



CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC SAFETY SURVEY 2021

DATA ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON WITH 2010-2020 SURVEY DATA RESULTS

Conducted on Behalf of

The California Office of Traffic Safety
The Safe Transportation Research and Education Center
University of California, Berkeley

June 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	4
OVERVIEW OF 2021 STUDY	7
SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS YEARS	7
Data Weights	8
Analysis Notes	8
Region Variable	9
Respondent Demographics	11
Safety Concerns (Q2)	12
Safety Concerns (Q2) by California Region	14
Safety Concerns (Q2) by Age	14
Behavioral Changes due to COVID-19 (COVID): Coding Categories	15
Behavioral Changes due to COVID-19 (COVID) by California Region	16
Behavioral Changes due to COVID-19 (COVID) by Age	17
Most Serious Distraction (Q3): Coding Categories	17
Most Serious Distraction (Q3) by Survey Wave	18
Most Serious Distraction (Q3) by Region	19
Using electronic device while driving (Q4) by Region and Wave	20
Driving Mistake Due to Cell Phone Use (Q5) by Wave	20
Near Crash Due to Other Driver Talking/Texting on a Cell Phone (Q6) by Wave	21
Likelihood of Being Ticketed for Hand-Held Phone Use or Texting (Q7) by Wave	21
Recall of “Go Safely California” (Q8a) by Region and Wave	22
Recall of “Drive Sober or Get Pulled Over” (Q8b) by Region and Wave	22
Recall of “Slow the Fast Down” Campaign (Q8c) by Region	23
Recall of “DUI Doesn’t Just Mean Booze” (Q8d) by Region and Wave	23
Recall of “Put Your Phone Down, Just Drive” (Q8e) by Region and Wave	24
Safety Campaign Source of Recall (Q8a-e)	24
Intoxicated Driving (Q9) by Wave	25
Intoxicated Driving (Q9) by Region	25
Use of Alternative Ride Services When Drinking (Q10) by Region and Wave	26
Designated Sober Driver (Q11) by Region and Wave	27
Recall of Sobriety/DUI Checkpoints in Past 6 Months (Q12) by Wave	28
Recall of Sobriety/DUI Checkpoints in Past 6 Months (Q12) by Region	28
Awareness of DUI (Q13) by Region and Wave	29

Likelihood of Getting Arrested for Driving Impaired (Q14) by Region and Wave	29
Perception of Marijuana Impairing Driving Functions (Q15) by Region and Wave	30
Perception of DUI of Drugs, Legal and Illegal (Q16) by Region and Wave	30
Safety of Driving 10 Miles Over the Speed Limit on Freeways (Q17) by Region and Wave	31
Safety of Driving 5 Miles Over the Speed Limit on Residential Streets (Q18) by Region and Wave	31
Chance of Being Ticketed for Driving Over Speed Limit (Q19) by Region and Wave	32
Perception of driverless vehicles and road safety (Q20) by Region and Wave	32
Sharing roads with driverless vehicles (Q21) by Region and Wave	33
Perception of Legality for Bikes on Roadways (Q22) by Region and Wave	33
Level of Comfort Sharing Road with Bicyclists with Bike Lanes (Q23) by Region and Wave	34
Sharing Road with Bicyclists without Bike Lane (Q24) by Region and Wave	35
Safety Problems Experienced as Pedestrian or Bicyclist (Q25): Coding Categories	35
Safety Problems Experienced as Pedestrian or Bicyclist (Q25) by Region and Wave	37
Safety Problems Experienced as Driver around Pedestrians and Bicyclists (Q26)	38
Safety Problems Experienced as Driver around Pedestrians and Bicyclists (Q26) by Region & Wave	39

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Biggest Safety Concern (Q2)

“Distracted Driving because of TEXTING” was the biggest safety concern for 74.3% of surveyed drivers of the online panel, followed by “Speeding and Aggressive Driving” and “Drunk Driving”, mentioned by 73.8% and 68.7% respectively (Table Q2_2).

Behavioral Changes due to COVID-19 (COVID)

“Aggressive Driving / Road Rage” was the most frequently given response in Southern and Central California regions, whereas in Northern California, “Have Not Noticed Any Changes” was the biggest behavioral change noticed in the past year (Table COVID_2).

Most Serious Distraction (Q3)

Consistent with prior data collection waves, in 2021, “Texting or Checking Phone While Driving” was reported as the most serious distraction by 69.7% of respondents (Table Q3_2).

Using Electronic Device While Driving (Q4)

Similar to previous waves, one-third of respondents (33.8%) indicated that they “Regularly” or “Sometimes” used an electronic wireless device while driving in the past 30 days, while two-thirds stated they “Rarely” or “Never” did (Table Q4).

Driving Mistake Due to Cell Phone Use (Q5)

The majority (59.8%) of respondents indicated they have never made a driving mistake while using a cell phone, a 4.5% significant decrease from 2020 (Table Q5).

Near Crash Due to Talking/Texting (Q6)

More than half (51.9%) of drivers in 2021 indicate that they have been hit or nearly hit by a driver who was talking or texting on a cell phone, which is similar to the 2020 data (Table Q6).

Recall of Traffic Safety Outreach Campaigns (Q8a-Q8e)

Similar to prior waves of data collection, the outreach campaign with the highest recall rate was “Drive Sober or Get Pulled Over”, with more than half of the surveyed drivers having seen or heard the campaign (Tables Q8a-Q8e). The 5.2% increase in recall of the “Go Safely California” campaign and the 3.5% increase of “DUI Doesn’t Just Mean Booze” compared to 2020 are significant.

Campaign	Recall Rate 2021	Recall Rate 2020	Recall Rate 2019	Recall Rate 2018	Recall Rate 2017
“Go Safely California”	35.4%	30.2%	16.4%	--	--
“Drive Sober or Get Pulled Over”	50.2%	50.3%	34.8%	42.5%	38.4%
“Slow the Fast Down”	19.1%		--	--	--
“DUI Doesn’t Just Mean Booze”	45.0%	41.5%	30.1%	43.0%	29.3%
“Put Your Phone Down, Just Drive”	33.0%	30.4%	17.1%	29.4%	--

Alcohol-Impaired Driving (Q9)

The number of surveyed drivers who reported driving after having too much to drink in the past six months was similar to the previous year, an increase of 1.4% over 2020 (Table Q9_1).

Use of Ride Services (Q10)

More than half (52.7%) of respondents reported they have not used ride services when drinking in the past six months, similar to the previous year's responses (Table Q10).

Designated Sober Driver (Q11)

In 2021, 32.6% of respondents reported "Always" using a designated driver in the past six months, while 39.6% reported "Never" using one. Comparisons among regions and with the previous year's data did not show any significant differences (Table Q11).

Recall of Sobriety Checkpoints (Q12)

More than half (51.0%) of respondents have seen or heard about police sobriety or DUI checkpoints in the past 6 months; this 4.5% decrease compared to 2020 was significant (Table Q12_1). Additionally, there was a significant regional difference in recall, with Central California drivers having a higher recall rate than Northern California drivers (Table Q12_2).

Likelihood of Arrest for Impaired Driving (Q14)

Overall, 78.8% of California drivers believed it to be "Very Likely" or "Somewhat Likely" to be arrested for driving impaired (Table Q14).

Marijuana Impairing Driving Functions (Q15)

In 2021, 77.0% of respondents believed marijuana can impair driving functions, compared to 80.1% in 2020 (Table Q15).

Safety of Driving 10 MPH Over Speed Limit (Q17)

Between 2020 and 2021 there was a significant 3.1% reduction in the number of respondents who believe it is safe to drive 10 miles over the speed limit on freeways (Table Q17).

Safety of Driving 5 MPH Over Speed Limit (Q18)

The majority (51.7%) of respondents believe it is unsafe to drive 5 miles over the speed limit on residential streets, with a comparable distribution between regions (Table Q18).

Chances of Being Ticketed for Speeding (Q19)

Over two-thirds of drivers (68.4%) believe it is "Very Likely" or "Somewhat Likely" to get a ticket for driving over the speed limit, similar to the previous year's results (Table Q19).

Driverless Vehicles and Road Safety (Q20)

48.3% of respondents reported they did not believe driverless vehicles will make roadways safer, a 2.2% increase from 2020 (Table Q20).

Sharing Road with Driverless Vehicle (Q21)

The majority (58.1%) of drivers were "Somewhat Uncomfortable" or "Very Uncomfortable" sharing the road with driverless vehicles, which is similar to the 2020 distribution of responses for this measure. There was a significant regional difference in 2021; Central California drivers were the most likely to say they are "Very Uncomfortable" and Northern California drivers are most likely to say they are "Very Comfortable" (Table Q21).

Legality of Bicyclists on Roadways (Q22)

When asked whether they believe it is legal to ride bicycles on roadways, 62.2% of surveyed drivers in 2021 believed so, compared to 63.0% of the 2020 respondents, without significant change (Table Q22).

Sharing Road with Bicyclists (Q23)

72.0% of drivers were “Very Comfortable” or “Somewhat Comfortable” sharing the road with bicyclists in bike lanes, with a similar distribution among regions and consistent with the previous year’s data (Table Q23).

OVERVIEW OF 2021 STUDY

The 2021 California Traffic Safety Study was conducted with an online panel of California drivers, as in the prior year of data collection. While in previous years, data was collected via in-person intercepts, the 2020 wave transitioned to an online, self-administered survey, a mode that was continued in 2021 to avoid in-person contact in light of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. This report describes the findings of the 2021 Traffic Safety data, with a comparison to previous years of data, which include opinions on traffic safety, distracted driving, bicycle and pedestrian interactions, and other driving behaviors from a representative sample of California drivers.

The online survey panelists were provided by MSG, a commercial sample and panel vendor. Participants were forwarded to an online survey portal programmed and managed by E&W. Eligibility criteria for participation included a valid California driver's license and being 18 year or older. Quotas were specified for age groups and gender to align the 2021 survey with previous waves of the Traffic Safety Study and to achieve a representative cross-section of pre-screened and qualified respondents.

Survey participation was anonymous, and a total of 2,801 responses were collected in May of 2021.

SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS YEARS

Since the 2020 and 2021 waves of data collection were both conducted online, a more direct comparison of results between these waves was possible. However, comparisons to waves before 2020 should also recognize the potential impact of the different data collection modes as well as the unique circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, previous intercept surveys included measures administered by field staff who recorded the responses from a set of options that were not read to the respondent. The corresponding online survey measures, however, presented all the response options to the respondent, which facilitated a greater number of responses than previous years. Furthermore, 2020/2021 responses were likely affected by changes in travel behavior due to the pandemic.

2,801 drivers participated in the survey, resulting in an overall confidence interval of +/- 1.85, at a confidence level of 95%.

In this report, the statistically significant differences in 2021 findings as compared to the previous year are highlighted in the 2021 data column, and the statistically significant differences within regions are highlighted in the respective region column. Every effort has been made to match the 2021 sample with previous waves by age, gender and geographic region, to minimize the effects of sample differences between data collection years.

Since the number of valid responses differs by question, the total number of responses reported varies by table. These totals reflect variations in the number of valid answers respondents provided for each measure, excluding all "Don't know" and "Prefer not to answer" responses. In addition, due to skip patterns programmed in the survey, some questions were not shown to all respondents. The rounding of percentages resulted in some percentages not always adding up to the exact value of 100.0%.

Data Weights

As with the 2020 panel data analysis, a calculated population weight based on age group and gender was applied to the collected data. These applied weights resulted in only minor adjustments to the data; since the 2021 panel data was collected with more detailed age and gender quotas, the sample distribution was much closer to the most recent Census data for Californians age 18 and over (see Table Weights by Age and Gender).

Table Weights by Age and Gender. Census data, survey results and proportional weight calculation

Age Range	Census Data*		Survey Data		Weights		Weighted Survey Data	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
18-24	51.5%	48.5%	55.1%	44.9%	0.93	1.08	51.4%	48.6%
25-34	51.6%	48.4%	48.9%	51.1%	1.06	0.95	51.7%	48.3%
35-44	50.5%	49.5%	55.1%	44.9%	0.92	.10	50.6%	49.4%
45-54	49.8%	50.2%	44.2%	55.8%	1.13	0.90	49.8%	50.2%
55-70	48.2%	51.8%	49.8%	50.2%	0.97	1.03	48.4%	51.6%
71 +	43.2%	56.8%	51.3%	48.7%	0.84	1.17	42.9%	57.1%
Total	49.3%	50.7%	50.7%	49.3%	0.97	1.03	50.1%	49.9%

*Source: Census.gov: ACS DEMOGRAPHIC AND HOUSING ESTIMATES 2019 American Community Survey

The population weights for gender were calculated based on the proportional weight calculation formula in the Table Weights Formula.

Table Weights Formula. Proportional weight calculation formula

$$W_p = \frac{\text{Percent of Population}}{\text{Percent of Respondents}} = \frac{P_i / P_{total}}{R_i / R_{total}}$$

Analysis Notes

The California Traffic Safety Study 2021 used a convenience sample of a commercially available online panel, similar to the 2020 data collection wave. The analysis outlined in the 2021 report is based on a sample size similar to previous years' data collection.

Because the 2020 and 2021 survey were both conducted online, and, thus, were comparable data collection modes, tests for significance were calculated and will be noted where applicable.

➔ For multiple choice questions, a respondent could give more than one answer. The listed "Percent of cases" column is calculated from the total number respondents who answered a question. The resulting percentage is more than 100.0% and reflects the percentage of respondents who selected the answer, not the percentage of total answers given, which would add up to 100.0%.

- ➔ The findings are reported weighted, with the data weights applied as outlined in Table Weights by Age and Gender.
- ➔ The significances outlined refer to a two-tailed probability with the resulting value of “z” and a *p* value indicating the difference between the listed (and assumed independent) proportion of drivers interviewed per wave. Where applicable, the significant differences calculated were adjusted for pairwise comparisons using the Bonferroni correction. Significant findings in table cells are highlighted in orange.
- ➔ The survey version used was the same as the 2020 survey instrument, with the addition of one question and minor updates to the answer choices for two other questions.

Region Variable

The 58 California counties were included in the online survey, and segmented into three regions: “Northern California,” “Central California,” and “Southern California,” comparable to previous waves (Table R1).

Table R1. Three geographic region definitions by county

Northern California				
Alameda	El Dorado	Mendocino	Sacramento	Solano
Alpine	Glenn	Modoc	San Francisco	Sonoma
Amador	Humboldt	Mono	San Mateo	Sutter
Butte	Inyo	Napa	Santa Clara	Tehama
Colusa	Lake	Nevada	Shasta	Trinity
Contra Costa	Lassen	Placer	Sierra	Yolo
Del Norte	Marin	Plumas	Siskiyou	Yuba
Central California			Southern California	
Calaveras	Merced	Santa Cruz	Imperial	Ventura
Fresno	Monterey	Stanislaus	Los Angeles	
Kern	San Benito	Tulare	Orange	
Kings	San Joaquin	Tuolumne	Riverside	
Madera	San Luis Obispo		San Bernardino	
Mariposa	Santa Barbara		San Diego	

For the 2021 survey, data was collected from 54 counties, with Table R2 showing the number of completed surveys by county.

Table R2. Completed surveys by county

County	Northern California	Total	County	Central California	Total	County	Southern California	Total
Alameda	112	4.0%	Calaveras	9	0.3%	Imperial	8	0.3%
Alpine	3	0.1%	Fresno	75	2.7%	Los Angeles	829	29.6%
Amador	4	0.1%	Kern	50	1.8%	Orange	256	9.1%
Butte	18	0.6%	Kings	9	0.3%	Riverside	144	5.1%
Colusa	3	0.1%	Madera	7	0.2%	San Bernardino	126	4.5%
Contra Costa	80	2.9%	Merced	17	0.6%	San Diego	238	8.5%
Del Norte	11	0.4%	Monterey	22	0.8%	Ventura	62	2.2%
El Dorado	23	0.8%	San Benito	8	0.3%	Total	1,663	
Glenn	3	0.1%	San Joaquin	49	1.7%	% of total	59.4%	
Humboldt	14	0.5%	San Luis Obispo	23	0.8%			
Inyo	2	0.1%	Santa Barbara	17	0.6%			
Lake	9	0.3%	Santa Cruz	11	0.4%			
Lassen	3	0.1%	Stanislaus	32	1.1%			
Marin	10	0.4%	Tulare	21	0.7%			
Mendocino	3	0.1%	Tuolumne	1	0.0%			
Mono	3	0.1%	Total	351				
Napa	6	0.2%	% of total	12.5%				
Nevada	8	0.3%						
Placer	27	1.0%						
Plumas	2	0.1%						
Sacramento	140	5.0%						
San Francisco	74	2.6%						
San Mateo	35	1.2%						
Santa Clara	103	3.7%						
Shasta	14	0.5%						
Siskiyou	2	0.1%						
Solano	27	1.0%						
Sonoma	18	0.6%						
Sutter	6	0.2%						
Tehama	3	0.1%						
Yolo	10	0.4%						
Yuba	11	0.4%						
Total	787							
% of total	28.1%							

The unweighted absolute totals and weighted percent of online completed surveys by California region are outlined in Table R3, with the majority of completed weighted surveys (1,663, 59.3%) from Southern California drivers, which corresponds to previous years of data collection.

Table R3. Completed surveys by region and year

Region	Number of Completes	Percent	Weighted Percent	2020 Percent	2019 Percent
Northern California	787	28.1%	28.1%	29.5%	32.6%
Central California	351	12.5%	12.6%	12.7%	12.6%
Southern California	1,663	59.4%	59.3%	57.8%	54.9%
Total	2,801	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Respondent Demographics

The weighted respondent age and gender distributions by California region are outlined in Table D1, showing a slightly higher percentage of respondents from the 18–24-year-old range (both male and female), as compared to the 2020 age distribution.

Table D1. Age and gender distribution by geographic regions and year comparison

Gender	Age Group	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total	2020 Total	2019 Total
Male	18-24	15.5%	18.0%	20.4%	18.7%	10.7%	11.9%
	25-34	22.6%	32.3%	17.5%	20.7%	23.1%	25.0%
	35-44	21.1%	19.8%	21.1%	21.0%	23.6%	25.6%
	45-54	20.1%	15.0%	19.7%	19.2%	25.1%	19.8%
	55-70	16.5%	13.2%	17.6%	16.7%	14.6%	14.8%
	71 or	4.2%	1.8%	3.7%	3.6%	2.9%	3.0%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Female	18-24	16.8%	16.8%	18.3%	17.7%	10.1%	17.1%
	25-34	20.0%	18.9%	19.4%	19.5%	21.7%	25.3%
	35-44	19.2%	23.2%	20.6%	20.6%	23.3%	19.3%
	45-54	18.7%	20.0%	19.6%	19.4%	25.2%	19.9%
	55-70	21.3%	17.3%	16.5%	17.9%	15.9%	15.5%
	71 or	3.9%	3.8%	5.5%	4.9%	3.9%	2.9%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The distribution of respondent gender by region is shown in Table D2 with a distribution similar to previous years of data collection (not shown).

Table D2. Gender distribution by geographic regions

Gender	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total
Male	51.8%	47.4%	49.8%	50.1%
Female	48.2%	52.6%	50.2%	49.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Safety Concerns (Q2)

Respondents were asked to identify the biggest safety concerns on California roadways. The provided multiple-choice options are listed in Table Q2_1, with additionally coded open-ended responses highlighted in blue.

Table Q2 1. “In your opinion, what are the biggest safety problems on California roadways?”

Drunk Driving	Congestion on Roadways
Speeding/Aggressive Driving	Construction on Roadways
Distracted Driving because of TALKING	Unlicensed/Uninsured Drivers
Distracted Driving because of TEXTING	Trash/Debris
Internal Car Distractions (passengers, eating, grooming, adjusting radio/stereo)	Not Signaling Lane Change/Merging Vehicles
Bad Road Surfaces	Running Red Lights & Stop Signs
Not Wearing Seatbelts	Infrastructure Issues
Drugged Driving	Perceived Driving Skills
Other (un-coded)	

The multi-choice question on the biggest safety problems on California roadways resulted in 10,799 answers. The most frequently cited safety problem was “Distracted Driving because of Texting,” with 18.9% of total responses and 74.3% of all respondents indicating this concern. The second most frequent response was “Speeding and Aggressive Driving,” with 18.8% of all responses and selected by 73.8% of respondents, followed by “Drunk Driving”, with 17.5% of responses and 68.7% of respondents (Table Q2_2).

Table Q2 2. Frequencies of Q2 by percent of answers and percent of drivers

Q2 all answers combined	Count	% of Answers	% of Drivers
Distracted Driving because of TEXTING	2,041	18.9%	74.3%
Speeding/Aggressive Driving	2,029	18.8%	73.8%
Drunk Driving	1,888	17.5%	68.7%
Drugged Driving	1,210	11.2%	44.0%
Bad Road Surfaces	1,179	10.9%	42.9%
Distracted Driving because of TALKING	973	9.0%	35.4%
Internal Car Distractions (passengers, eating, grooming, adjusting radio/stereo)	700	6.5%	25.5%
Not Wearing Seatbelts	699	6.5%	25.4%
All Other Responses Combined	80	0.7%	2.90%
Total	10,799	100.0%	392.9%

The biggest safety problem on California roadways compared to previous years is shown in Table Q2_3. The three most frequently mentioned responses in 2021 (“Distracted Driving because of Texting”, “Speeding and Aggressive Driving,” and “Drunk Driving”) corresponds to the previous year’s data, and resembles the results from previous waves.

Table Q2_3. Frequencies of top six responses to Q2 by percent of answers provided and by year of data collection

Q2 all answers combined	% answers 2021	% answers 2020	% answers 2019	% answers 2018	% answers 2017	% answers 2016	% answers 2015	% answers 2014	% answers 2013	% answers 2012	% answers 2011	% answers 2010
Distracted Driving because of Texting	18.9%	19.8%	19.4%	16.9%	14.7%	18.2%	16.1%	21.2%	20.3%	17.1%	18.5%	9.9%
Speeding/Aggressive Driving	18.8%	19.1%	20.3%	19.4%	27.7%	19.2%	18.1%	20.2%	14.3%	15.6%	17.6%	18.2%
Drunk Driving	17.5%	17.9%	9.2%	6.5%	22.9%	5.6%	6.6%	6.2%	5.7%	4.3%	12.6%	7.9%
Drugged Driving	11.2%	10.6%	1.8%	1.3%	1.5%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Bad Road Surfaces	10.9%	10.5%	11.0%	15.3%	3.8%	12.2%	13.0%	10.4%	9.2%	11.4%	11.6%	11.6%
Distracted Driving because of Talking	9.0%	9.0%	15.7%	14.2%	11.9%	13.8%	11.7%	18.0%	16.0%	18.3%	20.3%	15.8%
All other responses combined	13.7%	13.1%	22.6%	26.4%	17.5%	31.0%	34.5%	24.0%	34.5%	33.3%	19.4%	36.6%
Total responses	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Safety Concerns (Q2) by California Region

The crosstabulations of the biggest safety concerns by region are outlined in Table Q2_4, with respondents from Northern California and Southern California most frequently indicating “Distracted Driving because of texting,” while Central California respondents most frequently citing “Speeding/Aggressive Driving” as the biggest safety problem.

Table Q2 4. Frequencies of top five safety concerns by region

Q2 by Region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California
Distracted Driving because of TEXTING	18.5%	17.6%	19.3%
Speeding/Aggressive Driving	18.3%	18.8%	19.0%
Drunk Driving	17.5%	17.7%	17.4%
Drugged Driving	11.1%	11.2%	11.2%
Bad Road Surfaces	11.7%	12.6%	10.2%
All other responses combined	22.9%	22.1%	22.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Safety Concerns (Q2) by Age

The five most frequently stated safety concerns by age are shown in Table Q2_5, with a similar pattern of distribution across all age groups.

Table Q2 5. Cross-tabulation of top five safety concerns by age group

Q2 by Age	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-70	71 or older
Distracted Driving because of TEXTING	17.2%	18.1%	18.7%	20.1%	20.4%	19.3%
Speeding/Aggressive Driving	18.3%	18.5%	18.7%	20.3%	18.5%	17.8%
Drunk Driving	19.6%	18.3%	17.7%	16.0%	16.1%	16.4%
Drugged Driving	13.2%	10.0%	11.0%	10.6%	11.5%	10.6%
Bad Road Surfaces	9.1%	11.4%	11.4%	12.1%	10.6%	9.7%
All other responses combined	22.6%	23.7%	22.5%	20.9%	22.9%	26.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Behavioral Changes due to COVID-19 (COVID): Coding Categories

In the 2021 wave of data collection, a survey item was added to the online questionnaire to ascertain respondents' perception of other drivers' behaviors since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, asking them to indicate the biggest change they have noticed. Respondents were able to select from a list of answering choices and could enter any additional changes not listed as an open-ended response. Table COVID_1 outlines the answer choices provided, along with additional coding categories based on the open-ended responses (highlighted in blue).

Table COVID_1. "Since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, what is the biggest change in behaviors you have noticed from drivers" with additional code categories

Speeding	Fewer Drivers
Impaired Driving	General Poor/Inconsiderate Driving
Not Wearing Seatbelts	Running Red Lights/Not Signaling
Distracted driving because of Talking and/or Texting	Mask Wearing
Aggressive Driving / road rage	
Have not noticed any changes	
Other (Uncoded)	

Behavioral Changes due to COVID-19 (COVID) by California Region

Table COVID_2 shows the distribution of answers by California region. “Aggressive Driving/Road Rage” was the most frequently given response in all three regions except Northern California, where “Have Not Noticed Any Changes” was cited as frequently as “Aggressive Driving/Road Rage” as the biggest change in driving behavior.

Table COVID 2. “Since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, what is the biggest change in behaviors you have noticed from drivers” by region

COVID by Region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021
Aggressive Driving/Road Rage	24.5%	28.8%	26.9%	26.5%
Have Not Noticed Any Changes	24.5%	25.9%	23.1%	23.8%
Speeding	23.1%	17.9%	26.0%	24.2%
Distracted Driving because of Talking and/or Texting	17.7%	17.6%	15.5%	16.4%
Impaired Driving	6.6%	5.8%	5.3%	5.7%
Not Wearing Seatbelts	1.7%	2.0%	1.8%	1.8%
Fewer Drivers	0.9%	0.9%	0.5%	0.6%
General Poor/Inconsiderate Driving	0.6%	0.6%	0.2%	0.4%
Other	0.3%	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%
Running Red Lights/Not Signaling	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%
Mask Wearing	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Behavioral Changes due to COVID-19 (COVID) by Age

Drivers aged 45-54 were most likely to identify “Aggressive Driving/Road Rage” as the biggest change in behavior since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, as shown in Table COVID_3. Conversely, 35–44-year-olds most frequently cited “Speeding” as the biggest change.

Table COVID_3. “Since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, what is the biggest change in behaviors you have noticed from drivers” by age

COVID by Age	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-70	71 or older
Aggressing Driving/Road Rage	25.5%	25.3%	26.2%	28.6%	27.1%	25.2%
Speeding	23.9%	20.8%	27.2%	25.2%	23.2%	26.9%
Have Not Noticed Any Changes	21.7%	24.8%	20.6%	23.7%	27.3%	31.1%
Distracted Driving because of Talking and/or Texting	15.5%	16.7%	17.3%	15.8%	17.0%	13.4%
Impaired Driving	7.2%	8.1%	6.1%	4.3%	3.3%	1.7%
Not Wearing Seatbelts	5.4%	2.3%	1.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
General Poor/Inconsiderate Driving	0.4%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Fewer Drivers	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%	1.0%	0.8%
Mask Wearing	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Other	0.0%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.8%
Running Red Lights/Not Signaling	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Most Serious Distraction (Q3): Coding Categories

Respondents were asked what they perceive as the most serious distraction for drivers. Respondents were only able to select one answer choice, but had the option to provide an open-ended response if none of the provided categories accurately represented their opinion. Table Q3_1 shows the provided answer choices, with the additional coding categories based on open-ended answers highlighted in blue.

Note: minor revisions were made to some answer categories in the 2021 wave of data collection.

Table Q3_1. “In your opinion, what is the MOST serious distraction for drivers” with additional code categories

Talking on phone (handheld or hands-free) while driving	Car Crashes causing Rubbernecking	Age/Gender/Ethnicity of Other Drivers
Texting or Checking Phone While Driving	Dashboard Screens/Navigation Systems	Drunk Drivers
Passengers in Car	Roadside Billboards	Drivers Distracted/Inattentive
Eating While Driving	Other	Construction on Roadways

Most Serious Distraction (Q3) by Survey Wave

As in previous years of data collection, respondents in 2021 most often indicated “Texting or checking phone while driving” as the biggest distraction for drivers. “Texting or checking phone while driving” has been the most frequently given response for this measure since 2013, with Table Q3_2 showing the distribution of 2021 answers, compared to previous years (the most frequently cited distraction per survey wave is highlighted).

Note: Some of the answering choices provided were phrased slightly different in the 2021 survey iteration; the minor wording changes of the response choices are outlined below the table.

Table Q3 2. Frequencies of Q3 by survey year

Q3	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014	Total 2013	Total 2012	Total 2011	Total 2010
Texting or Checking Phone While Driving*	69.7%	68.5%	46.7%	44.5%	50.8%	44.1%	39.0%	51.8%	47.9%	37.2%	27.6%	12.7%
Talking on Phone While Driving	17.2%	17.4%	23.1%	32.2%	31.9%	33.5%	22.2%	29.5%	33.4%	42.8%	56.0%	61.9%
Car Crashes causing Rubbernecking***	5.0%	6.4%	6.2%	5.3%	1.4%	1.7%	1.6%	1.3%	1.4%	2.9%	1.9%	1.9%
Eating While Driving	2.5%	1.7%	2.4%	0.5%	1.3%	0.6%	1.5%	1.8%	0.5%	0.8%	1.2%	1.9%
Passengers in Car	2.4%	1.2%	4.1%	2.3%	1.7%	0.6%	1.2%	2.0%	1.5%	1.4%	1.8%	3.3%
Dashboard/Navigation Systems**	1.5%	1.7%	2.5%	0.8%	1.3%	1.7%	0.7%	0.9%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%
Roadside Billboards	1.0%	1.5%	2.3%	1.7%	1.2%	1.5%	2.6%	0.9%	1.8%	1.9%	1.3%	2.1%
All other responses combined	0.7%	1.6%	12.7%	12.7%	10.4%	16.3%	31.2%	11.8%	13.1%	12.5%	9.7%	16.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*"Texting while driving" in 2020 survey

**"GPS/Navigation System" in 2020 survey

***"Car Crashes/Vehicle Issues" in 2020 survey

Most Serious Distraction (Q3) by Region

In 2021, respondents across all three California regions most commonly indicated “Texting or Checking Phone While Driving” as the most serious distraction for drivers, with a comparable distribution of responses overall (Table Q3_3).

Table Q3 3. Frequencies of Q3 by California region

Q3 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California
Texting or Checking Phone While Driving	66.6%	68.2%	71.4%
Talking on Phone While Driving	19.7%	15.8%	16.3%
Car Crashes causing Rubbernecking	5.9%	5.7%	4.4%
Eating While Driving	2.4%	2.3%	2.5%
Passengers in Car	2.8%	3.7%	1.9%
Dashboard/Navigation Systems	1.0%	1.7%	1.7%
Roadside Billboards	1.0%	0.6%	1.1%
All Other Responses Combined	0.6%	2.0%	0.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Using electronic device while driving (Q4) by Region and Wave

Similar to previous waves, about one-third of 2021 respondents (33.8%) indicated that they “Regularly” or “Sometimes” used an electronic wireless device while driving in the past 30 days, while about two-thirds stated they “Rarely” or “Never” did. The differences between California regions are not significant and are similarly distributed for both 2020 and 2021 online survey administrations, but the answers are significantly different compared to the in-person data collected in 2019 and might be the result of the data collection mode ($p < 0.01$, Table Q4).

Table Q4. “How often in the past 30 days have you used an electronic wireless device, like a cell phone when driving?” by region and year

Q4 by Region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Regularly	114 14.6%	42 12.1%	267 16.2%	423 15.2%	428 15.1%	458 35.4%	443 32.0%
Sometimes	140 17.9%	68 19.5%	310 18.8%	518 18.6%	528 18.6%	380 29.4%	295 21.3%
Rarely	221 28.3%	106 30.5%	465 28.2%	792 28.5%	872 30.7%	268 20.7%	298 21.5%
Never	306 39.2%	132 37.9%	608 36.8%	1,046 37.6%	1,015 35.7%	188 14.5%	348 25.1%
Total	781 100.0%	348 100.0%	1,650 100.0%	2,779 100.0%	2,843 100.0%	1,294 100.0%	1,384 100.0%

Driving Mistake Due to Cell Phone Use (Q5) by Wave

Respondents were asked whether they have ever made a driving mistake while talking or texting on a cell phone. The majority (59.8%) of respondents indicated they have not, as shown in Table Q5. The 4.5% decrease in drivers reporting mistakes from 2020 is significant ($p < 0.01$).

Table Q5. “Have you EVER made a driving mistake while talking OR texting on a cell phone?” by year

Q5 by year	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014	Total 2013	Total 2012	Total 2011	Total 2010
Yes	1,108 40.2%	1,263 44.7%	665 51.3%	634 46.0%	670 49.3%	550 43.9%	744 39.4%	858 47.1%	866 45.0%	827 44.6%	802 45.8%	766 46.5%
No	1,648 59.8%	1,561 55.3%	632 48.7%	743 54.0%	690 50.7%	704 56.1%	1,143 60.6%	965 52.9%	1,060 55.0%	1,027 55.4%	951 54.2%	883 53.5%
Total	2,756 100.0%	2,824 100.0%	1,297 100.0%	1,377 100.0%	1,360 100.0%	1,254 100.0%	1,887 100.0%	1,823 100.0%	1,926 100.0%	1,854 100.0%	1,753 100.0%	1,649 100.0%

Near Crash Due to Other Driver Talking/Texting on a Cell Phone (Q6) by Wave

More than half (51.9%) of respondents in 2021 indicate that they have been hit or nearly hit by a driver who was talking or texting on a cell phone, which is similar to the 2020 data collection (Table Q6).

Table Q6. “Have you ever been hit or nearly hit by a driver who was talking or texting on a cell phone?” by year

Q6 by year	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014	Total 2013	Total 2012	Total 2011	Total 2010
Yes	1,434 51.9%	1,466 51.7%	739 57.9%	852 62.3%	827 61.0%	685 54.6%	1,117 59.6%	1,098 61.2%	421 59.5%	1,067 60.1%	1,038 60.1%	912 57.5%
No	1,330 48.1%	1,371 48.3%	538 42.1%	515 37.7%	528 39.0%	570 45.4%	756 40.4%	697 38.8%	286 40.5%	708 39.9%	689 39.9%	673 42.5%
Total	2,764 100.0%	2,837 100.0%	1,277 100.0%	1,367 100.0%	1,355 100.0%	1,255 100.0%	1,873 100.0%	1,795 100.0%	707 100.0%	1,775 100.0%	1,727 100.0%	1,585 100.0%

Likelihood of Being Ticketed for Hand-Held Phone Use or Texting (Q7) by Wave

In each wave of data collection, respondents are asked about their perception of the likelihood of being ticketed for using a hand-held cell phone or texting while driving. Table Q7 shows the 2021 distribution, compared to previous waves. The distribution of answers is almost identical to the 2020 survey panel responses.

Table Q7. “What do you think is the likelihood of being ticketed for hand-held cell phone use or texting?” by year

Q7 by year	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014	Total 2013	Total 2012
Very Likely	643 23.2%	679 23.9%	269 21.0%	314 23.0%	287 21.2%	272 21.5%	444 23.4%	424 23.4%	493 26.3%	368 20.1%
Somewhat Likely	760 27.4%	792 27.9%	288 22.4%	344 25.1%	277 20.4%	265 21.0%	459 24.2%	416 23.0%	599 31.9%	570 31.2%
Neither Likely or Unlikely	378 13.6%	391 13.8%	228 17.8%	168 12.3%	197 14.5%	150 11.9%	218 11.5%	210 11.6%	131 7.0%	154 8.4%
Somewhat Unlikely	444 16.0%	425 15.0%	261 20.3%	250 18.3%	262 19.3%	256 20.3%	361 19.1%	376 20.8%	306 16.3%	356 19.5%
Very Unlikely	552 19.9%	555 19.5%	238 18.5%	292 21.3%	333 24.6%	320 25.3%	412 21.8%	385 21.3%	349 18.6%	379 20.7%
Total	2,778 100.0%	2,841 100.0%	1,284 100.0%	1,395 100.0%	1,356 100.0%	1,263 100.0%	1,894 100.0%	1,811 100.0%	1,878 100.0%	1,827 100.0%

Recall of “Go Safely California” (Q8a) by Region and Wave

Respondents are asked each wave whether they have heard of various California Office of Traffic Safety campaigns. In 2021, 35.4% of drivers recalled seeing or hearing the campaign “Go Safely California”, with the highest recall in Southern California compared to the other two regions and a similar distribution overall among regions. Compared to 2020, when 30.2% reported seeing or hearing the campaign, the 5.2% increase in recall is significant ($p < 0.01$, Table Q8a).

Table Q8a. “In the past 6 months, do you recall: Go Safely California?” by region and year

Q8a by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019
Yes	220 33.5%	94 31.4%	526 37.0%	840 35.4%	744 30.2%	207 16.4%
No	436 66.5%	205 68.6%	894 63.0%	1,535 64.6%	1,716 69.8%	1052 83.6%
Total	656 100.0%	299 100.0%	1,420 100.0%	2,375 100.0%	2,460 100.0%	1,259 100.0%

Recall of “Drive Sober or Get Pulled Over” (Q8b) by Region and Wave

The second safety campaign, “Drive Sober or Get Pulled Over” was recalled by over half (50.2%) of all respondents, with a comparable distribution across regions and consistent with the 2020 survey results (Table Q8b).

Table Q8b. “In the past 6 months, do you recall: Drive Sober or Get Pulled Over?” by region and year

Q8b by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016
Yes	347 49.2%	167 52.5%	743 50.2%	1,257 50.2%	1,306 50.3%	439 34.8%	577 42.5%	518 38.4%	515 40.8%
No	359 50.8%	151 47.5%	737 49.8%	1,247 49.8%	1,292 49.7%	821 65.2%	781 57.5%	830 61.6%	747 59.2%
Total	706 100.0%	318 100.0%	1,480 100.0%	2,504 100.0%	2,598 100.0%	1,260 100.0%	1,358 100.0%	1,348 100.0%	1,262 100.0%

Recall of “Slow the Fast Down” Campaign (Q8c) by Region

“Slow the Fast Down”, the third safety campaign and new addition to the 2021 survey, had the highest recall among Southern California respondents, with 20.1% reporting seeing or hearing the campaign, but without significant differences in responses overall among regions (Table Q8c).

Table Q8c. “In the past 6 months, do you recall: “Slow the Fast Down?” by region and year

Q8c by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021
Yes	132 18.7%	49 15.6%	298 20.1%	479 19.1%
No	575 81.3%	266 84.4%	1,182 79.9%	2,023 80.9%
Total	707 100.0%	315 100.0%	1,480 100.0%	2,502 100.0%

Recall of “DUI Doesn’t Just Mean Booze” (Q8d) by Region and Wave

The fourth safety campaign, “DUI Doesn’t Just Mean Booze” was recalled by 45.0% of respondents in 2021, a 3.5% slightly significant increase from the previous year’s results ($p < 0.05$, Table Q8d).

Table Q8d. “In the past 6 months, do you recall: DUI Doesn’t Just Mean Booze” by region and year

Q8d by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017
Yes	321 45.3%	138 43.0%	675 45.3%	1,134 45.0%	1,091 41.5%	376 30.1%	585 43.0%	394 29.3%
No	338 54.7%	183 57.0%	816 54.7%	1,387 55.0%	1,535 58.5%	874 69.9%	775 57.0%	950 70.7%
Total	709 100.0%	321 100.0%	1,491 100.0%	2,521 100.0%	2,626 100.0%	1,250 100.0%	1,360 100.0%	1,344 100.0%

Recall of “Put Your Phone Down, Just Drive” (Q8e) by Region and Wave

The final safety campaign surveyed was “Put your Phone Down, Just Drive”, where approximately one-third of respondents (33.0%) indicated they recalled the campaign. Recall in Southern California was highest (34.9%), and a slightly lower percentage of respondents recalled this campaign in Northern and Central California (30.3% each), but there were no significant differences when compared across regions and with the 2020 responses (Table Q8e).

Table Q8e. “In the past 6 months, do you recall: Put Your Phone Down, Just Drive” by region and year

Q8e by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Yes	213 30.3%	95 30.3%	526 34.9%	834 33.0%	800 30.4%	213 17.1%	398 29.4%
No	491 69.7%	219 69.7%	982 65.1%	1,692 67.0%	1,830 69.6%	1,035 82.9%	954 70.6%
Total	704 100.0%	314 100.0%	1,508 100.0%	2,526 100.0%	2,630 100.0%	1,248 100.0%	1,352 100.0%

Safety Campaign Source of Recall (Q8a-e)

Respondents who recalled a safety campaign were then asked where they had seen or heard the campaign. Table Q8a_e outlines the results, with the most frequent response highlighted for each campaign. “Road Sign” was reported most often as the source for the majority of the safety campaigns, except for the “Go Safely California” campaign, where respondents were most likely to report seeing or hearing the campaign on TV.

Table Q8a e Follow-Up: “Where did you See or Hear...?” respective campaign source

Q8a-e	Go Safely California	Drive Sober or Get Pulled Over	Slow the Fast Down	DUI Doesn’t Just Mean Booze	Put Your Phone Down, Just Drive
Road Sign	19.9%	30.7%	24.7%	31.1%	24.0%
TV	20.0%	20.1%	14.0%	21.0%	17.0%
Facebook	16.7%	12.1%	17.7%	11.8%	15.8%
Twitter	10.6%	8.0%	13.3%	8.2%	10.3%
Instagram	14.6%	10.1%	14.3%	9.6%	13.8%
Web	8.2%	8.2%	8.9%	8.3%	10.5%
Radio	10.0%	10.8%	7.1%	10.0%	8.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Intoxicated Driving (Q9) by Wave

All respondents were asked whether they had driven when they thought they had too much alcohol to drive safely in the past six months. In 2021, the number of respondents who reported this behavior increased by 1.4% from the previous year while the number of respondents who say they don't drink at all increased by only 0.4%, which is not significant compared to the 2020 panel data (Table Q9_1).

Table Q9_1. "In the past 6 months, did you drive when you thought you had too much alcohol to drive safely?" by year

Q9 by year	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014	Total 2013	Total 2012	Total 2011	Total 2010
Yes	256 9.2%	223 7.8%	95 7.3%	88 6.3%	137 10.1%	83 6.6%	138 7.2%	162 8.8%	119 6.2%	102 5.5%	120 6.7%	99 6.0%
No	1,846 66.4%	1,945 68.2%	766 59.2%	980 70.5%	918 67.4%	816 64.5%	1,264 65.6%	1,258 68.3%	1,452 75.3%	1,263 68.6%	1,267 70.7%	1,214 73.5%
I do not drink at all	678 24.4%	685 24.0%	433 33.5%	322 23.2%	307 22.5%	367 29.0%	525 27.2%	422 22.9%	358 18.6%	475 25.8%	405 22.6%	338 20.5%
Total	2,781 100.0%	2,853 100.0%	1,294 100.0%	1,390 100.0%	1,362 100.0%	1,266 100.0%	1,927 100.0%	1,842 100.0%	1,929 100.0%	1,840 100.0%	1,792 100.0%	1,671 100.0%

Intoxicated Driving (Q9) by Region

Table Q9_2 shows the comparison of self-reported intoxicated driving in the previous six months by region. Northern California respondents have a slightly higher percentage of respondents who reported driving after drinking too much.

Table Q9_2. "In the past 6 months, did you drive when you thought you had too much alcohol to drive safely?" by region

Q9 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California
Yes	74 9.5%	32 9.2%	150 9.1%
No	509 65.3%	220 63.4%	1,117 67.5%
I do not drink at all	196 25.2%	95 27.4%	387 23.4%
Total	779 100.0%	347 100.0%	1,654 100.0%

Use of Alternative Ride Services When Drinking (Q10) by Region and Wave

Table Q10 shows the distribution of how often respondents have used a taxi or other ride-hailing service when drinking in the past six months. In 2021, more than half (52.7%) of respondents reported they “Never” use these services when drinking, with the highest percentage of Central California respondents reporting never using them. Overall, the distribution of responses among regions is similar, and the comparison to 2020 data does not show any significant change. It may be that some of the shift in use of ride services is due to the pandemic, which limited travel and use of ride sharing.

Table Q10. “In the past 6 months, how often have you used a taxi or other ride-hailing service when drinking with others or alone?” by region and year

Q10 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Always	109 18.8%	42 16.7%	243 19.3%	394 18.8%	457 21.2%	316 37.1%	330 31.2%	278 26.4%	187 20.8%	319 22.9%	150 10.6%
Sometimes	99 17.0%	39 15.5%	213 16.9%	351 16.8%	389 18.1%	217 25.5%	240 22.7%	188 17.8%	162 18.0%	177 12.7%	179 12.7%
Rarely	67 11.5%	30 11.9%	148 11.7%	245 11.7%	272 12.6%	88 10.3%	115 10.9%	147 13.9%	111 12.3%	184 13.2%	189 13.4%
Never	306 52.7%	141 56.0%	657 52.1%	1,104 52.7%	1,036 48.1%	230 27.0%	372 35.2%	442 41.9%	439 48.8%	710 51.1%	894 63.3%
Total	581 100.0%	252 100.0%	1,261 100.0%	2,094 100.0%	2,154 100.0%	851 100.0%	1,057 100.0%	1,055 100.0%	899 100.0%	1,390 100.0%	1,412 100.0%

Designated Sober Driver (Q11) by Region and Wave

Respondents were asked how often they had (or were) a designated sober driver in the past six months, and respondents most often reported “Never,” with highest percentage of Northern California drivers responding this way (42.0%) compared to the other two regions, but comparisons among regions and with the previous year’s data did not show any significant differences (Table Q11).

Table Q11. “In the past 6 months, how often have you had a designated sober driver, including yourself?” by region and year

Q11 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Always	194 33.6%	81 32.3%	406 32.3%	681 32.6%	711 32.8%	322 38.5%	355 33.6%	249 23.6%	223 24.9%	585 42.2%	525 28.5%
Sometimes	87 15.1%	46 18.3%	235 18.7%	368 17.6%	400 18.5%	213 25.4%	248 23.5%	222 21.1%	184 20.6%	226 16.3%	338 18.3%
Rarely	54 9.3%	30 12.0%	126 10.0%	210 10.1%	240 11.1%	101 12.1%	135 12.8%	170 16.1%	140 15.6%	154 11.1%	192 10.4%
Never	243 42.0%	94 37.5%	490 39.0%	827 39.6%	815 37.6%	201 24.0%	317 30.0%	413 39.2%	348 38.9%	421 30.4%	790 42.8%
Total	578 100.0%	251 100.0%	1,257 100.0%	2,086 100.0%	2,166 100.0%	837 100.0%	1,055 100.0%	1,054 100.0%	895 100.0%	1,386 100.0%	1,845 100.0%

Recall of Sobriety/DUI Checkpoints in Past 6 Months (Q12) by Wave

When asked whether they had seen or heard about police setting up sobriety/DUI checkpoints in the past six months, more than half of the panelists (51.0%) said they had. Compared to the 2020 findings, there was a 4.5% decrease in respondents who reported awareness of the checkpoints, a significant decrease between years ($p < 0.01$, Table Q12_1).

Table Q12_1. “In the past 6 months, have you seen/heard anything about police setting up sobriety/DUI checkpoints to catch drunk drivers?” by year

Q12 by year	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014	Total 2013	Total 2012	Total 2011	Total 2010
Yes	1,234 51.0%	1,415 55.5%	489 40.1%	593 45.7%	706 52.9%	735 57.9%	1,094 56.8%	1,327 71.3%	993 51.6%	1,263 67.8%	1,300 72.9%	1,006 60.6%
No	1,187 49.0%	1,135 44.5%	730 59.9%	704 54.3%	629 47.1%	535 42.1%	831 43.2%	535 28.7%	931 48.4%	599 32.2%	483 27.1%	653 39.4%
Total	2,421 100.0%	2,550 100.0%	1,219 100.0%	1,297 100.0%	1,335 100.0%	1,270 100.0%	1,925 100.0%	1,862 100.0%	1,924 100.0%	1,862 100.0%	1,783 100.0%	1,659 100.0%

Recall of Sobriety/DUI Checkpoints in Past 6 Months (Q12) by Region

56.5% of Central California respondents reported awareness of DUI checkpoints in the past six months, compared to 51.9% of Southern California and 46.4% of Northern California respondents. A comparison of responses by region shows significant differences between Northern and Central California, with respondents in Central California reporting a significantly higher recall compared to those in Northern California ($p < 0.01$, Table Q12_2)

Table Q12_2. “In the past 6 months, have you seen/heard anything about police setting up sobriety/DUI checkpoints to catch drunk drivers?” by region

Q12 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California
Yes	312 46.4%	173 56.5%	749 51.9%
No	360 53.6%	133 43.5%	694 48.1%
Total	672 100.0%	306 100.0%	1,443 100.0%

Awareness of DUI (Q13) by Region and Wave

Compared to 2020, there was a 1.8% decrease in respondents who were aware that you can get a DUI for driving under the influence of legal or illegal drugs. Central California had the highest percentage of awareness, with 89.3% respondents, compared to 88.7% of Southern California respondents. However, the differences when compared across regions and with the 2020 data collection are not significant (Table Q13).

Table Q13. “Did you know that you can get a DUI if you drive under the influence of legal or illegal drugs” by region and year

Q13 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017
Yes	681 87.8%	309 89.3%	1,459 88.7%	2,449 88.5%	2,572 90.3%	1,132 90.0%	1,263 93.8%	1,209 91.2%
No	95 12.2%	37 10.7%	185 11.3%	317 11.5%	275 9.7%	126 10.0%	83 6.2%	116 8.8%
Total	776 100.0%	346 100.0%	1,644 100.0%	2,766 100.0%	2,847 100.0%	1,258 100.0%	1,346 100.0%	1,325 100.0%

Likelihood of Getting Arrested for Driving Impaired (Q14) by Region and Wave

Respondents were asked about their perception of the likelihood of getting arrested for driving while impaired, with the results outlined in Table Q14. Overall, 78.8% of California drivers believed it to be “Very Likely” or “Somewhat Likely” to be arrested for driving impaired.

Table Q14. “How likely is it for someone to get arrested if they drive impaired?” by region and year

Q14 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Very Likely	279 36.0%	129 37.3%	595 36.2%	1,003 36.3%	1,099 38.6%	571 45.4%	569 42.5%	519 38.7%	519 41.3%	643 34.7%	808 44.5%
Somewhat Likely	337 43.5%	148 42.8%	690 41.9%	1,175 42.5%	1,177 41.4%	394 31.3%	454 33.9%	446 33.2%	377 30.0%	625 33.7%	515 28.4%
Somewhat Unlikely	125 16.1%	56 16.2%	281 17.1%	462 16.7%	299 14.0%	213 16.9%	206 15.4%	243 18.1%	264 21.0%	373 20.1%	316 17.4%
Very Unlikely	33 4.3%	13 3.8%	79 4.8%	125 4.5%	171 6.0%	81 6.4%	109 8.1%	134 10.0%	97 7.7%	214 11.5%	175 9.6%
Total	774 100.0%	346 100.0%	1,645 100.0%	2,765 100.0%	2,846 100.0%	1,259 100.0%	1,338 100.0%	1,342 100.0%	1,257 100.0%	1,855 100.0%	1,814 100.0%

Perception of Marijuana Impairing Driving Functions (Q15) by Region and Wave

In 2021, 77.0% of respondents believed marijuana can impair driving functions, compared to 80.1% in 2020. Southern California respondents were slightly more likely to report this (77.7%), compared to those in Northern and Central California (77.3% and 73.0%, respectively). There are no significant differences in the perception of marijuana impairing driving among regions and when compared to 2020 (Table Q15).

Table Q15. “Do you think marijuana can impair driving related functions, such as reaction time, distance perception, lane tracking, coordination and balance?” by region and year

Q15 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Yes	601 77.3%	254 73.0%	1,283 77.7%	2,138 77.0%	2,271 80.1%	1,019 80.0%	1,048 77.3%
No	63 8.1%	38 10.9%	136 8.2%	237 8.5%	209 7.4%	125 9.8%	98 7.2%
It Depends	113 14.5%	56 16.1%	232 14.1%	401 14.4%	356 12.6%	130 10.2%	210 15.5%
Total	777 100.0%	348 100.0%	1,651 100.0%	2,776 100.0%	2,836 100.0%	1,274 100.0%	1,356 100.0%

Perception of DUI of Drugs, Legal and Illegal (Q16) by Region and Wave

The majority of respondents in 2021 (51.9%) reported they believe driving under the influence of drugs (including marijuana, prescription, and illegal) to be “A Very Big Problem,” with a similar distribution among regions and compared to the previous year’s data (Table Q16).

Table Q16. “How serious of a problem is driving under the influence of drugs: including marijuana, prescription, and illegal?” by region and year

Q16 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015
A Very Big Problem	379 48.8%	191 55.0%	867 52.7%	1,437 51.9%	1,486 52.3%	617 49.6%	664 49.3%	715 53.5%	717 58.1%	980 54.7%
Somewhat of a Problem	314 40.5%	111 32.0%	605 36.8%	1,030 37.2%	1,006 35.4%	353 28.4%	494 36.7%	461 34.5%	381 30.9%	571 31.9%
A Small Problem	70 9.0%	36 10.4%	153 9.3%	259 9.4%	287 10.1%	237 19.1%	140 10.4%	122 9.1%	113 9.1%	193 10.8%
Not a Problem at all	13 1.7%	9 2.6%	20 1.2%	42 1.5%	63 2.2%	37 3.0%	48 3.6%	39 2.9%	24 1.9%	48 2.7%
Total	776 100.0%	347 100.0%	1,645 100.0%	2,768 100.0%	2,842 100.0%	1,244 100.0%	1,346 100.0%	1,337 100.0%	1,235 100.0%	1,792 100.0%

Safety of Driving 10 Miles Over the Speed Limit on Freeways (Q17) by Region and Wave

Between 2020 and 2021, there was a 3.1% reduction in the number of respondents who believe it is safe to drive 10 miles over the speed limit on freeways. Central California respondents were most likely to believe it is safe (34.4%) compared to the other two regions. There are no significant differences in perception across the California regions, but the 3.1% decrease in drivers who believe it is safe to drive 10 miles over the speed limit from 2020 is slightly significant, ($p < 0.05$, Table Q17).

Table Q17. “Do you think it’s safe to drive 10 miles over the speed limit on freeways?” by region and year

Q17 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Yes	237 30.5%	120 34.4%	551 33.6%	908 32.8%	1,023 35.9%	764 59.5%	788 56.9%	879 65.0%	755 59.5%	1,110 57.5%	1,104 59.3%
No	214 27.5%	100 28.7%	474 28.9%	788 28.5%	742 26.0%	337 26.2%	266 19.2%	253 18.7%	275 21.7%	481 24.9%	449 24.1%
It Depends	327 42.0%	129 37.0%	616 37.5%	1,072 38.7%	1,087 38.1%	183 14.3%	332 24.0%	220 16.3%	238 18.8%	341 17.7%	309 16.6%
Total	778 100.0%	349 100.0%	1,641 100.0%	2,768 100.0%	2,852 100.0%	1,284 100.0%	1,386 100.0%	1,352 100.0%	1,268 100.0%	1,932 100.0%	1,862 100.0%

Safety of Driving 5 Miles Over the Speed Limit on Residential Streets (Q18) by Region and Wave

The majority (51.7%) of respondents in 2021 indicated they believe it is unsafe to drive five miles over the speed limit on residential streets, with a comparable distribution among regions (Table Q18), and no significant difference compared to the previous year.

Table Q18. “Do you think it’s safe to drive five miles over the speed limit on residential streets?” by region and year

Q18 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Yes	168 21.5%	79 22.6%	405 24.6%	652 23.5%	729 25.6%	506 39.5%	460 33.2%	545 40.3%	465 36.6%	750 38.8%	577 31.0%
No	418 53.5%	195 55.9%	823 49.9%	1,436 51.7%	1,476 51.8%	639 49.8%	701 50.7%	598 44.3%	585 46.1%	905 46.8%	978 52.6%
It depends	196 25.1%	75 21.5%	420 25.5%	691 24.9%	643 22.6%	137 10.7%	223 16.1%	208 15.4%	220 17.3%	279 14.4%	306 16.4%
Total	782 100.0%	349 100.0%	1,648 100.0%	2,779 100.0%	2,848 100.0%	1,282 100.0%	1,384 100.0%	1,351 100.0%	1,270 100.0%	1,934 100.0%	1,861 100.0%

Chance of Being Ticketed for Driving Over Speed Limit (Q19) by Region and Wave

The 2021 distribution of responses regarding the likelihood of getting a ticket for driving over the speed limit is comparable across California regions, and over two-thirds of drivers (68.4%) believe it is “Very Likely” or “Somewhat Likely”. Those results are comparable to the 2020 panel data (Table Q19).

Table Q19. “What do you think the chances are of getting a ticket if you drive over the speed limit?” by region and year

Q19 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Very Likely	162 20.8%	86 24.8%	397 24.1%	645 23.3%	614 21.6%	345 27.7%	267 20.1%	290 21.6%	267 21.3%	398 21.5%	413 22.5%
Somewhat Likely	380 48.8%	154 44.4%	718 43.6%	1,252 45.1%	1,315 46.2%	410 32.9%	552 41.6%	484 36.0%	460 36.7%	741 40.0%	691 37.6%
Somewhat Unlikely	190 24.4%	85 24.5%	408 24.8%	683 24.6%	717 25.2%	354 28.4%	321 24.2%	334 24.9%	341 27.2%	467 25.2%	484 26.4%
Very Unlikely	47 6.0%	22 6.3%	125 7.6%	194 7.0%	198 7.0%	138 11.1%	186 14.0%	236 17.6%	186 14.8%	245 13.2%	248 13.5%
Total	779 100.0%	347 100.0%	1,648 100.0%	2,774 100.0%	2,844 100.0%	1,247 100.0%	1,326 100.0%	1,344 100.0%	1,254 100.0%	1,851 100.0%	1,836 100.0%

Perception of driverless vehicles and road safety (Q20) by Region and Wave

In 2021, 48.3% of respondents reported they did not believe driverless vehicles will make roadways safer, a 2.2% increase from 2020. Regionally, Central California respondents represented the highest percentage responding this way, with more than half (55.9%) of drivers, answering “No”, but without significant differences among regions nor compared to the 2020 data (Table Q20).

Table Q20. “Do you think driverless vehicles will make our roadways safer?” by region and year

Q20 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017
Yes	204 26.2%	75 21.6%	391 23.8%	670 24.2%	683 24.0%	444 35.9%	319 23.8%	351 27.7%
No	368 47.2%	193 55.9%	776 47.3%	1,337 48.3%	1,310 46.1%	534 43.2%	642 47.9%	614 48.5%
It Depends	208 26.7%	80 23.0%	475 28.9%	763 27.5%	849 29.9%	258 20.9%	380 28.3%	301 23.8%
Total	780 100.0%	348 100.0%	1,642 100.0%	2,770 100.0%	2,842 100.0%	1,236 100.0%	1,341 100.0%	1,266 100.0%

Sharing roads with driverless vehicles (Q21) by Region and Wave

The majority (58.1%) of drivers surveyed in 2021 were “Somewhat Uncomfortable” or “Very Uncomfortable” sharing the road with driverless vehicles, which is similar to the 2020 distribution of responses for this measure. Central California respondents were significantly more likely to report they are “Very Uncomfortable”, compared to the other regions, and Northern California respondents were significantly more likely to report that they are “Very Comfortable” sharing the road with driverless vehicles ($p < 0.01$, Table Q21).

Table Q21. “How comfortable are you about sharing the road with driverless vehicles?” by region and year

Q21 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017
Very Comfortable	127 16.4%	35 10.2%	233 14.2%	395 14.3%	381 13.4%	246 20.2%	234 17.7%	269 21.0%
Somewhat Comfortable	223 28.8%	87 25.3%	449 27.4%	759 27.5%	830 29.2%	409 33.6%	318 24.0%	287 22.4%
Somewhat Uncomfortable	240 31.0%	104 30.2%	530 32.4%	874 31.7%	892 31.4%	323 26.5%	350 26.4%	279 21.6%
Very Uncomfortable	184 23.8%	118 34.3%	425 26.0%	727 26.4%	738 26.0%	239 19.6%	423 31.9%	449 35.0%
Total	774 100.0%	344 100.0%	1,637 100.0%	2,755 100.0%	2,841 100.0%	1,217 100.0%	1,325 100.0%	1,284 100.0%

Perception of Legality for Bikes on Roadways (Q22) by Region and Wave

When asked whether they believe it is legal to ride bicycles on roadways, 62.2% of surveyed drivers confirmed this, compared to 63.0% of the 2020 respondents, and there were no significant differences in perceptions for this measure among regions (Table Q22).

Table Q22. “Do you think it is legal for bicyclists to ride on roadways when there is no bike lane?” by region and year

Q22 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Yes	469 61.7%	215 63.0%	1,014 62.2%	1,698 62.2%	1,764 63.0%	993 80.2%	984 73.8%	956 72.2%	838 68.0%	1,260 68.6%	1,204 68.7%
No	291 38.3%	126 37.0%	617 37.8%	1,034 37.8%	1,038 37.0%	245 19.8%	349 26.2%	369 27.8%	395 32.0%	577 31.4%	549 31.3%
Total	760 100.0%	341 100.0%	1,631 100.0%	2,732 100.0%	2,802 100.0%	1,238 100.0%	1,333 100.0%	1,325 100.0%	1,233 100.0%	1,837 100.0%	1,753 100.0%

Level of Comfort Sharing Road with Bicyclists with Bike Lanes (Q23) by Region and Wave

Overall, 72.0% of drivers surveyed were “Very Comfortable” or “Somewhat Comfortable” sharing the road with bicyclists in bike lanes, and with a similar distribution among regions and when compared to the previous year’s data (Table Q23).

Table Q23. “How comfortable are you with sharing the road with bicyclists when there IS a designated bike lane?” by region and year

Q23 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Very Comfortable	277 35.7%	123 35.4%	586 35.7%	986 35.7%	1,034 36.2%	570 45.1%	634 46.3%
Somewhat Comfortable	294 37.9%	134 38.6%	576 35.1%	1,004 36.3%	1,045 36.6%	395 31.3%	369 27.0%
Somewhat Uncomfortable	138 17.8%	66 19.0%	325 19.8%	529 19.1%	506 17.7%	171 13.5%	205 15.0%
Very Uncomfortable	67 8.6%	24 6.9%	155 9.4%	246 8.9%	269 9.4%	127 10.1%	160 11.7%
Total	776 100.0%	347 100.0%	1,642 100.0%	2,765 100.0%	2,854 100.0%	1,263 100.0%	1,368 100.0%

Sharing Road with Bicyclists without Bike Lane (Q24) by Region and Wave

In 2021, 38.8% of drivers surveyed were “Very Comfortable” or “Somewhat Comfortable” sharing the road with bicyclists without a bike lane, similar to the 2020 survey and without significant differences across California regions (Table Q24).

Table Q24. “How comfortable are you with sharing the road with bicyclists when there ISN’T a designated bike lane?” by region and year

Q24 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Very Comfortable	112 14.5%	40 11.6%	202 12.3%	354 12.8%	396 13.9%	289 22.9%	237 17.4%
Somewhat Comfortable	219 28.3%	91 26.5%	410 24.9%	720 26.0%	702 24.7%	327 25.9%	329 24.2%
Somewhat Uncomfortable	219 28.3%	121 35.2%	520 31.6%	860 31.1%	887 31.2%	281 22.3%	348 25.6%
Very Uncomfortable	225 29.0%	92 26.7%	513 31.2%	830 30.0%	855 30.1%	364 28.9%	446 32.8%
Total	775 100.0%	344 100.0%	1,645 100.0%	2,764 100.0%	2,840 100.0%	1,261 100.0%	1,360 100.0%

Safety Problems Experienced as Pedestrian or Bicyclist (Q25): Coding Categories

Respondents were asked to identify the safety problems they had experienced as pedestrians or bicyclists in the past six months in a multiple-choice question. The provided answers and additional codes based on open-ended responses (highlighted in blue) are shown in Table Q25_1.

Table Q25_1. “Think of the times you have been a pedestrian or bicyclist in the last 6 months. What safety problems did you experience, if any?” Coding Categories

Distracted drivers using cell phones	Bicycle behavior
Cars not stopping	Drivers turning right without looking
Cars going too fast	Drivers don't see or look for pedestrians
Bicyclists not stopping	Drivers not paying attention
Lots of Traffic	Drivers stopping in crosswalk
Almost getting hit by car or bike	Lack of awareness of bike lanes
Lack of sidewalks or bike lanes	Lack of awareness of right-of-way
None	Not Applicable-Have not been a pedestrian/bicyclist because of COVID
Other	

In 2021, respondents reported a total of 7,451 answers on safety problems experienced as a pedestrian or bicyclist - “Cars going too fast” was reported most frequently, accounting for 20.2% of responses and given by 54.5% of drivers. “Cars not stopping” was the second most frequent response with 17.9% of responses provided by 48.4% of drivers, followed by “Distracted drivers (cell phones)” as the third most frequent response with 14.2% of answers and reported by 38.2% of drivers (Table Q25_2 with the three most frequently mentioned responses highlighted).

Table Q25 2. Frequencies Q25 by percent of answers and percent of drivers

Q25 all answers combined	Count	% of answers	% of Drivers
Cars going too fast	1,507	20.2%	54.5%
Cars not stopping	1,337	17.9%	48.4%
Distracted drivers (cell phones)	1,057	14.2%	38.2%
Lack of sidewalks or bike lanes	914	12.3%	33.1%
Lots of traffic	819	11.0%	29.6%
Almost getting hit by car or bike*	742	10.0%	26.8%
Bicyclists not stopping	644	8.6%	23.3%
NONE	385	5.2%	13.9%
Not Applicable-Have not been a pedestrian/bicyclist because of COVID	15	0.2%	0.5%
All Other Responses Combined	32	0.4%	1.2%
Total	7,451	100.0%	269.5%

Safety Problems Experienced as Pedestrian or Bicyclist (Q25) by Region and Wave

The safety problems experienced as a pedestrian or bicyclist by California region and survey year are outlined in Table Q25_3, with similar results among regions and when compared to the 2020 data. The answering option with a slight change to the verbiage are outlined under the table.

Table Q25 3. “Think of the times you have been a pedestrian or bicyclist in the last 6 months. What safety problems did you experience, if any?” by region and year

Q25 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Cars going too fast	422 20.7%	182 20.0%	902 20.0%	1,507 20.2%	1,598 20.7%	336 17.7%	239 12.3%
Cars not stopping	362 17.8%	157 17.3%	818 18.1%	1,337 17.9%	1,403 18.1%	432 22.8%	336 17.3%
Distracted drivers (cell phones)	275 13.5%	116 12.7%	666 14.8%	1,057 14.2%	1,246 16.1%	348 18.4%	426 21.9%
Lack of sidewalks or bike lanes*	256 12.6%	128 14.1%	530 11.8%	914 12.3%	858 11.1%	37 2.0%	52 2.7%
Lots of traffic	214 10.5%	96 10.6%	509 11.3%	819 11.0%	791 10.2%	98 5.2%	106 5.5%
Almost getting hit by a car or bike**	194 9.5%	90 9.9%	457 10.1%	742 10.0%	741 9.6%	197 10.4%	185 9.5%
Bicyclists not stopping	203 10.0%	66 7.3%	374 8.3%	644 8.6%	718 9.3%	69 3.6%	67 3.5%
NONE	97 4.8%	61 6.7%	227 5.0%	385 5.2%	320 4.1%	308 16.3%	352 18.1%
All Other Responses Combined	9 0.4%	7 0.7%	17 0.3%	32 0.4%	62 0.6%	55 2.9%	162 8.4%
Not Applicable-Have not been a pedestrian because of COVID	4 0.2%	5 0.6%	6 0.1%	15 0.2%	--	--	--
Total	2,036 100.0%	909 100.0%	4,506 100.0%	7,451 100.0%	7,736 100.0%	1,894 100.0%	1,942 100.0%

*"Lack of sidewalks" in 2020 survey

**"Almost getting hit by a car" in 2020 survey

Safety Problems Experienced as Driver around Pedestrians and Bicyclists (Q26)

The safety problems reported while driving near pedestrians and bicyclists are outlined in Table Q26_1, based on 8,516 responses and with the three most frequently mentioned responses highlighted. “Pedestrians not using crosswalks” was reported most frequently by 55.9% of respondents, while half of the respondents (50.6%) also indicated “Pedestrians stepping off curb without looking” as a safety problem.

Table Q26_1. Frequencies Q26 by percent of answers and percent of drivers

Q26 all answers combined	Count	% of answers	% of Drivers
Pedestrians not using crosswalks	1,548	18.2%	55.9%
Pedestrians stepping off curb without looking	1,399	16.4%	50.6%
Cyclists not stopping at stop signs or traffic lights	1,255	14.7%	45.4%
Pedestrians/cyclists not being visible enough	1,117	13.1%	40.4%
Pedestrians/cyclists distracted behavior (phones, ear pods, headsets)	1,087	12.8%	39.3%
Cyclists being in the road or blocking traffic	960	11.3%	34.7%
Lack of sidewalks or bike lanes	905	10.6%	32.7%
None	221	2.6%	8.0%
All Other Responses Combined	12	0.1%	0.3%
Lack of awareness of right-of-way/Not following rules of road	11	0.1%	0.4%
Total	8,516	100.0%	307.8%

Safety Problems Experienced as Driver around Pedestrians and Bicyclists (Q26) by Region & Wave

The distribution of problems experienced as a driver around pedestrians and bicyclists is comparable, both by region and by survey wave (Table Q26_2). It should be noted that the sample may be biased in favor of drivers, since respondents needed a driver's license to participate in the survey.

Table Q26 2. "Think of the times you have been a DRIVER around pedestrian or bicyclist in the last 6 months. What safety problems did you experience, if any?" by region and year

Q26 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Pedestrians not using crosswalks	438 18.6%	207 19.1%	902 17.8%	1,548 18.2%	1,612 18.5%	300 15.2%	294 14.8%
Pedestrians stepping off curb without looking	379 16.1%	175 16.1%	845 16.7%	1,399 16.4%	1,453 16.7%	321 16.2%	179 9.0%
Cyclists not stopping at stop signs or traffic lights	366 15.5%	167 15.4%	722 14.2%	1,255 14.7%	1,385 15.9%	321 10.7%	179 10.6%
Pedestrians/cyclists not being visible enough	304 12.9%	138 12.7%	676 13.3%	1,117 13.1%	1,143 13.1%	194 9.8%	169 8.5%
Pedestrians/cyclists distracted behavior (phones, ear pods, headsets)	297 12.6%	132 12.1%	659 13.0%	1,087 12.8%	1,174 13.5%	332 16.8%	264 13.3%
Cyclists being in the road or blocking traffic	255 10.8%	110 10.2%	595 11.7%	960 11.3%	1,047 12.0%	269 13.6%	187 9.4%
Lack of sidewalks or bike lanes*	244 10.4%	120 11.0%	542 10.7%	905 10.6%	652 7.5%	38 1.9%	108 5.5%
NONE	60 2.6%	34 3.2%	126 2.5%	221 2.6%	223 2.6%	242 12.2%	356 18.0%
All Other Responses Combined	6 0.2%	1 0.1%	5 0.1%	12 0.1%	36 0.4%	47 2.4%	76 3.8%
Lack of awareness of right-of way/Not following rules of road	5 0.2%	1 0.1%	5 0.1%	11 0.1%	--	--	--
Total	2,354 100.0%	1,085 100.0%	5,077 100.0%	8,516 100.0%	8,725 100.0%	1,979 100.0%	1,942 100.0%

*"Lack of sidewalks or clear crosswalks" in 2020 survey