

How Many Incidents Do Not Become Reported In Police Collision Data? – Part 4

Posting Date: 3-Feb-2017

1.0 Background

Since the fall of 2009 Gorski Consulting has been involved in a research project involving documentation of collision and loss-of-control incidents at an S-Curve of Clarke Road north of Fanshawe Park Road at the north-eastern outskirts of the City of London, Ontario, Canada. By the end of 2016 89 incidents were documented.

In the fall of 2016 Gorski Consulting made a Freedom of Information request to the City of London requesting details of the collision data they possessed for the segment of Clarke Road between Fanshawe Park Road and Sunningdale Road. That request was forwarded to the London City Police which provided their data.

In three previous articles posted on January 25, 27 and 29, 2017, the police data from the years 2011, 2012 and 2013 were compared to the Gorski Consulting data of the same years. The present article will review the police reported data of the year 2014 and attempt to match it with the data gathered by Gorski Consulting.



Figure 1: View, looking south, of the S-Curve on Clarke Road on October 11, 2013.

2.0 Comparison of the Gorski Consulting Data with the Collision Data from London City Police Service

In November of 2016 Gorski Consulting sent correspondence to the City of London requesting their collision data with respect to the Clarke Road site. Specifically, the following was requested for the period of October, 2009 through to October, 2016:

1. The date/time of each occurrence.
2. The collision severity (property damage only, personal injury, fatal).
3. The specific location of the occurrence within the roadway segment of Clarke Road north of Fanshawe Park Road and south of Sunningdale Road.
4. The general character of the collision (head-on, single vehicle loss-of-control, etc.).
5. The type of vehicle involved (passenger car, light truck, heavy truck, etc.)

In response, the City of London indicated it would be transferring the request to the London City Police. In their subsequent correspondence to the police the City representative indicated the following: "I am transferring this request to your office as I believe that your institution has greater interest in the requested records than the City of London". This was followed, early in January of 2017, with receipt of data from the London Police Service of the noted collision history. That data included the following for each year.

2009 – 1 one record of a collision

2010 – "No results for 2010"

2011 – 7 records

2012 – 8 records

2013 – 4 records

2014 – 7 records

2015 – 10 records

2016 – 4 records

In comparison, the following records of incidents were documented by Gorski Consulting at the S-curve for the noted years:

2009 – 9 records

2010 – 15 records

2011 – 21 records

2012 – 11 records

2013 – 10 records

2014 – 7 records

2015 – 9 records

2016 – 7 records

In the previous articles the number of records in the Gorski Consulting dataset for the year 2014 was noted to be only 4. However, once a thorough review was made it was revealed that 3 additional records of loss of control events existed. Thus the corrected information indicates that 7 records existed for the year 2014.

The data from the year 2014 will be examined in the present article. Figure 2 shows the London City Police collision data for the year 2014.

Collision Data From London Police Service Regarding Clarke Road North of Fanshawe Park Road

Year = 2014

Collision Date	Time	Severity	Location	General Character	Vehicle
16-Jan	1647	Personal Injury	Travelling North	loss of control	Passenger Car
31-Jan	1137	Property Damage	Travelling North	deer struck	Passenger Car
5-Mar	1145	Property Damage	Travelling North	deer struck	Passenger Car
12-Mar	1414	Property Damage	2nd curve travelling North	loss of control	Passenger Car
19-Mar	2100	Property Damage	Travelling North	loss of control	Passenger Car
21-Jun	0813	Property Damage	Travelling North	deer struck	Passenger Car
22-Nov	0555	Property Damage	Travelling North	deer struck	Passenger Car

Figure 2

Figure 3 shows the 2013 incident data documented by Gorski Consulting at the S-curve of Clarke Road. It needs to be clarified that the “Date” in the Gorski Consulting data does not refer to the date that the incident occurred. It relates to the date that Gorski Consulting attended the Clarke Road site and identified the evidence of that incident. Since Gorski Consulting did not attend the site every day of the year there could be several day’s difference between the day of the occurrence and the day that Gorski Consulting observed the physical evidence of that incident.

	Date	Travel Direction	Location of Collision Evidence	Description of Collision Evidence	Estimate of Injury & If Reported
1	Jan 21-14	Northbound	West Roadside Between Two Curves	Loss-of-control tire marks on west roadside	Vehicle slid to rest in grass, no impact, injury not likely, likely not reported
2	Mar 18-14	Northbound	East Roadside Between Two Curves	Loss-of-control tire marks on east roadside	Evidence of impact but unknown circumstances; Vehicle parts lying on ground
3	Mar 18-14	Northbound	West Roadside at North Curve	Debris from Unknown Collision against west fence	Obvious collision but unknown if single vehicle or involves another vehicle
4	Apr 4-14	Northbound	East roadside at North Curve	Tire marks and vehicle debris in ditch	No impact and no injuries; event not likely reported
5	Apr 21-14	Southbound	Loss-of-control tire marks on east driveway and roadside between two curves	Loss-of-control yaw marks indicating sideways slid onto grass	No impact; likely no injuries, likely not reported
7	May 19-14	Southbound	East Roadside Between Two Curves	Clockwise rotation yaw marks on east shoulder	No collision, regained control of rotation without further incident; no injuries, not reported
7	Aug 5-14	Northbound	Loss-of-control tire marks on east shoulder of north curve progressing to west shoulder north of north curve	Yaw marks only, first on east shoulder then on west shoulder	No impact and no injuries; event not likely reported

Figure 3: 2014 Incident Data Documented by Gorski Consulting

A review of the photographs on file indicates that Gorski Consulting visited the S-Curve on Clarke Road in 2014 as indicated below, summarized according to each month of the year:

January = 22 visits
 February = 16 visits
 March = 18 visits
 April = 14 visits
 May = 10 visits
 June = 16 visits
 July = 17 visits
 August = 18 visits
 September = 19 visits
 October = 21 visits
 November = 17 visits
 December = 17 visits

The above indicates that Gorski Consulting examined the Clarke Road site in 2014 a total of 205 times. This is a large increase over the examinations from 2011 (68 times) and 2012 (92 times) and similar to the visit times in 2013 (211visits). However the

reason for this increase is that in 2013 Gorski Consulting began to supplement actual “boots on the ground” presence at the site with “drive through” examinations where the observer passed through the site in a moving vehicle to determine if there were any obvious incidents that needed further study. While this approach is not as detailed as actual walking through the site, these additional dates of observation could allow for earlier capture of physical evidence which might not be found until the next actual walk through of the site. A delay in the frequency of observation could result in possible spoilage of any fragile evidence and a missed opportunity to recognize that an incident occurred.

As with the previous analyses the comparison between the police data and the Gorski Consulting data was made by review of the actual photographs taken by Gorski Consulting during each examination of the site. This led to the following results.

The police dataset indicated that at 1647 hours of January 16th a northbound passenger went out of control and was involved in a personal injury collision. On January 17th Gorski Consulting drove through the S-curve and no collision evidence was observed. However the road conditions were poor as shown in Figure 4. Gorski Consulting also drove through the site on January 20th and no collision evidence was found. Then on January 21st while walking the site, evidence was found indicating that a northbound vehicle had slid into the west ditch, as shown in Figures 5 and 6. Although no evidence was found with respect to a collision it is conceivable that such a collision occurred between two vehicles on the road resulting the northbound vehicle’s travel into the ditch. Given the snow cover the existence of pieces of debris could have been undetected. However this is insufficient evidence to conclude, one way or another, whether the collision referred to by police was related to the loss-of-control evidence found on the west roadside.



Figure 4: View looking south on January 17th from the dash camera of the Gorski Consulting vehicle as it passes by the area where the loss-of-control evidence was found on January 21st. Given the extent of snow cover is it conceivable that a collision occurred here on the previous day but the evidence was obscured. It simply cannot be determined.



Figure 5: Incident documented on January 21st, 2014. This is a view of the evidence of a loss-of-control incident whereby a northbound vehicle slid into the west roadside. It is conceivable that his action occurred because of an impact with another vehicle on the road however the lack of further information from the police data makes it not possible to draw a conclusion one way or the other.



Figure 6: View looking south toward the roadway from the location of the loss-of-control evidence in the west ditch. No evidence of a collision was found in the vicinity of this loss-of-control incident.

The police dataset indicated that on January 31, 2014 at 1137 hours a northbound passenger car struck a deer resulting in property damage. Gorski Consulting drove through the curve at approximately 0900 hours on January 31st and again at approximately 1350 hours on February 2nd. No collision evidence was found on February 2nd. In comparing the road conditions with January 31st it was noted that the road surface was wet with snow cover on the roadsides and it was noted further that a snowplow has plowed the snow on the shoulders sometime between the two dates. Thus, it is conceivable that if there was fragile evidence of an impact in the S-curve the evidence could have been obliterated by the snow-plowing operations. Figure 7 shows an example of the road conditions on January 31st whereas Figure 8 shows the conditions on February 2nd. Even without the snow plowing operations it can be appreciated that a typical impact with a deer will not leave a substantial quantity of evidence on the road unless the impacting vehicle becomes destabilized and the driver loses control.



Figure 7: View, looking north near the north curve showing the road conditions on January 31st. The condition of the right snow bank can be compared to the same location from February 2nd in Figure 8 to demonstrate that a snowplow plowed the snow sometime between those dates.



Figure 8: View looking north at the north curve taken on February 2nd, 2014. The right (east) snow bank has been freshly plowed in comparison to the condition of January 31st shown in Figure 7.

The police dataset indicated that at 1145 hours on March 5th another northbound passenger car struck a deer resulting in property damage. Gorski Consulting drove through the S-curve at approximately 0850 hours on March 4th and then again at 1425 hours on March 7th. No evidence of a collision was observed within the S-curve. Comparing the road conditions of March 4th shown in Figure 9 with the conditions on March 7th in Figure 10 it can be noted that there was some snow in the shoulders and ditch and that some melting took place in the time between those dates. There was no evidence of any snow plowing thus if there was collision evidence on the roadsides there was the opportunity to identify it in the photographs of March 7th. However, as stated above, impacts with deer can potentially leave little physical evidence of that occurrence. When combined with the inability of police to provide more specific information about the collision locations it cannot be determined either way if the deer impact occurred within the bounds of the S-curve or somewhere outside of those bounds.



Figure 9: View, looking north at the north end of the north curve on March 4th, 2014, showing the road conditions.



Figure 10: View, looking north at the north end of the north curve on March 7th, 2014, showing the road conditions.

The police dataset indicated that at 1414 hours on March 12th, a northbound vehicle went out of control and was involved in a property damage collision. The collision location was coded as “2nd curve travelling north” and this description was helpful. Gorski Consulting drove through the S-curve at approximately 0940 hours on March 12th and again at 0930 hours on March 13th. No collision evidence was detected.

Figures 11 and 12 are photos taken from the Gorski Consulting dash camera while travelling through the north curve on March 12th. It is possible to understand how a vehicle might go out of control in the poor road conditions.

Figures 13, 14 and 15 provide similar northbound views taken from the dash camera on March 13th. The weather conditions are much better and the road surface is wet. The roadside suggests that some snow plowing has occurred that could have destroyed any collision evidence if that existed in the north curve of the S-curve. Therefore it can be understood how the physical evidence of the collision reported by police could not be detected.



Figure 11: View, looking north while travelling around the north curve at approximately 0940 hours on March 12, 2014.



Figure 12: View looking north while travelling northbound at the north curve on March 12, 2014.



Figure 13: View looking north while travelling northbound at the north curve at approximately 0930 hours on March 13, 2014.



Figure 14: View looking north while travelling northbound at the north curve on March 13th, 2014.



Figure 15: View looking north while travelling northbound at the north curve on March 13th, 2014.

The Gorski Consulting dataset indicated that on March 18th, evidence was found in the S-curve of two separate collisions of northbound vehicles.

In the first incident, collision debris was found against a fence post of the west fence past the north end of the north curve. Faint tire marks suggested that a northbound vehicle crossed into the west ditch and struck the fence post with one of the corners of its front end. Figures 16, 17 and 18 show the collision evidence that was found at this first of two incidents on March 18th.

A reasonable question to ask is whether this collision was the one noted in the police dataset that occurred on March 12th? In both instances it involved a northbound vehicle and the both incidents are located at the “2nd curve”. Both events involved the loss-of-control collision of a vehicle. This combination of facts suggests that one could draw the conclusion that the two collisions are the same but there is insufficient evidence to be certain.



Figure 16: Collision documented on March 18th, 2014. This is a view looking north along the west shoulder and ditch. In the background, adjacent to the large tree are a set of wooden posts. Vehicle parts were found at the base of one of these posts. Faint tire marks were also observed indicating that a northbound vehicle collided at this location.



Figure 17: View looking west toward one of the fence posts showing the vehicle debris indicating that a collision occurred here.



Figure 18: View looking south from the struck fence post. Faint tire marks are visible in the ditch indicating that the colliding vehicle was northbound.

In the second incident documented by Gorski Consulting on March 18th, the dataset reports that a northbound vehicle produced loss-of-control tire marks on the east roadside between the two curves. A comment is attached that reads “Obvious collision but unknown circumstances”. Having reviewed the photographs in detail the conclusion drawn is that there is doubt about the travel direction of the vehicle however it was definitely rotating while on the east roadside. There was also vehicle debris strewn throughout the vicinity of the tire marks indicating that an unknown collision occurred. This collision was not reported in the police dataset. Figures 19, 20 and 21 provide views of the physical evidence that was found.



Figure 19: Collision documented by Gorski Consulting on March 18th, 2014 this is a view looking north along the east roadside. Loss-of-control yaw marks can be seen in the grass of the roadside and on the gravel shoulder in the foreground. For official purposes the evidence has been reported as caused by a northbound vehicle. However there is some doubt about that conclusion. Vehicle parts can be seen strewn around the vicinity of the tire marks indicating there was a collision but no further conclusions can be drawn.



Figure 20: View looking north along the yaw marks located on the east roadside.



Figure 21: View looking south along the yaw marks on the east roadside.

The police dataset indicated that at 2100 hours on March 19th, 2014, a northbound passenger car was involved in a loss-of-control collision that resulted in property damage but no injuries. Gorski Consulting drove through the S-curve on the morning of March 20th when the road surface was wet and then again on March 22nd when the road surface was dry. On both instances no evidence of a collision was noted within the S-curve. The road conditions can be appreciated by examining Figure 22 which provides a view from the dash camera of the Gorski Consulting vehicle as it was northbound at passing through the S-curve on March 20th.



Figure 22: View looking north along the S-curve taken at approximately 0930 on March 20th or approximately 11 hours after the collision reported in the police dataset.

The Gorski Consulting dataset indicated that an incident was documented on April 4, 2014 indicating that a northbound vehicle produced loss-of-control tire marks and that vehicle debris was located on the east roadside at the north curve. The debris indicated that, upon falling down a steep embankment, the northbound vehicle made ground contact with the bottom of its front end. Pieces of the front bumper and fascia that was strewn at the end of the tire marks indicated that vehicle damage was sufficient that the collision should have been reported to police. Tire marks along the east roadside also suggested that a tow truck attended the site with respect to that collision. Figures 23 through 26 provide details of the physical evidence that was found.



Figure 23: Collision that was documented on April 4th, 2014. This is a view looking north along the east shoulder at the north curve. Just past the utility pole a northbound vehicle travelled down the embankment and collided with the ground below.



Figure 24: View looking down from the top of the embankment showing tire marks and vehicle parts where the northbound vehicle collided with the ground and came to rest.



Figure 25: View from the final rest position of the northbound vehicle to the embankment from which vehicle the vehicle fell.



Figure 26: View of the tire marks and vehicle debris at the bottom of the embankment where the northbound vehicle came to rest.

The Gorski Consulting dataset documented an incident on April 21st, 2014 where a southbound vehicle slid sideways and came to rest on the grass roadside between the two curves of the S-curve. There was no reference to this incident in the police records likely because it did not involve a collision. Other tire marks existed in the vicinity suggesting that a vehicle was under prolonged acceleration. It became questionable whether all the marks were related to the same incident and whether the marks were created under intentional acceleration. That question has not been resolved. Figures 27 through 33 show some of the tire mark evidence. Although most of the marks suggest acceleration was involved it does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the acceleration was intentional as there are numerous incidents where unintended sudden acceleration occur resulting in significant collisions and consequences. For this reason this physical evidence has been included in the summary of incidents.



Figure 27: Incident documented on April 21, 2014. This is a view looking south within the driveway on the east side of Clarke Road between the two curves of the S-Curve. Curved yaw marks are seen travelling toward the parked car in the background. It is questioned whether these marks are intentional acceleration marks similar to others found in the driveway and on the east shoulder.



Figure 28: View of the loss-of-control tire marks on the grass of the east roadside. The vehicle causing the marks would have come to rest just before reaching the area of the parked car.



Figure 29: View looking northwest with the investigators fingers pointing out the location of the faint loss-of-control tire marks in the grass roadside.



Figure 30: View looking north at the loss-of-control tire marks on the gravel of the driveway. Closer examination suggests that the vehicle approached the camera from the other driveway in the background and not from the roadway. This would suggest that the marks were created from acceleration, and possibly intentional acceleration.



Figure 31: View of other tire marks in the grass roadside which show clear indications of acceleration.



Figure 32: View of tire marks on the east roadside which show clear signs of powered acceleration with hard steering.



Figure 33: View of tire marks on the east roadside showing an exit from the road by a southbound vehicle which is then steering hard to the left under high acceleration in the background.

The Gorski Consulting dataset indicated that an incident was documented on May 19th, 2014, involving a southbound vehicle that produced yaw marks on the east roadside between the two curves of the S-curve. The yaw marks were terminated as the driver of the vehicle regained control and there was no collision. This incident was understandably not included in the police dataset. Figures 34, 35 and 36 provide indications of the evidence that was found.



Figure 34: Incident documented on May 19th, 2014. This is a view looking north along the east shoulder between the two curves of the S-Curve. Yaw marks in the shoulder show that a southbound vehicle rotated clockwise as it approached the camera. The driver regained control in the foreground thus the yaw marks are no longer visible.



Figure 35: View looking north along the east shoulder showing the yaw marks as a southbound vehicle travelled toward the camera while rotating clockwise.



Figure 36: View looking south along the east shoulder showing how the yaw marks fade out as the driver regains control of the vehicle and continues southbound back onto the road.

The police dataset indicated that at 0813 hours on June 21st, 2014 a northbound passenger car struck a deer resulting in property damage but no injuries. Gorski Consulting conducted an examination of the S-curve at approximately 1410 hours or 6 hours after the reported collision occurred. No evidence was found that a recent collision occurred within the bounds of the S-curve. Figures 37 and 38 provide general views of the curve to illustrate the conditions at that time.

It needs to be acknowledged again that a collision with a deer can leave little physical evidence of that impact depending of the unique circumstances of each case. Six hours after the reported collision no evidence was found of a collision within the S-curve and there is some degree of probability that the collision may have occurred somewhere else within the 1300 metres where police would have reported their data. However there is degree of uncertainty in concluding, one way or another, whether or not the collision occurred within the S-curve.



Figure 37: View looking north taken from the Gorski Consulting dash camera at approximately 1410 hours of June 21, 2014. This is upon approach to the south portion of the S-curve.



Figure 38: View looking south while approaching the north curve of the S-curve.

The Gorski Consulting dataset documented an incident on August 5th, 2014 in which a northbound vehicle produced yaw marks on the east shoulder followed by more yaw marks on the west shoulder. These marks were located at the north curve as well as just north of the north curve. As there was no physical evidence that the marks were associated with an impact it is understandable why the police dataset does not make mention of this incident. Figures 39 through 44 show the evidence that was found.

While no evidence of an impact was found of this incident it is worth repeating that evidence of a minor impact with another vehicle may not always reveal itself with physical evidence. What ensures that such an impact is reported is that, in order for a collision to be concealed, two drivers or additional others, would have to cooperate to conceal the facts and this is not probable.

There could be instances where fault could be in doubt. That outcome is not unusual in the Ontario system where “minor” collisions are reported to a reporting centre without any independent examination of the evidence at a collision site. It is well known that when fault is not attributed as 100%, insurers will apply 50% fault to each involved party and then both parties are charged with an “at fault” collision on their record and their insurance premiums are increased. Thus there is a real reason why both drivers could collude to not report a collision that otherwise should have been reported.



Figure 39: Incident documented on August 5th, 2014. This is a view looking south along the east shoulder at the north curve. Yaw marks from as northbound vehicle can be seen in the shoulder as the vehicle began to rotate counter-clockwise. The tire marks show the vehicle returning to the road surface in the foreground as it continues its rotation.



Figure 40: View looking north from the north end of the yaw marks in the foreground as the rotating, northbound vehicle returns to the road surface. At the centre-line, in the centre of the view, are some black transfers of rubber with striations within them indicating that these are from the continued yaw mark produced by the northbound vehicle. The vehicle eventually comes to rest on the west shoulder adjacent to the tree in the background.



Figure 41: View looking northwest at the black yaw marks on the centre line and the tire marks on the west shoulder in the background where the northbound vehicle came to rest.



Figure 42: View of the tire marks at the final rest position of the northbound vehicle at the west shoulder.



Figure 43: View looking south-east from the final rest position of the northbound vehicle.



Figure 44: Close-up view of the tire marks at the final rest position of the northbound vehicle. The tire marks show how the vehicle slid to rest and then tread marks shows how the vehicle then exited and drove away.

The police dataset identified that at 0555 hours on November 22, 2014, a northbound passenger car struck a deer resulting in property damage but no injuries to the vehicle occupants. Gorski Consulting drove through the site on November 24th and a small, disabled utility trailer was found parked on the east shoulder north of the north curve. On November 25th Gorski Consulting conducted a walk through the S-curve and no collision evidence was found.

As indicated previously, impacts of deer can leave little physical evidence of their occurrence. Thus, even though no impact evidence was found, there is a reasonable probability that the police –reported collision might still have occurred in the S-curve. It simply cannot be known without further information from the police file. Figures 45 and 46 provide views of the disabled trailer and the road conditions that existed during the examination on November 25th.



Figure 45: View from the dash camera of the Gorski Consulting vehicle while northbound near the north end of the north curve. A small utility trailer is seen parked on the east shoulder and there is no towing vehicle in sight.



Figure 46: View looking north toward the north curve demonstrating the type of road conditions that existed that the time of the examination of the S-curve on November 25th, 2014.

3.0 Discussion

In summary, 7 collisions were reported by police to have occurred in 2014 on Clarke Road between Fanshawe Park and Sunningdale Roads. Only one of these collisions (March 12th) could be matched to the evidence documented by Gorski Consulting at the S-curve. Even so, there was some uncertainty about the matching as the collision evidence was not observed until six days later.

One of the reasons for this lack of matching may be because 4 of the 7 reported collisions involved impacts with deer. Such collisions generally do not produce abundant physical evidence of their occurrence. Conversely one must maintain a healthy level of skepticism when evaluating such reports without a full review of the details. It is not uncommon for drivers who are involved in a single vehicle collision to raise the defense that the reason for collision was due to an animal being present on the road. In such cases it is advisable, where possible, to determine whether police identified visible,

objective evidence to support the determination or whether the determination was made based on the officer's subjective opinion.

The continual problem exists that the police dataset did not report where the noted collisions occurred within the 1300 metre distance between Fanshawe Park and Sunningdale Roads. Thus it is difficult to conclude whether any of the police-reported collisions simply did not produce sufficient, visible, physical evidence or whether they occurred outside of the bounds of the S-Curve where Gorski Consulting conducted its examinations.

Irrespective of this uncertainty, there was indisputable physical evidence that another two collisions occurred within the S-curve in the year 2014 that were not identified in the police dataset. These collisions occurred on the following dates:

1. March 18th.
2. April 4th.

Furthermore, there were another 4 loss-of-control incidents within the bounds of the S-curve that were documented by Gorski Consulting but were not noted in the police dataset. These incidents occurred on the following dates:

1. January 21st.
2. April 21st.
3. May 19th.
4. August 5th.

Assuming that the 7 police-reported collisions in the year 2014 occurred within the S-curve, the 2 additional collisions that were missed by the police represent about 22% of the collisions that were never reported. In the first article on this topic the collision data from 2011 were examined and it was found that 7 collisions were reported in the police dataset and another 5 were documented by Gorski Consulting that were missing and thus this represented 42% of total collisions were missing. Similarly the 2012 data indicated that police reported 8 collisions while Gorski Consulting identified an additional 2 collisions that were not reported representing a rate of missing data of 20%. The 2013 data indicated 4 police reported collisions occurred while Gorski Consulting identified another additional 3 collisions that were not reported representing a rate of missing data of 43%.

It is now possible to combine the results from all four years (2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014). In those 4 years police indicated that 26 collisions occurred. In those same years Gorski Consulting documented an additional 12 collisions that were not reported in the police data. Thus the research indicates that at least 32% of the collisions that actually occurred were not reported to police.

However this 32% could be a substantial underestimate. The data is complicated by the fact that police did not identify the location of the collisions that they reported. The request for data asked for collision data over the full 1300 metre length of Clarke Road between Fanshawe Park and Sunningdale Road. So conceivably police may have reported exactly what was asked for. In that sense, the collisions reported by them that were not located by Gorski Consulting within the S-curve could have occurred outside of the bounds of that curve. The number of police-reported collisions that were not matched in this way are noted below for each year”

Year 2011 = 1 collision not matched

Year 2012 = 5 collisions not matched

Year 2013 = 3 collisions not matched

Year 2014 = 6 collisions not matched

Thus if the above-mentioned 15 collisions actually occurred outside of the bounds of the S-curve then the number of police-reported collisions that occurred within the S-curve in the years 2011 to 2014 was not 26, but only 11. Thus if Gorski Consulting documented another 12 collisions that were missed by police this would indicate that 52% of the collisions that occurred in the S-curve were not reported to police.

Given the uncertainty caused by the lack of information about the location of collisions in the police data the widest range of possibility is that somewhere between 32 and 52% of the collisions that actually occurred at the S-curve of Clarke Road were not reported in the police data.

However this does not include the many loss-of-control incidents documented by Gorski Consulting that did not result in reported collisions. While these incidents are not required to be reported to police they never-the-less provide an indication as to the threat to the driving public and the unreported costs to society that result from the interaction of motor vehicles with curves on rural roads.

Furthermore these loss-of-control events only provide information about the end result of vehicles sliding and rotating to their rest positions with an apparent impact. There is not 100% certainty whether a collision might have occurred, of a minor nature, that then led to the observed loss of control events. Such a collision might involve the sideswiping of two vehicles for example where the determination of fault would be difficult and therefore both drivers would have a reason to hide the occurrence from police and their insurers.

The question raised in the previous articles is raised again: How does one achieve comfort in reconciling with these facts? For years various government agencies including transportation departments have used collision rates to understand how various safety measures have been performing. Various court proceedings have quoted collision rates as indicative of the safety of a particular road segment. How can these

actions be justified in the face of the evidence presented in these Gorski Consulting articles?

Gorski Consulting will continue to examine the remaining collision data of 2015 and 2016 to determine whether the above-noted trends continue.

Gorski Consulting
London, Ontario, Canada

*Copyright © Gorski Consulting,
All rights reserved*