June the 12th., 2015.

To: Jennifer Biggs, Candrive, (Jenniferbiggs@rogers.com

    Hello Jennifer,

    I am emailing you as a result of reading a current article in the Ottawa Citizen, which concerns me, and my email following. I am also enclosing a comment from a very astute friend of mine, which perhaps your researchers may want to review. But my concern is that senior drivers are being discriminated against by the Provinces by requiring special testing, because the Provinces, notably Ontario, Alberta and B.C. stated that " They have more accidents and constitute a traffic risk". And now we have Mr. Sylvain Gagnon, saying on behalf of Candrive that " Senior Drivers are the Safest on the Roads", which we know is overwhelmingly statistically correct. If that is so, is it not just as discriminatory for Candrive to search for a new tool to test seniors, when they are the safest drivers on the roads?

    What we have now is, the Provinces discriminating against senior drivers, because they say they are dangerous on the roads, and the Federal Study, by Candrive, who are discriminating against the senior drivers because they are the safest on the roads. We are damned if we do, and damned if we don't.

    I hope Candrive understands fully the giant responsibility being placed on them, in finding a reasonable conclusion. It would seem by any reasonable person that the seniors are not the problem. According to recent studies done by the United States Insurance Institute for highway safety, a 6 year study that was completed last year, they stated that, " Even with the growing senior population, with each passing year of the study, the senior drivers record improved more than any other age group". Because of age and experience, the seniors have become self monitoring, and thus, the safest on the roads.

    Now what we don't need, is another tool like the Simard,MD, or the Montreal Cognitive Assessment, or any other combination of substandard grade test, so that the Provinces can say, " See this is recommended by Candrive, the Federal Study, and use it to legitimize the scam. The Lie Detector test is probably closer to 90% accurate, and the Courts hesitate to recognize it, and the Police have to use it as a Investigative Aid instead.

    Ed. Rockburne, RCMP, Sgt. Retired.

 Attachment:

Candrive is trying to develop better screening tools. The Candrive study is so huge that concerned seniors should be trying to follow it, regardless of how they may feel about it. Candrive could set the course in Canada for years to come, although the Provinces have a way of doing their own thing.

Physicians hate the fitness to drive issue, and they know that they are not competent, except in extreme cases. They have been demanding better tests and the Canadian Institute for Health Research has attempted to come to their rescue, with a huge amount of funding to their rescue, but not necessarily to ours. Our rescue would have to come from data, which has been good. Because of this good data I have been hoping against hope, that Candrive will come up with a statement recommending that they leave most older drivers alone.

There can be legitimate situations where a physician has to make a diagnosis, but mass medical screening can quickly generate huge numbers with very small false positive rate.

For any medical test, sensitivity tells us who is sick, and specificity tells us who isn't sick. I don't see how they can get both high enough at the same time, and if specificity isn't 100%, there would be injustices.

Crashes are rare events, most medically at risk drivers never crash, and some very fit drivers do. How are they going to analyze that?

I imagine that the Candrive Researchers now feel under considerable pressure, to come up with something definitive, after burning through almost 5 million dollars. Any tool can be dangerous when used incorrectly, and I am hoping that the user's manual will make the case against mass medical screening. It can be amazing, however, how some people can distort the evidence, to support their views.

The centrepiece in the case against the older driver is the unmodified accident risk curve. They can use more accidents per 100 million miles, in order to stop an elderly woman from driving to the grocery store a half mile away. This can become a form of statistical idiocy, which is totally out of balance. They need to balance the harm done by crashes, against the harm done by the loss of mobility and functionality in our car culture. They also have to balance the danger in a car, against the danger which can come from unprotected forms of mobility.

Getting through life involves trying to minimize risk while trying to maintain function. The complete elimination of risk wouldn't allow us to get out of bed in the morning, and that would kill us. Falls take a terrible toll on the elderly, and I don't see any laws against walking.

I don't know if Candrive is going to do the right thing or not. You are correct in fearing a potential threat.

   Bill Bears.