



Office of the  
Saskatchewan Information  
and Privacy Commissioner

## **REVIEW REPORT 064-2016 to 076-2016**

### **Ministry of Highways and Infrastructure**

**January 5, 2017**

#### **Summary:**

The Ministry of Highways and Infrastructure (Highways) provided the Applicant with a single estimate of costs in the amount of \$69,645.00 to process 13 access to information requests. The Commissioner found Highways inappropriately provided one estimate of costs to respond to the 13 access to information requests and should have contacted the Applicant to attempt to narrow the scope of the requests prior to issuing the estimate of costs. The Commissioner also found the \$66,160.00 portion of the estimate of costs to be inappropriate as it was not calculated pursuant to subsection 6(2) of *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Regulations*. The Commissioner recommended that Highways ensure it has written processes in place to properly address estimates of cost. The Commissioner also recommended that Highways establish procedures that complement the *Guidelines for Government Communications During a General Election* to ensure access to information requests are handled in the routine manner during the Writ period.

#### **I BACKGROUND**

- [1] The Applicant, a journalist, submitted 14 access to information requests pursuant to *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (FOIP) to the Ministry of Highways and Infrastructure (Highways) on March 8, 2016. Each of these requests were submitted on the prescribed Access to Information Request Form - Form A in Part II of *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Regulations* (FOIP Regulations). Upon receipt of the access to information requests, Highways realized there was a duplicate request, therefore the total number of requests was 13:

*Access to information request #1 (Review file 064-2016)*

Please provide all correspondence related to [Name] and comments he made in CBC stories about land transactions along the West Regina Bypass near the GTH from February 1, 2016 until March 5, 2016 – including any correspondence with [Name].

*Access to information request #2 (Review file 065-2016)*

Please provide all internal and external correspondence related to [Name] and/or a CBC reporter and/or the CBC regarding stories about GTH land transactions along the West Regina Bypass and/or [Minister] from February 3, 2016 until March 5, 2016.

*Access to information request #3 (Review file 066-2016)*

Please provide all correspondence related to [Name] and comments he made in CBC stories about land transactions along the West Regina Bypass near the GTH from February 3, 2016 until March 5, 2016 – including any correspondence with [Name].

*Access to information request #4 (Review file 067-2016)*

Please provide all correspondence, including attachments, between the Ministry and [Name], [Name] and/or their numbered company 101225232 Saskatchewan Ltd. from February 1, 2013 until June 30, 2014.

*Access to information request #5 (Review file 068-2016)*

Please provide all internal and external correspondence related to [Name] and/or a CBC reporter and/or the CBC regarding stories about GTH land transactions along the West Regina Bypass and/or [Minister] from December 1, 2015 until February 3, 2016.

*Access to information request #6 (Review file 069-2016)*

Please provide all internal correspondence/documentation related to the Ministry's potential interest or actual interest in purchasing Surface Parcel 165025414 (NW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) and/or Surface Parcel 166005862 (SW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) from 101225232 Saskatchewan Ltd. between February 1, 2013 until April 30, 2014.

*Access to information request #7 (Review file 070-2016)*

Please provide all external correspondence/documentation related to the Ministry's potential interest or actual interest in purchasing Surface Parcel 165025414 (NW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) and/or Surface Parcel 166005862 (SW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) from 101225232 Saskatchewan Ltd. between February 1, 2013 until April 30, 2014.

*Access to information request #8 (Review file 071-2016)*

Please provide all internal correspondence/documentation related to Surface Parcel 165025414 (NW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) and or Surface Parcel 166005862 (SW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) from February 1, 2013 until April 30, 2014.

*Access to information request #9 (Review file 072-2016)*

Please provide all external correspondence/documentation related to Surface Parcel 165025414 (NW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) and or Surface Parcel 166005862 (SW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) from February 1, 2013 until April 30, 2014.

*Access to information request #10 (Review file 073-2016)*

Please provide all records (emails, reports, briefing notes etc.) related to a land sale agreement between the Global Transportation Hub and the Ministry of Highways – related to Surface Parcel 165025414 (NW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) and or Surface Parcel 166005862 (SW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) signed in March 2014 – including but not limited to drafts, emails, briefing notes etc. from July 1, 2013 until June 30, 2014.

*Access to information request #11 (Review file 074-2016)*

Please provide all correspondence with the Ministry of Economy and/or the Global Transportation Hub Authority related to Surface Parcel 165025414 (NW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) and/or Surface Parcel 166005862 (SW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) excluding any discussion of a land sale agreement between the entities involving this land from July 1, 2013 until June 30, 2014.

*Access to information request #12 (Review file 075-2016)*

Please provide all records related to any and all appraisals of Surface Parcel 165025414 (NW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) and or Surface Parcel 166005862 (SW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) from January 1, 2013 until April 30, 2014.

*Access to information request #13 (Review file 076-2016)*

Please provide all correspondence related to an appraisal of Surface Parcel 16502514 (NW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) and/or Surface Parcel 166005862 (SW 20-17-20 W2 Ext 1) provided to the Global Transportation Hub and/or Ministry of Economy by [Name], [Name] and/or their numbered company 101225232 Saskatchewan Ltd. from March 1, 2013 until March 31, 2014.

- [2] On April 4, 2016, Highways provided the Applicant with a single estimate of costs in the amount of \$69,645.00 to process all 13 requests.
- [3] On April 20, 2016, my office received a Request for Review from the Applicant, in which he disagreed with the \$69,645.00 estimate of costs and that Highways provided one estimate of costs to respond to the 13 requests.
- [4] Upon receipt of the Requests for Review, it was agreed that my office would work with Highways and the Applicant to narrow the scope of the 13 requests in an attempt to reduce the costs.

[5] On May 27, 2016, my office provided Highways with an email outlining the narrowed scope of each request as agreed to by the Applicant. By letter dated June 22, 2016, Highways provided the Applicant with a revised estimate of costs based on the narrowed scope of the requests. This estimate of costs was itemized to show the cost per request. There were additional communications with Highways and the Applicant and by letter dated July 15, 2016, Highways provided the Applicant with a second amended estimate of costs. On July 20, 2016, the Applicant provided Highways with a deposit to proceed with six of the 13 requests. Highways has now responded to those requests.

[6] On June 15 and 16, 2016, my office provided notification to Highways and the Applicant of our intention to conduct the 13 reviews. My office requested Highways provide a submission in support of the \$69,645.00 estimate of costs and its decision to provide the Applicant with one estimate of costs to process the 13 access to information requests. The Applicant was also invited to provide a submission.

[7] On August 26, 2016, the Applicant narrowed the scope of these reviews to the issues of the combined estimate of costs and the estimated fee related to the time to search and retrieve electronic records by the Information Technology Office pursuant to subsection 6(3) of the FOIP Regulations. This portion of the estimate of costs was approximately 95% of the total estimate of costs - \$66,100.00.

## **II RECORDS AT ISSUE**

[8] This review is of the estimate of costs provided by Highways to the Applicant. Therefore, no records are at issue.

## **III DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES**

[9] Highways is a “government institution” as defined by subsection 2(1)(d)(i) of FOIP.

**1. Did Highways appropriately issue one estimate of costs to process the 13 access to information requests?**

[10] Section 5 of FOIP provides the right of access to records in the possession or under the control of a government institution:

**5** Subject to this Act and the regulations, every person has a right to and, on an application made in accordance with this Part, shall be permitted access to records that are in the possession or under the control of a government institution.

[11] Subsection 6(1) of FOIP outlines the requirements for an applicant when requesting access to records under FOIP. Subsection 6(1) of FOIP provides:

**6(1)** An applicant shall:

(a) make the application in the prescribed form to the government institution in which the record containing the information is kept; and

(b) specify the subject matter of the record requested with sufficient particularity as to time, place and event to enable an individual familiar with the subject matter to identify the record.

[12] The Applicant submitted 13 separate access to information requests each on the prescribed form to Highways on March 8, 2016. In the Applicant's submission, which he submitted jointly for similar reviews with the Global Transportation Hub Authority (see Review Report 078-2016 to 091-2016), he asserts:

The Agencies should have provided an estimate for each request. The Agencies should have worked with me from the outset to narrow the requests. The fact that they didn't meant delays in the public's access to documents that should be public....

[13] Highways outlined in its submission to my office that they used the "common sense approach" when they received these requests:

The Ministry of Highways and Infrastructure (ministry) submits that the record requested in this application [IPC file 064-2016] has a common subject matter common with twelve (12) other access requests submitted by the applicant on March 8, 2016, and looked to apply a common sense approach to best serve the applicant and reduce disruption within the ministry.

- [14] As outlined in section 5, FOIP provides a right of access to records in the possession or under the control of a government institution. In section 5 of FOIP, “application” is singular not plural. The right of access is triggered when a person makes a formal application for the records they wish to access.
- [15] Provisions exist within FOIP to clarify an access to information request when it is unclear what an applicant is requesting. In addition, our office encourages public bodies to work with applicants to narrow the scope of requests in order to reduce work and fees.
- [16] Currently, FOIP does not specifically state that there is a duty to assist applicants. Nonetheless, my office has taken the position that there is an implied duty on the part of government institutions to take reasonable steps to ensure that they respond to access to information requests openly, accurately and completely. Highways did not meet this implied duty when it provided the Applicant with the single estimate of costs.
- [17] Bill 30, which has received second reading by the Legislative Assembly, introduces a duty to assist. Bill 30, section 5 introduces a new section 5.1 which provides as follows:
- 5.1(1)** Subject to this Act and the regulations, a government institution shall respond to a written request for access openly, accurately and completely.
- (2) On the request of an applicant, the government institution shall:
- (a) provide an explanation of any term, code or abbreviation used in the information; or
- (b) if the government institution is unable to provide an explanation in accordance with clause (a), endeavour to refer the applicant to a government institution that is able to provide an explanation.
- [18] Based on the above, I would encourage all access and privacy offices when they receive an access request to make contact with the Applicant and offer to assist the Applicant to clarify or narrow the access request. If clarification or narrowing occurs, the access and privacy officer should follow up with a confirmation letter or email to the Applicant summarizing the agreed upon clarification or narrowing.

[19] My office's resource *IPC Guide to Exemptions for FOIP and LA FOIP*, outlines the following seven steps when a public body is considering charging fees:

1. Clarify or narrow the access request with the applicant;
2. Make a search strategy;
3. Based on the search strategy, prepare a fee estimate (do not complete search);
4. Decide whether to charge a fee (refer to your public body's policy);
5. Send out fee estimate and suspend work;
6. If the applicant initiates, clarify or narrow request with applicant; and
7. When the applicant pays 50% deposit, start search.

[20] The first step is to clarify or narrow the access request with the Applicant. There should be conversations with the Applicant well in advance to see if there are ways to narrow the scope in order to reduce or eliminate costs, especially when a government institution is considering such a large estimate of work and costs.

[21] Highways indicated it used a common sense approach when determining how to calculate the estimate of costs. However, in a review of the details of the specific access to information requests, several requests appeared to be very specific and for short, recent timeframes (see access to information requests #1, 2, 3 and 5).

[22] In determining a strategy to respond to these requests within the 30 day legislated timeframe, Highways should have first identified those requests that the responsive records were easily identified and that could be responded to at little or no cost to the Applicant. Then, Highways should have contacted the Applicant to discuss the remaining requests to see if there was a way to narrow the scope of the requests and identify to the Applicant where there was overlap in his requests.

[23] In its submission, Highways also advised there were extenuating circumstances surrounding the timing of when the Applicant filed the access to information requests. In its submission, Highways advised:

The general provincial election was called on March 8, 2016. As with any general election, there are restrictions placed on government officials respecting who they can speak to and what they can speak about. The *Guidelines for Government Communications Activities During a General Election* provide that *Freedom of*

*Information requests are to be handled in the routine manner. However, the guidelines also instruct that “during the 90 days before the commencement of the election period, no government ministry/official shall advertise or speak to in any manner any information other than information that is intended to inform the public about programs and services of the government ministry for the broad public benefit of Saskatchewan people, e.g. to address an emergency or compelling public safety concern.”*

The ministry submits that responding...is neither an emergency or public safety concern.

The ministry submits s. 277(1)(2) of *The Elections Act* is unambiguous;

**No publication of information during an election**

**277** (1) In this section and in sections 277.1 and 277.2, “**government ministry**” means any ministry of the Government of Saskatchewan and includes any government institution as defined in *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

(2) During a general election, no government ministry shall **publish** in any manner any information with respect to the activities of the ministry. [emphasis added].

[24] I have reviewed the *Guidelines for Government Communications Activities During a General Election* (Guidelines) and the above is accurate. However, as Highways also noted in its’ submission, the Guidelines have a section that addresses freedom of information requests. This section has a distinct heading *Freedom of Information (FOI) Requests*, which states:

Freedom of Information requests are to be handled in the routine manner.

[25] The Guidelines have not distinguished a separate protocol for freedom of information requests filed by the media. Further, FOIP does not speak to special handling of requests because of an election. Therefore, Highways should have handled these requests routinely.

[26] Discussing the requests with an applicant in order to narrow the scope cannot be interpreted as publishing information as provided in subsection 277(2) of *The Elections Act*, 1996, even if an Applicant is a member of the media. Further, providing an

applicant with copies of records pursuant to an access to information request during an election would not be “publishing” information as provided in subsection 227(2) of *The Elections Act, 1996*, even if an applicant is a member of the media. Also, as outlined above, the Guidelines clearly state that freedom of information requests are to be handled in the routine manner. There is nothing routine with providing a \$69,645.00 estimate of costs without first discussing the requests with the Applicant.

[27] Highways also advised in its submission:

During the Writ period, government/ministry officials are also under instruction that all media contact and messaging is to be through Communications officials.

[28] I recognize there is a heightened level of caution when a government institution is communicating during the Writ period and it may be appropriate for communications to be vetted through communications directors. Highways has a dedicated Communications Branch whose role, I assume, would include media communications. Therefore, an official within the Communications Branch could have handled any discussions with the Applicant in terms of clarifying the request, narrowing the scope and where appropriate, working with the Applicant to combine similar requests.

[29] Factoring in all considerations, I find Highways inappropriately issued one estimate of costs to respond to the Applicant. Further, I find Highways should have contacted the Applicant to discuss his requests prior to issuing the \$69,645.00 estimate of costs to attempt to narrow the scope of the requests.

**2. Is the fee related to search and retrieval of electronic records estimated by Highways reasonable?**

[30] Highways provided the Applicant with a total estimate of costs in the amount of \$69,645.00. This estimate included the three types of fees provided for in FOIP:

1. Fees for searching for a responsive record;
2. Fees for preparing the record for disclosure; and

3. Fees for the reproduction of records.

[31] During these reviews, the Applicant advised our office that he was primarily concerned with the fee Highways calculated for the Information Technology Office – query fee to search and retrieve electronic records. This made up \$66,100.00 of the total fee estimated by Highways. Therefore, I will only be looking at the calculation of that particular fee.

[32] Highways provided my office with an email dated April 5, 2016 from the Ministry of Central Services. This email broke down the \$66,100.00 quote as follows:

Breakdown for the quote of \$66,100

1034 users (pulled from the HI all users dist list)

50 Exchange dbs to restore per month

100 databases to restore for Exchange

100 hours for Exchange

80 hours to build an Exchange environment, ingest restores and search for .psts

180 hours estimated total for ISM to gather and restore data

500 hours estimated total for ITD to search each mailbox for key words

[33] Highways’ estimate of costs to the Applicant outlined that the \$66,100.00 was as follows:

Type of Fee	Staff	Calculation of Fees	Fees
Electronic records – time to search and retrieve	Information Technology Office – query	1034 computer accounts active within the ministry during time period specified.	\$66,100.00

[34] In its submission, Highways claimed subsection 6(3) of the FOIP Regulations was applicable. Subsection 6(3) of the FOIP Regulations provides:

**6(3)** Where a search and retrieval of electronic data is required to give access to a record requested by an applicant, a fee equal to the actual cost of the search and retrieval, including machinery and operator costs, is payable at the time when access is given.

[35] My office confirmed with Highways that the \$66,100.00 fee was to search 1034 active email accounts within Highways in order to respond to the following four out of 13 access to information requests:

*Access to information request #1 (Review file 064-2016)*

Please provide all correspondence related to [Name] and comments he made in CBC stories about land transactions along the West Regina Bypass near the GTH from **February 1, 2016 until March 5, 2016** – including any correspondence with [Name]. [emphasis added]

*Access to information request #2 (Review file 065-2016)*

Please provide all internal and external correspondence related to [Name] and/or a CBC reporter and/or the CBC regarding stories about GTH land transactions along the West Regina Bypass and/or [Minister] from **February 3, 2016 until March 5, 2016**. [emphasis added]

*Access to information request #3 (Review file 066-2016)*

Please provide all correspondence related to [Name] and comments he made in CBC stories about land transactions along the West Regina Bypass near the GTH from **February 3, 2016 until March 5, 2016** – including any correspondence with [Name]. [emphasis added]

*Access to information request #5 (Review file 068-2016)*

Please provide all internal and external correspondence related to [Name] and/or a CBC reporter and/or the CBC regarding stories about GTH land transactions along the West Regina Bypass and/or [Minister] from **December 1, 2015 until February 3, 2016**. [emphasis added]

[36] I note that the oldest date in the above four requests was December 1, 2015. This date occurred approximately three months earlier than the date Highways received the access to information requests (March 8, 2016).

[37] In its submission, Highways advised:

The decision by the ministry to utilize a central data search was based on three factors:

- 1) Disruption to the workplace. As stated in paragraph 22 above, given the profile of the issue, to capture “all comments” in the ministry would have required a request to individually search 1034 desktops [sic] computers across the ministry. This would have been highly disruptive. It is worth noting the use of Central Services/ITD to retrieve electronic information is a practice of the ministry given it’s highly disbursed workforce. As well,

today's Information Technology Division was first created within the ministry, thus the ministry is very familiar with the timeliness and effectiveness of a central data search.

- 2) Cost effectiveness. HI285/15G is one of four requests that seek records related to land transaction stories aired over the same five week period, only individual names were changed. All four requests could be captured by establishing the search parameters once and requesting a single search from ITD. Alternatively the ministry could manage the requests internally as separate request. Managed internally as separate requests – disruption aside – would potentially result in greater costs to the applicant and disruptive to the ministry. The ministry explained this to the applicant in an April 14, 2016 telephone conversation.
- 3) Thoroughness. In the opinion of the ministry, an ITD search would result in a greater number of responsive records located than a request to have staff across the ministry conduct an individual search.

[38] Further, Highways advised in its submission:

The records search with respect to electronic correspondence (email), and specifically “*all comments made.../CBC stories*” was to be undertaken by the Information Technology Division of the Ministry of Central Services. The rationale for this is the interest in land acquisition related to the Regina Bypass is significant across the ministry. Many computer workstations held the potential to have records related to the Regina Bypass and land speculators stories aired by CBC.

...

To request all staff to search their files for comments made or received with respect to Bypass land transactions in relation to several CBC stories would be both expensive for the applicant (approximately 1034 workstations @ 1 hour/search) and highly disruptive to the ministry.

[39] At the point Highways deemed a search of the email accounts of an entire Ministry necessary, it is critical that they first communicated with the Applicant to ensure he would want the entire Ministry searched.

[40] In addition, as these were active email accounts of current employees, FOIP already provides a fee for a search of records. Subsection 6(2) of the FOIP Regulations provides:

6(2) Where time in excess of two hours is spent in searching for a record requested by an applicant or in preparing it for disclosure, a fee of \$15 for each half-hour or portion of a half-hour of that excess time is payable at the time when access is given.

[41] Subsection 6(3) of the FOIP Regulations, which was claimed by Highways in relation to the \$66,100.00 fee, provides, in part, “*Where a search and retrieval of electronic data is required to give access to a record requested by an applicant...*” Highways arbitrarily chose that a “search and retrieval of electronic data” was necessary. It was not “required”, as provided for in subsection 6(3), as FOIP already has a fee in place to search records pursuant to subsection 6(2) of the FOIP Regulations.

[42] Certainly, if the Applicant would have been in agreement with this approach, and there was evidence that the calculation under subsection 6(3) of the FOIP Regulations would have been less expensive than subsection 6(2) of the FOIP Regulations, it could have been acceptable to calculate the fee in that manner. But as I have already established, Highways did not communicate with the Applicant prior to issuing the estimate of costs and has not shown my office evidence that it calculated the fee each way before determining which fee would be less expensive.

[43] Highways determined it was appropriate to issue a combined estimate of costs to process the 13 access to information requests. Therefore, had it calculated the fee under subsection 6(2) of the FOIP Regulations, it could have directed all employees with active email accounts to search their email accounts from December 1, 2015 to March 5, 2016, with a predetermined keyword search that would capture the responsive emails. Highways advised my office it determined it would take one hour for each of the 1034 email accounts to be searched. It has not provided me any additional background to support that it would take one hour per account. Nevertheless, if that was the case and Highways instructed employees to search their accounts based upon the above methodology, the estimated amount under subsection 6(2) of the FOIP Regulations would be \$31,020.00 – less than half of what the fee was calculated at under subsection 6(3) of the FOIP Regulations:

$$1034 \text{ email accounts} \times 1 \text{ hour to search each account} \times \$15.00/\text{half-hour} = \$31,020$$

[44] When I review the details of the four requests that are the subject of the \$66,100.00 portion of the combined estimate of costs, they appear to be relatively easy to respond to

given the recent time frames the Applicant stated in the requests – being a little more than three months prior to the Applicant filing his requests with Highways. Based upon how willing the Applicant was to narrow the scope of the requests once my office became involved, I believe the \$66,100.00 portion of the estimate of costs could have been avoided had Highways communicated with the Applicant in the early stages of receiving these requests.

[45] It is important to note that the total fee estimate to process the 13 access to information requests was \$69,645.00. Given that Highways advised my office that \$66,100.00 of that total estimate of costs was to search for records responsive to four of the 13 requests, the difference between the two amounts is \$3,545.00 to process the remaining nine requests. This further supports that the Applicant should have been provided an estimate of costs for each access to information request and not a combined fee estimate.

[46] Based on the above, the \$66,100.00 Information Technology fee is inappropriate as Highways should not have issued the combined estimate of costs and the fee was not calculated under subsection 6(2) of the FOIP Regulations.

[47] When my office began work with the Applicant and Highways to narrow the scope of the requests to reduce costs, one of the first narrowing strategies was for Highways to identify which areas of the Ministry would have a legitimate business purpose to possess emails that were the subject of that request. Through that exercise, my office learned that there were very few areas within the Ministry that would actually have a legitimate business purpose related to those emails, and in almost all cases, the Applicant narrowed the scope of his requests to those units with a legitimate business purpose and the senior executive team of Highways.

[48] Through this review, I have determined that there is one underlying issue that led to the large estimate of costs being Highways did not communicate with the Applicant. I believe this large estimate of costs could have been avoided if Highways worked with the Applicant once the requests were received.

[49] Upon receipt of the Requests for Review, it was agreed that my office would work with Highways and the Applicant to attempt to narrow the scope of these requests to reduce work and costs. On May 27, 2016, my office provided Highways with the narrowed scope of each of the 13 requests. Highways provided the Applicant with amended estimate of costs based on the narrowed scope. Upon receiving the revised estimate of costs, the Applicant advised Highways which requests he wished to proceed with and Highways has now responded to those requests.

[50] FOIP provides for reasonable cost recovery associated with providing individuals access to records. Fees encourage responsible use of the right of access by applicants. However, fees should not present an unreasonable barrier to access. As Highways did not communicate with the Applicant prior to issuing the estimate of costs, this excessive fee was an unreasonable barrier to access.

[51] As a best practice where an estimate of costs is being issued by a public body, the public bodies' access and privacy office should take steps to contact the applicant in an attempt to narrow the scope of the requests to reduce work and costs.

#### **IV FINDINGS**

[52] I find Highways inappropriately provided one estimate of costs to the Applicant to respond to the 13 access to information requests.

[53] I find Highways should have contacted the Applicant to attempt to narrow the scope of the requests prior to issuing the estimate of costs.

[54] I find the \$66,100.00 fee provided in the estimate of costs to be inappropriate as that fee was not calculated under subsection 6(2) of the FOIP Regulations.

**V RECOMMENDATIONS**

[55] I recommend Highways has written processes in place to properly address estimate of costs and provide a copy to my office in 30 days.

[56] I recommend Highways establish procedures that complement the *Guidelines for Government Communications During a General Election* to ensure that access to information requests are handled in the routine manner during the Writ period.

Dated at Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan, this 5th day of January, 2017.

Ronald J. Kruzeniski, Q.C.  
Saskatchewan Information and Privacy  
Commissioner