

**MINUTES
BLOOMINGTON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2020 4:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
109 EAST OLIVE STREET
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Rickielee Benecke (departed at 5:10 pm), Ms. Maureen (Reenie) Bradley, Mr. Edward Breitweiser, Mr. John Corey, Mr. Adam Heenan

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. George Boyle, City Attorney; AC Greg Scott, Police Dept.; Mr. Kevin Kothe, City Engineer; Mr. Philip Allyn, City Traffic Engineer; and members of the public.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Bradley called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm.

2. ROLL CALL: Mr. Allyn called the roll. With five members in attendance, a quorum was established.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

4. MINUTES: Reviewed and approved the minutes of the November 19, 2019 and January 21, 2020 regular meetings of the Bloomington Transportation Commission. Mr. Heenan motioned to approve the minutes from both meetings. Ms. Benecke seconded the motion. The Transportation Commission unanimously approved the motion via voice vote.

5. REGULAR AGENDA:

A. Information: Local Traffic Calming Statistics

Mr. Allyn provided a summary of the traffic calming data provided in the table in the packet. He noted traffic speeds and violation rates reduced significantly at the devices. In addition, the speeds and violation rates between devices dropped.

Mr. Allyn then briefly reviewed the various terms discussed in the memo. Diversion is the re-routing of traffic from the street with calming to another street. This can be bad if the calming just moves the speeders from one residential street to a different residential street. It can be good if the vehicles are moved from a residential street to an adjacent collector or arterial street.

Mr. Allyn gave a short overview of the traffic calming policy and process for both installation and removal of traffic calming devices as detailed on the City website.

Mr. Breitweiser asked if there was a reason for the installation of new devices to slow down around 2008. Mr. Allyn indicated that by that point, we had been able to address most of the streets that both fell within the thresholds and had a speeding problem. There may still be some locations in the newer areas of town that will be eligible as growth continues. In addition, there was a significant growth boom that slowed dramatically in 2008/2009 which resulted in fewer new subdivisions.

Mr. Heenan asked whether the islands on Front Street between East and Madison were considered traffic calming. Mr. Allyn indicated that the data provided covered locations considered as a result of citizen requests. Staff provides traffic calming in some locations that may benefit from it for other reasons, such as the higher-pedestrian Downtown area.

B. TC-2019-03: Annual Street Maintenance Program Discussion

Mr. Allyn indicated that as of last month (January) Staff had completed the data entry in the model and were comfortable with the initial configuration settings. The next step at that time was to gain feedback from the Commission on the various settings and priorities. After which, staff would run the program and discuss the results for final approval by the Council. Since we were not able to meet in January, in order to meet the construction bidding deadline, staff ran the program based on the recommended settings and Mr. Kothe and Administration have been discussing the results with the Council to finalize the program for this year. This month, the intent is to still have a discussion with the Commission on recommendations on which settings are currently being used and not used for this year and start the discussion for next year.

Mr. Allyn gave an overview of the various settings and the staff recommendations as detailed in the agenda packet.

Mr. Breitweiser asked for clarification about the process and the current status. Mr. Allyn indicated that the process has been discussed with individual councilmembers and Administration (City Manager and his staff) to verify that they were all on board with the model and settings. This allowed staff to run the model and develop a street list which will be approved by Council. The original intent was to gain Commission feedback on the setup in January concurrently with Council and Administration. Since we were not able to meet in January, now is the opportunity for the Commission to provide feedback for next year's program.

Mr. Breitweiser asked about the Minimum Acceptable Performance measure. Mr. Allyn indicated that this was not an attempt to temporarily minimize maintenance costs until a resurfacing. The measure sets a floor for the average quality of the entire system (for each classification) over the entire analysis period of 10 years. If a solution meeting this threshold is not possible with the available funding, the program will not return a solution.

Mr. Breitweiser asked about the Minimal Acceptable Condition if it will force a street to receive work even if it isn't a priority based on other measures leading to a worst-first philosophy. Mr. Allyn indicated that it is not a hard factor in that a street will automatically be included once it hits this value, it will just increase the priority of that segment. This is more of an efficiency factor. It costs significantly more to reconstruct a street as opposed to overlay it, so as the segment approaches the point of needing to be reconstructed, its priority for resurfacing will increase to avoid needing to be reconstructed. However, this is a priority increase in just one factor. There may be other factors (ADT, classification, location, etc.) that will place other better streets ahead of worse streets. This factor is more preventative rather than just placing the focus on the worst streets.

Mr. Breitweiser asked what the program will look like overall. Will the first year be just doing all the worst streets? Mr. Allyn indicated that the program will balance the various maintenance types and budgets across the years to match the available funding. Some bad streets may receive a maintenance treatment with a shorter lifespan to push its resurfacing back a couple years to balance out the funding.

Mr. Breitweiser expressed concern that there may be a regularly used road in an area that may not be a high-economic area that would be lower priority. Mr. Allyn indicated that there is no factor that accounts for Ward, age of neighborhood, or socio-economic factors that could lead to a street being prioritized or penalized due to those factors.

Ms. Benecke asked if the priority list publicly released would include a single year or multiple years. Mr. Allyn indicated that the current intent is to release the list for the upcoming 5 years with the understanding that only the first year and potentially a couple projects in the following years is locked in. When the model is updated and re-ran each year, there may be streets that will move from year 4 to 3 or

from year 5 to outside of the 5-year plan. It's also possible that when Council reviews the list, they may elect to move streets forward or backward in the planned year.

Mr. Heenan asked about the process moving forward regarding the Community Benefits factors. The memo indicated that while the current recommendation is to not utilize these factors, they can be further defined and incorporated over the coming year. Mr. Allyn indicated that this would be determined by the discussion today. Staff is looking for feedback on which of the factors would have benefit to spend time adding to the program.

Ms. Bradley asked if we currently have a ranking of all the streets. Mr. Allyn indicated that we have ran the program, but do not have a priority ranking of all the streets. The program outputs the list of streets to receive each treatment each year.

Ms. Bradley asked who is doing the condition ratings each year. Mr. Allyn indicated that we have a technician that drives each street regularly, rates then, maintains the software, and puts together the construction documents for each maintenance operation. This technician uses an objective rating system (PASER) to determine the condition rating. Ms. Bradley indicated that we have the system set up, the initial data is determined, the funding levels are set. The Community Benefit factors seems to be the most difficult to determine.

Mr. Heenan agreed that determining the Community Benefits was not a reason to hold up the program this year. However, he would like to see if there are recommendations or case studies/scenarios from other communities from the consultant that developed the software to help with the decision making. Mr. Allyn indicated that the intent wasn't to not ever use these factors, it was a function of timing and the recognition that most of these factors are very difficult to define and that there may be a diminishing level of return for the level of effort required.

Mr. Breitweiser expressed a preference that the Community Benefits factors should be incorporated in the future and take this one year at a time. Also, these factors are not necessarily random and that they would come into play in areas that have maybe been passed over in the past as well as potentially look at TIF districts differently from areas with standard tax revenue.

Ms. Benecke indicated that an advantage of the model is that is it based on data and expressed a concern that the Community Benefits factors could be used to create a Ward versus Ward conflict on who "deserves" it more.

Ms. Bradley asked about the general Council feedback so far. Mr. Kothe indicated that there hasn't been much discussion of the Community Benefits so far due to the recognition of the current schedule. They reviewed the same information the Commission has seen. The focus has been on the next couple years. Each year the program would be re-run to account for actual changes year to year. It's not realistic to expect that a street shown in a giving year in 5 to 10 years is likely to shift some.

Mr. Breitweiser asked if the goal is to get everything up to an acceptable level at the end of the 10-year period. Can the first 5 years be seen as "getting us out of a hole" and then the years after than are making the system better? Mr. Kothe indicated that over time the model will be able to more accurately predict the future deterioration rates as ratings are updated annually. As this model updates to match actual data for a street, the hope is that the overall system will improve.

Ms. Bradley indicated she favored a formal public rollout of the program as well as informing the public of the systematic process of determining the work locations. This will help reduce the perception that it is being done strictly on a Ward system with bias. She indicated that she didn't see a problem with holding on the Community Benefits factors for now to keep the program moving forward.

Mr. Allyn asked for any specific feedback on the recommendations for the Level of Service and Network Factors. Is there general agreement with the recommendations.

Mr. Breitweiser indicated that he was generally in favor of the recommendations, but asked if they were solely determined by Engineering? Mr. Allyn indicated that we started with the defaults from the company who developed the software. We then adjusted a couple of the factors to fit our specific City such as downplaying the rural factor as opposed to urban and sub-urban as well as pavement types such as gravel and earth surfaces being lowered.

Ms. Bradley indicated that the recommended factors is a usable scale and that the adjustments seem reasonable as we adapt the program from Canadian use to our community.

Mr. Allyn indicated there appeared to be concurrence on the Network and Level of Service Factors.

Mr. Allyn asked for feedback on the specific Community Based Factors and whether there are some that staff should be focusing on. Mr. Heenan asked for some examples from other communities to start with. Ms. Bradley mentioned she thought that most of these factors were very subjective. They may be agreement on access to schools gets higher priority, but how do you define the border of the area? Mr. Allyn responded that this is an example of the time and effort that it would take to include all these factors. There are several components: defining the criteria, quantifying the criteria, and then assigning values to all the segments. Staff will talk with the company about getting some examples from other communities and look into the effort required. Mr. Heenan asked that staff also contact the communities that are provided for their direct feedback.

Mr. Allyn indicated that he understood that there is Commission concurrence on using the staff recommendations for the Network and Level of Service Factors and that additional effort should be put in to defining and incorporating the Community Benefits.

Mr. Breitweiser and Mr. Heenan indicated that deprioritizing TIF districts would be desired.

Ms. Benecke left the meeting at 5:10 pm.

C. Information: February 2020 Citizen Comments/Complaints Summary

Ms. Bradley asked about item number 9 (Gill Street signage). There are a lot of signs in this area and more signs does not seem to be the answer. Mr. Allyn indicated that this was an area that developed in pieces. The cul-de-sac was provided to keep trucks and commercial traffic in the commercial area to the east and out of the residential area to the west. We are looking at this area overall to clean up the signage.

Ms. Bradley asked about item number 20 (College and Stone Mountain streetlight). Is this a request for a streetlight or a traffic signal? Mr. Allyn indicated that the request was for a streetlight to light the cross walk across the south leg of the intersection.

Ms. Bradley asked about item numbers 27 and 28 (Corpus Christi complaints). Mr. Allyn indicated that this was a complaint from residents in the subdivision north of the school about traffic traveling fast through the neighborhood, not stopping at stop signs, etc. Staff replaced yield signs with stop signs and put together talking points for the school to send to parents about proper driving behavior in the subdivision.

Ms. Bradley asked about item number 37 (deer crossing signage). She is generally supportive of deer crossing warning signs as these locations are not readily apparent.

Mr. Breitweiser asked about item number 69 (length of pedestrian crossing time at Veterans and Lincoln). Mr. Allyn indicated that the complaint was that there was not enough green time on Lincoln for a bike to

get across Veterans Parkway once the light turns green (while riding in traffic). Mr. Allyn indicated that light timings are set by IDOT and the comment was forwarded to them.

Ms. Bradley asked if IDOT controls all the intersections on the state routes. Mr. Allyn indicated that the City does the small maintenance work such as replacing malfunctioning hardware, but the state controls the overall timings.

Mr. Breitweiser asked if there was any way to organize this data to be better able to see trends. Mr. Allyn indicated that most of the requests and complaints come in via paper or pdf rather than a web or app entry and that there isn't a good way to sort and filter items. The new items are indicated as such, so current trends should be able to be easily seen.

6. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Amending the minutes of the September 2019 Commission Meeting

Mr. Allyn indicated the changes to the minutes included correcting Mr. Breitweiser from present to absent and adjusting the roll call number from 5 to 4.

Mr. Heenan motioned to approve the revised minutes. Mr. Corey seconded the motion. The Transportation Commission unanimously approved the motion via voice vote.

B. Other Items:

Mr. Allyn indicated that surveys had been sent out to Downtown business regarding parking Downtown to help inform the discussion on the pavement markings for Main Street. Staff is still sorting through the responses.

7. NEW BUSINESS:

A. City Intersection Crash Statistics

Mr. Allyn indicated that the Pantagraph was working on a story on dangerous intersections in the City and asked for crash statistic data. He distributed to the Commission the data that was provided and briefly discussed it (copies attached to minutes). There first handout contains two tables with data from 2019. The top table shows the top 10 intersections ranked by number of crashes. The bottom table shows the top 10 intersections ranked by rate (number of crashes per 1 million vehicles that travel through the intersection). Staff uses both measures combined to evaluate intersections since a high rate can sometimes be skewed by a single, statistically insignificant crash on a low volume street. Similarly, a higher number of crashes may not necessarily indicate an unsafe intersection if there is an extremely high volume of traffic. The second set of tables show how these rankings have changed overtime during the past 10 years. It was noted that most of the top intersections are on the State Routes.

Mr. Breitweiser asked if these numbers were only vehicle crashes. Mr. Allyn indicated that these were all the crashes with a police report filed including bicycles and pedestrians.

8. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Breitweiser indicated that the Commission members would be able to support and collaborate with Public Works on the information campaign on the street work roll out. Mr. Allyn indicated that most of the information sharing is through the City website, press releases, and Council and Commission presentations. He would welcome any additional suggestions.

9. ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Heenan made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Corey seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:35 pm.

Respectfully,

Philip Allyn
City Traffic Engineer



2019 Crash Statistics

Public Works Engineering Division

| Intersection | Rate | Total | Intersection | Midblock | Private | Injuries | | | |
|---|------|-------|--------------|----------|---------|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | A | B | K | |
| 1 VETERANS PKWY @ EMPIRE ST | 0.75 | 44 | 18 | 17 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| 2 MORRISSEY DR @ VETERANS PKWY | 0.73 | 32 | 12 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 3 VETERANS PKWY @ OAKLAND AVE | 0.52 | 20 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| 4 VETERANS PKWY @ CLEARWATER AVE | 0.50 | 48 | 9 | 30 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 |
| 5 VETERANS PKWY @ WASHINGTON ST | 0.43 | 30 | 9 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 6 HERSHEY RD @ EMPIRE ST | 0.71 | 27 | 9 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7 VETERANS PKWY @ GENERAL ELECTRIC/VERNON | 0.39 | 18 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 8 COMMERCE PKWY @ VETERANS PKWY | 0.76 | 13 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 VETERANS PKWY @ EASTLAND DR | 0.39 | 30 | 7 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| 10 MADISON ST @ MARKET ST | 0.95 | 17 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 |

Sorted on Intersection Crashes - Decreasing

| Intersection | Rate | Total | Intersection | Midblock | Private | Injuries | | | |
|------------------------------|------|-------|--------------|----------|---------|----------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | A | B | K | |
| 1 CLINTON ST @ BELL ST | 5.23 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 SPRINGFIELD RD @ TANNER ST | 2.31 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 I A DR @ ROWE DR | 1.82 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 4 ALLIN ST @ OLIVE ST | 1.79 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 EAST ST @ WALNUT ST | 1.74 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 PRAIRIE ST @ DOUGLAS ST | 1.72 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 DAVIS ST @ MONROE DR | 1.66 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 MAIN ST @ MARKET ST | 1.65 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 ROBINSON ST @ GROVE ST | 1.42 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 GRIDLEY ST @ GROVE ST | 1.34 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

Sorted on Crash Rate - Decreasing



2010 - 2019 Crash Statistics
Public Works Engineering Division

| Years in Top 10 | Ranking by Intersection Crashes | | | | | | | | | | Rate | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.38 | 1.34 | 1.08 | 1.00 | 0.75 | 1.67 | 1.62 | 1.84 | 1.54 | 0.75 |
| 10 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1.58 | 1.64 | 1.39 | 1.64 | 1.15 | 0.91 | 1.45 | 1.09 | 1.64 | 0.73 |
| 10 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 1.55 | 1.13 | 0.66 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 1.23 | 0.75 | 0.52 |
| 8 | 19 | 19 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.84 | 0.73 | 0.84 | 0.62 | 0.78 | 1.62 | 1.29 | 0.50 |
| 9 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 0.76 | 0.95 | 0.61 | 1.14 | 0.57 | 0.71 | 0.57 | 1.04 | 1.14 | 0.43 |
| 10 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 2.34 | 1.10 | 1.51 | 1.00 | 1.17 | 1.45 | 1.10 | 2.29 | 1.66 | 0.71 |
| 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 61 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 1.12 | 0.86 | 0.47 | 0.73 | 0.43 | 0.17 | 0.90 | 0.86 | 0.77 | 0.39 |
| 3 | 8 | 25 | 6 | 7 | 24 | 14 | 6 | 14 | 27 | 8 | 1.44 | 0.68 | 1.26 | 1.27 | 0.59 | 0.68 | 1.43 | 1.18 | 0.59 | 0.76 |
| 8 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 1.00 | 0.83 | 0.88 | 0.55 | 0.50 | 0.78 | 1.10 | 1.05 | 1.61 | 0.39 |
| 1 | 63 | 23 | 33 | 89 | 66 | 54 | 77 | 128 | 142 | 10 | 0.68 | 1.22 | 0.95 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.68 | 0.54 | 0.41 | 0.27 | 0.95 |

Sorted on 2019 Intersection Crashes - Decreasing



2010 - 2019 Crash Statistics
Public Works Engineering Division

| Years in Top 10 | Ranking by Intersection Crashes | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | Intersection | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 VETERANS PKWY @ EMPIRE ST | 38 | 39 | 34 | 39 | 32 | 63 | 51 | 55 | 56 | 44 |
| 10 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 2 MORRISSEY DR @ VETERANS PKWY | 41 | 38 | 31 | 43 | 29 | 27 | 37 | 28 | 41 | 32 |
| 10 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 3 VETERANS PKWY @ OAKLAND AVE | 47 | 32 | 25 | 34 | 32 | 32 | 25 | 29 | 28 | 20 |
| 8 | 19 | 19 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 VETERANS PKWY @ CLEARWATER AVE | 22 | 18 | 37 | 33 | 40 | 35 | 53 | 54 | 61 | 48 |
| 9 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 VETERANS PKWY @ WASHINGTON ST | 36 | 36 | 33 | 37 | 34 | 30 | 26 | 30 | 33 | 30 |
| 10 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 HERSHEY RD @ EMPIRE ST | 44 | 34 | 36 | 38 | 27 | 34 | 26 | 32 | 36 | 27 |
| 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 61 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 VETERANS PKWY @ GENERAL ELECTRIC/VERNON | 40 | 30 | 26 | 35 | 30 | 32 | 30 | 29 | 8 | 18 |
| 3 | 8 | 25 | 6 | 7 | 24 | 14 | 6 | 14 | 27 | 8 | 8 COMMERCE PKWY @ VETERANS PKWY | 22 | 12 | 23 | 28 | 18 | 21 | 29 | 20 | 17 | 13 |
| 8 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 9 VETERANS PKWY @ EASTLAND DR | 39 | 28 | 38 | 33 | 26 | 37 | 41 | 32 | 40 | 30 |
| 1 | 63 | 23 | 33 | 89 | 66 | 54 | 77 | 128 | 142 | 10 | 10 MADISON ST @ MARKET ST | 7 | 12 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 17 |

Sorted on 2019 Intersection Crashes - Decreasing



2010 - 2019 Crash Statistics
Public Works Engineering Division

| Years in Top 10 | Ranking by Intersection Crashes | | | | | | | | | | Intersection | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 32 | 26 | 24 | 18 | 40 | 39 | 44 | 37 | 18 |
| 10 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 26 | 27 | 23 | 27 | 19 | 15 | 24 | 18 | 27 | 12 |
| 10 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 33 | 24 | 14 | 18 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 26 | 16 | 11 |
| 8 | 19 | 19 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 15 | 13 | 15 | 11 | 14 | 29 | 23 | 9 |
| 9 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 16 | 20 | 13 | 24 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 22 | 24 | 9 |
| 10 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 34 | 16 | 22 | 20 | 17 | 21 | 14 | 29 | 21 | 9 |
| 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 61 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 26 | 20 | 11 | 17 | 10 | 4 | 21 | 20 | 7 | 9 |
| 3 | 8 | 25 | 6 | 7 | 24 | 14 | 6 | 14 | 27 | 8 | 17 | 8 | 15 | 15 | 7 | 8 | 17 | 14 | 7 | 9 |
| 8 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 18 | 15 | 16 | 10 | 9 | 14 | 20 | 19 | 29 | 7 |
| 1 | 63 | 23 | 33 | 89 | 66 | 54 | 77 | 128 | 142 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 7 |

Sorted on 2019 Intersection Crashes - Decreasing



2010 - 2019 Crash Statistics
Public Works Engineering Division

| Years in Top 10 | Ranking by Intersection Crashes | | | | | | | | | | Midblock | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | Intersection | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 VETERANS PKWY @ EMPIRE ST | 4 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 11 | 14 | 17 |
| 10 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 2 MORRISSEY DR @ VETERANS PKWY | 10 | 7 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 13 |
| 10 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 3 VETERANS PKWY @ OAKLAND AVE | 12 | 7 | 5 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 9 |
| 8 | 19 | 19 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 VETERANS PKWY @ CLEARWATER AVE | 9 | 6 | 14 | 16 | 19 | 14 | 24 | 16 | 21 | 30 |
| 9 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 VETERANS PKWY @ WASHINGTON ST | 13 | 12 | 16 | 10 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 15 |
| 10 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 HERSHEY RD @ EMPIRE ST | 4 | 17 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 9 | 14 |
| 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 61 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 VETERANS PKWY @ GENERAL ELECTRIC/VERNON | 12 | 10 | 11 | 16 | 18 | 25 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 6 |
| 3 | 8 | 25 | 6 | 7 | 24 | 14 | 6 | 14 | 27 | 8 | 8 COMMERCE PKWY @ VETERANS PKWY | 2 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 2 |
| 8 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 9 VETERANS PKWY @ EASTLAND DR | 16 | 8 | 13 | 20 | 14 | 19 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 19 |
| 1 | 63 | 23 | 33 | 89 | 66 | 54 | 77 | 128 | 142 | 10 | 10 MADISON ST @ MARKET ST | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

Sorted on 2019 Intersection Crashes - Decreasing



2010 - 2019 Crash Statistics
Public Works Engineering Division

| Years in Top 10 | Ranking by Intersection Crashes | | | | | | | | | | Private Property | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------------------|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | Intersection | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | |
| 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | VETERANS PKWY @ EMPIRE ST | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 9 |
| 10 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 2 | MORRISSEY DR @ VETERANS PKWY | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 7 |
| 10 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 3 | VETERANS PKWY @ OAKLAND AVE | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| 8 | 19 | 19 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | VETERANS PKWY @ CLEARWATER AVE | 4 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 9 | 17 | 9 |
| 9 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | VETERANS PKWY @ WASHINGTON ST | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| 10 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 | HERSHEY RD @ EMPIRE ST | 6 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 4 |
| 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 61 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | VETERANS PKWY @ GENERAL ELECTRIC/VERNON | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 8 | 25 | 6 | 7 | 24 | 14 | 6 | 14 | 27 | 8 | 8 | COMMERCE PKWY @ VETERANS PKWY | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 |
| 8 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 9 | VETERANS PKWY @ EASTLAND DR | 5 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 |
| 1 | 63 | 23 | 33 | 89 | 66 | 54 | 77 | 128 | 142 | 10 | 10 | MADISON ST @ MARKET ST | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 |

Sorted on 2019 Intersection Crashes - Decreasing