice pertaining to the following amendments that are going forward in our Phase 2 IRP RFL?

s.12

Note: The legal opinions need only be germane to the amendment. For example, we don't need all the conversations with legal regarding s.14 as that would likely be a bit too much to sift through for both of us at this point.

That said, opinions from LSB on the s.14 would be greatly help David and I as we proceed on drafting the RFL.

If you have questions, I'm happy to clarify anything.

Thanks in advance!

Corey

Corey Bowness
Sr. Policy Advisor, Policy and Strategic Initiatives Branch

Pages 136 through 141 redacted for the following reasons:

s.12, s.13, s.14

s.14

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2014 4:59 PM
To: Turner, Kimberley JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Segers

Thanks Kim!

I have several legal opinions (including *Segers*, *MacNeil*, etc.) so I should be good in that department! Very much appreciated ☺

David Coburn
Policy Analyst (250) 356-8070
RoadSafetyBC
Ministry of Justice



RoadSafetyBC



Please consider the environment
before printing this email.

From: Turner, Kimberley JAG:EX
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2014 1:33 PM
To: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: Segers

Hello David,

As per our phone conversation, I have attached what we have in terms of policy or guidance regarding Segers. Would you also like me to forward you any other legal advice or opinions regarding Segers applications?

Cheers

Kim Turner
Team Leader of Adjudication, RoadSafetyBC
Ministry of Justice
PO Box 9254 STN Prov Govt | Victoria BC | V8W 9J2
Phone: (250) 356-5654
E-Mail: kimberley.turner@gov.bc.ca



RoadSafetyBC

Pages 143 through 160 redacted for the following reasons:

s.14

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 4:19 PM
To: XT:Vanhelvoirt, Joy; ICBC MTIC:IN; Laupland, Lisa
Cc: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Subject: RE: RoadSafetyBC Policy Change - IRP Late Applications

Thanks, Joy. Lisa, I will be s.22 – if you have any questions s.22 please contact Steve Roberts and Shelly Burchnall.

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: s.17
Assistant - Anita Wilkinson: (250) 356-8640



This communication (both message and any attachment) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or email.

From: Van Helvoirt, Joy [<mailto:Joy.VanHelvoirt@icbc.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 3:35 PM
To: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Cc: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX; Laupland, Lisa
Subject: RE: RoadSafetyBC Policy Change - IRP Late Applications

Thanks Kathryn,

Lisa Laupland will be on lead for ICBC to ensure appropriate communication and procedures are amended.

Thx
Joy

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX [<mailto:Kathryn.Chapman@gov.bc.ca>]
Sent: Thursday, December 11, 2014 3:57 PM
To: Van Helvoirt, Joy
Cc: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Subject: RoadSafetyBC Policy Change - IRP Late Applications

Joy,
As you know, we have been making changes to operational processes at RoadSafetyBC. I'm writing to let you know about one of these changes in relation to Immediate Roadside Prohibition (IRP) reviews that will have some impact on ICBC staff.

As of January 12, 2015, RoadSafetyBC will no longer be accepting late applications, commonly known as *Segers* applications, from drivers who miss the 7-day deadline to apply for their IRP review as the *Motor Vehicle Act*. Our legal advice is

s.14

s.14

As of January 12, ICBC staff should no longer issue, to drivers who have missed the 7-day deadline, the current fact sheet that outlines the *Segers* application process. Attached to this note is the messaging that we are providing to our Client Service and Appeals Registry staff to assist in advising callers of this policy change after Jan. 12, 2015.

This policy change does not affect the process surrounding *Segers* applications for Administrative Driving Prohibitions. The change applies only to IRP reviews and the policy for not allowing late applications for 24 hr prohibition reviews continues.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss or have any questions or concerns regarding this policy change.

Thanks

Kathryn

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: s.17
Assistant - Anita Wilkinson: (250) 356-8640



RoadSafetyBC

This communication (both message and any attachment) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or email.

This email and any attachments are intended only for the named recipient and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized copying, dissemination or other use by a person other than the named recipient of this communication is prohibited. If you received this in error or are not named as a recipient, please notify the sender and destroy all copies of this email immediately.

Insurance Corporation of British Columbia | 151 W. Esplanade | North Vancouver | V7M 3H9
[Contact Us](#)

Pages 163 through 185 redacted for the following reasons:

s.13, s.14

s.14

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2014 11:22 AM
To: Murray, Melanie JAG:EX; Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Subject: Segers

Segers notice now live on our website - <http://www.pssg.gov.bc.ca/osmv/> (top of the homepage)

GCPE has Issue Note and Q&A's.

ICBC and RoadSafetyBC Clients Services & Appeals Registry both notified and given messaging.

Letters to law firms to go Monday.

Steve

Steven Roberts
Director, Stakeholder Relations
RoadSafetyBC
Ministry of Justice
Tel. 250-953-8688



RoadSafetyBC

Follow us on Twitter @RoadSafetyBC (<http://twitter.com/roadsafetybc>)

Watch us on You Tube at RoadSafetyBCGov (www.youtube.com/RoadSafetyBCGov)

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2014 9:30 AM
To: Small, Dianne H JAG:EX; Handgraaf, Harjeet JAG:EX
Cc: Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Subject: Segers change

Not sure if you've received this from Kathryn, but here are the latest messages for the changes being made to Segers. Notice will go up on our website today, letters going to frequent law office clients next week, messages has also been sent to ICBC. We will be processing applications received prior to the effective date of the change. Please use the below messages for any calls/questions.

Messages for Client Services & Appeals Registry

- As of January 12, 2015, RoadSafetyBC will not be accepting any late (Segers) applications for Immediate Roadside Prohibition (IRP) reviews.
- Under the Motor Vehicle Act, a driver who gets an IRP has seven days from the date of their prohibition to apply for an administrative review.
- This change does not affect the IRP review process that the court recently found to be constitutional.
- Drivers who miss the seven-day deadline continue to have access to a judicial review of their IRP in BC Supreme Court.
- This policy change does not affect the process surrounding Segers applications for Administrative Driving Prohibitions.

Steve

Steven Roberts
Director, Stakeholder Relations
RoadSafetyBC
Ministry of Justice
Tel. 250-953-8688



Follow us on Twitter @RoadSafetyBC (<http://twitter.com/roadsafetybc>)
Watch us on You Tube at RoadSafetyBCGov (www.youtube.com/RoadSafetyBCGov)

Pages 188 through 218 redacted for the following reasons:

s.13

s.14

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2014 3:48 PM
To: Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Cc: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: FW: Segers

Shelly,
Corey is going to have David begin to draft up next steps for discussion on my return.
Thanks
Kathryn

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent
Office of the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: s.17
Assistant - Anita Wilkinson: (250) 356-8640

This communication (both message and any attachment) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or email.

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2014 3:36 PM
To: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Cc: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: Segers

Hi Kathryn,

As promised, I spoke with Sam this afternoon about this issue and he is good to move forward with the policy change now and follow up with legislative amendments. Happy to discuss in further detail if you'd like.

Safe travels!

CB

Corey Bowness
A/Director, Policy and Strategic Initiatives Branch
Ministry of Justice
Ph: s.17
Cell: s.17
Fx: 250-356-5568



RoadSafetyBC

Pages 220 through 291 redacted for the following reasons:

, s.13, s.14, s.22
, s.14, s.22
s.14
s.14, s.16
s.14, s.16, s.22
s.14, s.22

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX
Sent: Friday, June 6, 2014 3:02 PM
To: JAG OSMV 940 Blanshard Immed Roadside Prohibition 90 day; JAG OSMV 940 Blanshard Immed Roadside Prohibition 30 day; Caldwell, Arlene M JAG:EX; Turner, Kimberley JAG:EX
Cc: Esposito, Tony JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX; Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: Legal Opinion Request - IRP - s.22 s.14
s.14
Attachments: Legal Opinion Request - IRP - s.22 s.14
s.14

Please find attached a legal opinion for Segers applications with respect to s.22

Kathy

Pages 293 through 314 redacted for the following reasons:

, s.13, s.14

s.14

Messages for Client Services/Appeals Registry/ICBC

- As of January 12, 2015, RoadSafetyBC will not be accepting any late (Segers) applications for Immediate Roadside Prohibition (IRP) reviews.
- Under the Motor Vehicle Act, a driver who gets an IRP has seven days from the date of their prohibition to apply for an administrative review.
- This change does not affect the IRP review process that the court recently found to be constitutional.
- Drivers who miss the seven-day deadline continue to have access to a judicial review of their IRP in BC Supreme Court.

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Sent: Thursday, December 11, 2014 3:57 PM
To: XT:Vanhelvoirt, Joy; ICBC MTIC:IN
Cc: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Subject: RoadSafetyBC Policy Change - IRP Late Applications
Attachments: Segers Messages for Staff.docx

Joy,

As you know, we have been making changes to operational processes at RoadSafetyBC. I'm writing to let you know about one of these changes in relation to Immediate Roadside Prohibition (IRP) reviews that will have some impact on ICBC staff.

As of January 12, 2015, RoadSafetyBC will no longer be accepting late applications, commonly known as *Segers* applications, from drivers who miss the 7-day deadline to apply for their IRP review as the *Motor Vehicle Act*. Our legal advice is

s.14

s.14

As of January 12, ICBC staff should no longer issue, to drivers who have missed the 7-day deadline, the current fact sheet that outlines the *Segers* application process. Attached to this note is the messaging that we are providing to our Client Service and Appeals Registry staff to assist in advising callers of this policy change after Jan. 12, 2015.

This policy change does not affect the process surrounding *Segers* applications for Administrative Driving Prohibitions. The change applies only to IRP reviews and the policy for not allowing late applications for 24 hr prohibition reviews continues.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss or have any questions or concerns regarding this policy change.

Thanks
Kathryn

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: s.17
Assistant - Anita Wilkinson: (250) 356-8640



RoadSafetyBC

This communication (both message and any attachment) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or email.

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2014 9:12 AM
To: Murray, Melanie JAG:EX
Subject: FYI IRP Policy change

Melanie,

FYI – the effective date for the IRP policy change with respect to late applications will be Jan 12. We were simply unable to get all of the requisite steps completed any earlier – the materials will go up on the web-site today and the letters will go out to the law firms today as well.

Thanks again for all of your help with this,
Kathryn

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: [s.17](#)
Assistant: (250) 356-8640



RoadSafetyBC

This communication (both the message and any attachments) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying, or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or by email.

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2014 11:22 AM
To: Murray, Melanie JAG:EX; Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Subject: Segers

Segers notice now live on our website - <http://www.pssg.gov.bc.ca/osmv/> (top of the homepage)

GCPE has Issue Note and Q&A's.

ICBC and RoadSafetyBC Clients Services & Appeals Registry both notified and given messaging.

Letters to law firms to go Monday.

Steve

Steven Roberts
Director, Stakeholder Relations
RoadSafetyBC
Ministry of Justice
Tel. 250-953-8688



RoadSafetyBC

Follow us on Twitter @RoadSafetyBC (<http://twitter.com/roadsafetybc>)

Watch us on You Tube at RoadSafetyBCGov (www.youtube.com/RoadSafetyBCGov)

Pages 319 through 355 redacted for the following reasons:

s.12, s.13, s.14

s.3

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2014 11:54 AM
To: Steinmetz, Susanne K JAG:EX
Cc: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Segers limit
Attachments: FW s.14 : Segers - case.pdf; s.22 case.pdf

I've attached the Segers case, the s.22 case, and our legal advice.

See paragraph 11 in the Segers case to address your question.

Kathy Anderson

From: Steinmetz, Susanne K JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:21 AM
To: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX
Subject: Segers limit

Hi Kathy,

I was looking at the Seger's procedures in the Appeal Registry folder and the introductions says "The Supreme Court of BC has said the OSMV has a jurisdiction to extend this time limit." Do you know where this decision / court opinion is located?

Thanks,
Susie

Susie Steinmetz

Policy Analyst, Policy and Strategic Initiatives Branch
RoadSafetyBC
Ministry of Justice
250-356-6301



RoadSafetyBC

Pages 357 through 368 redacted for the following reasons:

s.12, s.13, s.14

s.14

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2014 3:39 PM
To: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Cc: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Segers

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Sounds like a plan!

David – can you pull together a draft “next steps” for discussion with Shelly?

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2014 3:38 PM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Cc: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Segers

Wonderful. I think legal counsel mapped out, at least to some degree, next steps in their opinion and Sept. 17 discussion paper. If you are able to work with Shelly to set out in summary form what those next steps are and who will be responsible for each, we could perhaps meet next week to start to move this forward? What do you think?

Thanks so much for this,
Kathryn

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent
Office of the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: s.17
Assistant - Anita Wilkinson: (250) 356-8640

This communication (both message and any attachment) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or email.

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2014 3:36 PM
To: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Cc: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: Segers

Hi Kathryn,

As promised, I spoke with Sam this afternoon about this issue and he is good to move forward with the policy change now and follow up with legislative amendments. Happy to discuss in further detail if you'd like.

Safe travels!

CB

Corey Bowness

A/Director, Policy and Strategic Initiatives Branch
Ministry of Justice

Ph: s.17

Cell: s.17

Fx: 250-356-5568



RoadSafetyBC

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2014 1:17 PM
To: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Urgent ?

You're aces.

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2014 1:17 PM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Urgent ?

I already had this number which I gave to Glen just a couple weeks ago, so no worries. And by the way I didn't mention it below, but I had checked the past 2 years' worth of data.

Kathy Anderson

-----Original Message-----

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2014 1:15 PM
To: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Urgent ?

Thanks for your help!!! I owe you big!

-----Original Message-----

From: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2014 10:00 AM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Urgent ?

When I checked our data last month it appeared that we were receiving approximately 15 files per month on average.

Kathy Anderson

-----Original Message-----

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2014 9:56 AM
To: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Subject: Urgent ?

How many segers apps do we get per month?

Pages 372 through 383 redacted for the following reasons:

s.12, s.13, s.14

s.14

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Thursday, June 5, 2014 1:08 PM
To: Anness, Glenn JAG:EX; Moran, Deidre JAG:EX
Subject: RE: RFLs and Legislative Proposals

Yes, and s.13 go under the "legislation" section of an RFL.

Corey Bowness

Sr. Policy Advisor, Policy and Strategic Initiatives Branch

Ministry of Justice

Ph: s.17

Fx: 250-356-5568



RoadSafetyBC

From: Anness, Glenn JAG:EX
Sent: Thursday, June 5, 2014 12:30 PM
To: Moran, Deidre JAG:EX
Cc: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: RE: RFLs and Legislative Proposals

s.13

I believe Corey was going to touch base with you or Debra today.

G

From: Moran, Deidre JAG:EX
Sent: Thursday, June 5, 2014 12:12 PM
To: Anness, Glenn JAG:EX
Subject: RE: RFLs and Legislative Proposals

Glenn, the RFL will have

s.13

s.13

Deidre Moran, CPA, CGA

Director, Finance

Ministry of Justice

Corporate Management Services

Phone: 250-953-3758 Mobile: 250-507-1298

Fax: 250-356-5577 <mailto:deidre.moran@gov.bc.ca>



RoadSafetyBC

From: Anness, Glenn JAG:EX

Sent: Tuesday, June 3, 2014 10:05 AM

To: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX; Campbell, Darrion JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX

Cc: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX; Moran, Deidre JAG:EX

Subject: RFLs and Legislative Proposals

Just a quick update on the RFLs and Legislative Proposals. Further to the BN signed by the DSG (sent out by Cathy last week), the breakdown of legislative proposals are:

s.12

s.12

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Glenn Anness
Director, Policy and Strategic Initiatives Branch
RoadSafetyBC
Ministry of Justice
Telephone: s.17
Email: Glenn.Anness@gov.bc.ca

Pages 387 through 415 redacted for the following reasons:

s.12, s.14

s.14

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2014 11:06 AM
To: Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX
Subject: Segers

Importance: High

Shelly, after we spoke last week on this, Melanie has come back further

s.13, s.14

s.13, s.14

Corey Bowness

A/Director, Policy and Strategic Initiatives Branch
Ministry of Justice

Ph: s.17

Cell: s.17

Fx: 250-356-5568



RoadSafetyBC

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2014 3:36 PM
To: MacLeod, Sam JAG:EX
Cc: LeBlanc, Catherine JAG:EX; Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX
Subject: RE: IRP Legislation (Phases 1 & 2) Key Dates

Sure Sam. Here are the items.

s.13

s.13 I'll be sending you complete
recommendations with rationale once I get the program areas to fully weigh in on a couple of the items this week.

s.12

s.12

From: MacLeod, Sam JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2014 2:15 PM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: FW: IRP Legislation (Phases 1 & 2) Key Dates

Corey

Could I get a brief overview again of each of the issues we are addressing – I think we have that, please don't go to any extra work.

Sam

Sam MacLeod
Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
RoadSafetyBC
Ministry of Justice
Ph 250-387-5692 or 250-882-2347 (cell)



From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX

Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2014 2:11 PM

To: MacLeod, Sam JAG:EX; Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX; O'Neill, Robert JAG:EX; Burchnall, Shelly K JAG:EX; Campbell, Darrion JAG:EX; Roberts, Steven JAG:EX; Coburn, David JAG:EX; Steinmetz, Susanne K JAG:EX; Webber, Scott JAG:EX; Barnes, Natalie JAG:EX; Leavitt, Darlene JAG:EX; Martorana, Silvia J JAG:EX; Murray, Melanie JAG:EX

Cc: LeBlanc, Catherine JAG:EX; Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

Subject: IRP Legislation (Phases 1 & 2) Key Dates

FYI – please forward to anyone I may have missed.

From: Klima, Judy H JAG:EX

Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2014 2:01 PM

To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX

Subject: RE: New date for CCST

Hi Corey – I just got this from cab ops. Good timing and good to keep confirming with each other!!

I think this is what we had on our radar...

JAG	LRC Nov 4	MVA (IRP phase 1) RFL	Oct 24	
JAG	CCST Nov 5	MVA (IRP phase 2) RFL	Draft: Oct 22 Final: Oct 29	

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2014 3:22 PM
To: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: FW: Consultation Tracking Document October 7, 2014.docx
Attachments: Consultation Tracking Document October 7, 2014.docx

Hey - Have you made any edits to this since the 7th? Just going to send some items for ICBC review (in addition to the monetary one I just sent out).

From: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, October 7, 2014 10:56 AM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: Consultation Tracking Document October 7, 2014.docx

Here is the consultation document outlining who we thought should be consulted and on which items. Still a lot of blanks to fill in (e.g., some contact info, feedback summary, status, etc.).

Did you want me to fill in all the blanks before it goes out to Judy?

Pages 421 through 422 redacted for the following reasons:

s.12
s.14, s.16

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2014 3:49 PM
To: Roberts, Steven JAG:EX
Cc: Smith, Curtis M JAG:EX; Coburn, David JAG:EX; Steinmetz, Susanne K JAG:EX
Subject: FOR REVIEW: 503642 - MOTI and ICBC Phase 2 RFL Consultation Items
Attachments: 503642 - MOTI and ICBC Phase 2 RFL Consultation Items.docx

Hey Steve – Would you or Curtis be able to scan this for sensitive issues before I share it with ICBC/MOTI? Not a huge rush but I'd like to get it put to bed mid-week.

Thanks, and happy thanksgiving to everyone. Enjoy your weekend!

Corey

Pages 424 through 425 redacted for the following reasons:

s.12, s.13

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2014 8:38 AM
To: Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX
Subject: FW: RFL Docs
Attachments: 503642 - Fall 2015 RFL (Oct 10, 2014).docx; 503642 - Fall 2015 RFL D - Drafting Instructions (Oct 10, 2014).docx

Here you go.

From: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2014 8:36 AM
To: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Cc: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: RE: RFL Docs

Good morning Kathryn!

Here are the latest versions of the RFL and Drafting Instructions for this morning's meeting.

David Coburn
Policy Analyst (250) 356-8070
RoadSafetyBC
Ministry of Justice



RoadSafetyBC



Please consider the environment
before printing this email.

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2014 8:34 AM
To: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Cc: Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX; Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: RE: RFL Docs

Sure thing Kathryn. The plan was to walk them in.

David – can you flip Kathryn the RFL documents?

From: Chapman, Kathryn JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2014 8:32 AM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Cc: Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX
Subject: RFL Docs

Corey

I'm not sure that I have the latest drafts of the RFL docs – last version I have is from Sept. 5. If there are more current versions, could you please send me an electronic version and bring a paper copy for me to this morning's meeting. The ferry is quite late this morning, so I may arrive just in time for our RFL meeting.

Thanks

Kathryn

Kathryn Chapman
Deputy Superintendent of Motor Vehicles
Ministry of Justice
Phone: s.17
Assistant: (250) 356-8640



RoadSafetyBC

This communication (both the message and any attachments) is confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any distribution, copying, or other use by anyone else is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy the email message and any attachments immediately and notify me by telephone or by email.

Pages 428 through 478 redacted for the following reasons:

s.12, s.13, s.14

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 3:20 PM
To: 'Anness, Glenn'
Subject: RE: Segers Applications

Hey Glenn – I've asked Kathy to connect with you on this. She should be able to provide what you need!

From: Anness, Glenn [<mailto:Glenn.Anness@icbc.com>]
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 1:51 PM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Segers Applications

Thanks Corey – any sense of volumes? Both those applied for, and the percentage that may eventually need an IRP or ADP to be overturned?

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX [<mailto:Corey.Bowness@gov.bc.ca>]
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 1:05 PM
To: Anness, Glenn
Subject: Segers Applications

Hi Glenn – I'm advised that these may make their way to us through ICBC points of service.

Cheers,

CB

Corey Bowness
A/Director, Policy and Strategic Initiatives Branch
Ministry of Justice
Ph: s.17
Cell: s.17
Fx: 250-356-5568



RoadSafetyBC

This email and any attachments are intended only for the named recipient and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized copying, dissemination or other use by a person other than the named recipient of this communication is prohibited. If you received this in error or are not named as a recipient, please notify the sender and destroy all copies of this email immediately.

Insurance Corporation of British Columbia | 151 W. Esplanade | North Vancouver | V7M 3H9
[Contact Us](#)

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 3:14 PM
To: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Segers Applications

Oh, sorry. He's just asking because I sent them our legislative amendment proposals for consultation. Nixing the *Segers* was part of that package.

From: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 2:09 PM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Segers Applications

Sure Corey. What's the background on this? Are we just updating Glenn with current volumes? Just want to be sure I'm keeping it in the correct realm of information sharing.

Kathy Anderson

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 1:52 PM
To: Anderson, Kathy E JAG:EX
Subject: FW: Segers Applications

Hi Kathy – can you help with Glenn's question about *Segers* applications?

From: Anness, Glenn [<mailto:Glenn.Anness@icbc.com>]
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 1:51 PM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: RE: Segers Applications

Thanks Corey – any sense of volumes? Both those applied for, and the percentage that may eventually need an IRP or ADP to be overturned?

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX [<mailto:Corey.Bowness@gov.bc.ca>]
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 1:05 PM
To: Anness, Glenn
Subject: Segers Applications

Hi Glenn – I'm advised that these may make their way to us through ICBC points of service.

Cheers,

CB

Corey Bowness
A/Director, Policy and Strategic Initiatives Branch
Ministry of Justice
Ph: [s.17](tel:604-263-1171)

Cell: s.17
Fx: 250-356-5568



RoadSafetyBC

This email and any attachments are intended only for the named recipient and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized copying, dissemination or other use by a person other than the named recipient of this communication is prohibited. If you received this in error or are not named as a recipient, please notify the sender and destroy all copies of this email immediately.

Insurance Corporation of British Columbia | 151 W. Esplanade | North Vancouver | V7M 3H9
[Contact Us](#)

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2014 12:33 PM
To: Coburn, David JAG:EX
Subject: FW: Appendix B - Treasury Board Staff Comments.dotx
Attachments: Appendix B - Treasury Board Staff Comments.dotx; ATT00001.htm

Hey – looks like you sent this to my personal email.

Doc looks good – just need to change my number to s.17

Thanks!

From: Corey Bowness [[mailto:](#) s.22]
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2014 12:30 PM
To: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: Fwd: Appendix B - Treasury Board Staff Comments.dotx

Corey

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Coburn, David JAG:EX" <David.Coburn@gov.bc.ca>
Date: 20 October, 2014 12:24:13 PM PDT
To: "Corey Bowness" s.22
Subject: Appendix B - Treasury Board Staff Comments.dotx

Hey for review. I added the RFL summary and section information into the TBS Comments form for David. Can you have a look and provide feedback or approve? I told him I could get it back to him this afternoon.

Also, thanks for putting up with all my crap and annoying questions! Haha!

Pages 483 through 486 redacted for the following reasons:

s.12, s.13, s.14

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, December 2, 2014 1:44 PM
To: Kirby, Katherine JAG:EX
Subject: FW: Legislation

Hi Kathy – here is the information I provided to Robert on this. I just think we'll need to get LSB on the same page to alleviate Kathryn and Shelly's concerns on item 4.

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, December 1, 2014 5:34 PM
To: O'Neill, Robert JAG:EX
Subject: Legislation

Hi Robert,

As promised, here is an update after my meeting with Kathryn.

We had discussed s.13 which we're seeking some legal clarification around.

1)

2)

3)

s.13

4)

Next step for me is to clarify item 4, then get a decision from Sam on all items.

Corey Bowness
Senior Policy Advisor
Ministry of Justice
Ph: 250-356-5952
Cell: s.17
Fx: 250-356-5568



RoadSafetyBC

Wilkinson, Anita JAG:EX

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Monday, December 8, 2014 10:53 AM
To: Moran, Deidre JAG:EX
Subject: FW: FOR REVIEW: 503642 - MOTI and ICBC Phase 2 RFL Consultation Items
Attachments: 503642 - MOTI and ICBC Phase 2 RFL Consultation Items_ICBC comments Oct 28 2014.docx

Importance: High

FYI Deidre – for our meeting tomorrow.

From: Termuende, Rob [<mailto:Rob.Termuende@icbc.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 3, 2014 4:09 PM
To: XT:Kaila, Nirmal ICBC:IN; Anness, Glenn; Laupland, Lisa; Gormican, Doug
Cc: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Subject: FW: FOR REVIEW: 503642 - MOTI and ICBC Phase 2 RFL Consultation Items
Importance: High

Good afternoon,

As discussed, on December 9th at 1 pm, Corey Bowness of RoadSafetyBC will be discussing with ICBC and MOTI the specifics in their proposed legislation (see attached for topics/sections). Please confirm that you are able to make this meeting and if you will be able to attend in person or plan to call in. Prior to the meeting, ICBC staff will need to complete confidentially undertakings.

For those in Vancouver that will be attending by phone, please let me know so can make arrangements so you are able to view the proposed legislation.

Thanks
Rob.

From: Termuende, Rob
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 9:37 AM
To: Bowness, Corey SG:EX (Corey.Bowness@gov.bc.ca)
Cc: Atherton, Jerome; Anness, Glenn; Laupland, Lisa; Van Helvoirt, Joy; andrea.mercer@gov.bc.ca
Subject: FOR REVIEW: 503642 - MOTI and ICBC Phase 2 RFL Consultation Items
Importance: High

Good morning Corey,

As we discussed, please find attached ICBC's comments on the proposed legislative items. If you need any additional information or require any clarification, please don't hesitate to give me a call.

Best regards,
Rob.

From: Bowness, Corey JAG:EX
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2014 9:05 AM
To: Mercer, Andrea TRAN:EX

Subject: FOR REVIEW: 503642 - MOTI and ICBC Phase 2 RFL Consultation Items

Importance: High

Hi Andrea,

Please find attached a consultation document outlining the legislative items we're moving forward on for spring 2015. These items affect both ICBC and MOTI.

Please advise if you would like me to share directly with ICBC or if you would like to manage communications with them.

Can we have comments by Friday Oct 24?

Thanks!

Corey

Corey Bowness

A/Director, Policy and Strategic Initiatives Branch

Ministry of Justice

Ph: s.17

Cell: s.17

Fx: 250-356-5568



RoadSafetyBC

This email and any attachments are intended only for the named recipient and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized copying, dissemination or other use by a person other than the named recipient of this communication is prohibited. If you received this in error or are not named as a recipient, please notify the sender and destroy all copies of this email immediately.

Insurance Corporation of British Columbia | 151 W. Esplanade | North Vancouver | V7M 3H9
[Contact Us](#)

Pages 490 through 625 redacted for the following reasons:

s.12, s.13, s.14

s.13

s.13, s.14

s.14