

From: [Alexandre](#)
To: [Safe Streets](#)
Cc: [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: Can we use a High Risk Network instead of solely a High Injury Network?
Date: Thursday, April 16, 2026 3:05:09 PM

You don't often get email from minot.alexandre@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hi Jessica,

Thank you for your very clear presentation yesterday. It got me thinking about one point.

I have a bit of a philosophical and ethical problem with the High Injury Network. On the one hand, yes, absolutely, if someone is seriously injured or killed, we need to do something. But shouldn't we have done something before? You keep saying data-driven analysis, but really, a lot of vision zero is crash driven: There needs to be a serious crash before it comes on the vision zero radar.

Instead of measuring solely crashes, could we create a broader risk metric? In particular, high motor vehicle speed is dangerous. It's well documented that it correlates with high injuries. It's also fairly easy to measure: download speed board data, that paid-for data service that was mentioned, potentially add-ons to existing cameras, and when we need more data, temporary detection strips. Less easy to measure, but still doable, adding other high risk infractions like DUI or running red lights. Same, we know some infrastructure is unsafe: large lanes, many lanes, long stretch without signalized intersections, absence of bike infrastructure etc. All of this increase injury risk, and is measurable, and can still be part of a data driven analysis. Of course, we should keep injuries as part of the data.

You said the city will be updating the High Injury Network. Could we broaden it to a High Risk network instead?

Thanks,
Alexandre