

UC Berkeley

Technical Report

Title

California Traffic Safety Survey 2022: Data Analysis and Comparison with 2010-2021 Survey Data Results

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/58d907m6>

Authors

Ewald, Katrin

Wasserman, Lisa

Publication Date

2022-05-19



CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC SAFETY SURVEY 2022

DATA ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON WITH 2010-2021 SURVEY DATA RESULTS

Conducted on Behalf of

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

May 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW OF 2022 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) by California Region	15
Behavioral Changes due to COVID-19 (COVID) by Age.....	16
Most Serious Distraction (Q3) by Survey Wave.....	17
Most Serious Distraction (Q3) by Region.....	18
Using Cell Phone in a Non-Hands-Free manner when Driving (Q4) by Region and Wave.....	19
Driving Mistake Due to Cell Phone Use (Q5) by Wave.....	19
Near Crash Due to Other Driver Talking/Texting on a Cell Phone (Q6) by Wave.....	20
Likelihood of Being Ticketed for Hand-Held Phone Use or Texting (Q7) by Wave	20
Recall of “Go Safely California” (Q8a) by Region and Wave.....	21
Recall of “Slow the Fast Down” (Q8b) by Region and Wave.....	21
Recall of “Don’t Let Drunk, or ‘High’ Drive” Campaign (Q8c) by Region.....	22
Source of Recall of Safety Campaigns.....	22
Intoxicated Driving (Q9) by Wave.....	23
Intoxicated Driving (Q9) by Region	23
Use of Alternative Ride Services When Drinking (Q10) by Region and Wave.....	24
Recall of Sobriety/DUI Checkpoints in Past 6 Months (Q11) by Wave	24
Recall of Sobriety/DUI Checkpoints in Past 6 Months (Q11) by Region.....	25
Awareness of DUI (Q12) by Region and Wave	25
Likelihood of Getting Arrested for Driving Impaired (Q13) by Region and Wave.....	26
Perception of Marijuana Impairing Driving Functions (Q14) by Region and Wave.....	27
Perception of DUI of Drugs, Legal and Illegal (Q15) by Region and Wave.....	27
Safety of Driving 10 Miles Over the Speed Limit on Freeways (Q16) by Region and Wave	28
Safety of Driving Over the Speed Limit on Residential Streets (Q17) by Region and Wave.....	29
Chance of Being Ticketed for Driving Over Speed Limit on Residential Streets (Q18) by Region and Wave.....	30

Perception of Components of Safe System Approach (Safe1)	31
Most Important Factor Resulting in Traffic Injuries/Fatalities (Safe2) by Region	32
Main Form of Transportation (Q19) by Region	33
Perception of Legality for Bicyclists on Roadways (Q20) by Region and Wave.....	34
Level of Comfort Sharing Road with Bicyclists with Bike Lanes (Q21) by Region and Wave.....	34
Level of Comfort Sharing Road with Bicyclists when Driving (Q22) by Region.....	35
Safety Problems Experienced as Pedestrian or Bicyclist (Q23)	36
Safety Problems Experienced as Pedestrian or Bicyclist (Q23) by Region and Wave.....	37
Safety Problems Experienced as Driver around Pedestrians and Bicyclists (Q24)	38
Safety Problems Experienced as Driver around Pedestrians and Bicyclists (Q24) by Region and Wave .	39

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Biggest Safety Concern (Q2)

“Speeding/Aggressive Driving” was the biggest safety concern for 75.0% of surveyed drivers of the panel, followed by “Distracted Driving because of TEXTING” and “Drunk Driving,” mentioned by 71.5% and 67.4% drivers, respectively (Table Q2_2).

Behavioral Changes due to COVID-19 (COVID)

“Aggressive Driving / Road Rage” was the most frequently given response as the biggest behavioral change noticed since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Compared to 2021, “Aggressive Driving / Road Rage” had a significant increase in responses from 26.5% to 34.7% (Table COVID_1).

Most Serious Distraction (Q3)

Consistent with prior data collection waves, “Texting or Checking Phone While Driving” was reported as the most serious distraction overall by 71.9% of all respondents (Table Q3_1), though Central California drivers stated this with a significantly lower percentage than the other regions (Table Q3_2).

Using Cell Phone in Non-Hands-Free Manner While Driving (Q4)

In 2022 there was a significant decrease of 3.9% of drivers who say they “Regularly” or “Sometimes” used a cell phone in a non-hands-free manner while driving in the past 30 days, compared to the 2021 (Table Q4).

Driving Mistake Due to Cell Phone Use (Q5)

The majority (59.4%) of respondents reported having never made a driving mistake while using a cell phone, with no significant change compared to 2021 (Table Q5).

Near Crash Due to Talking/Texting (Q6)

A little more than half (50.2%) of drivers in 2022 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 2021 data (Table Q6).

Recall of Traffic Safety Outreach Campaigns (Q8a-Q8e)

The outreach campaign with the highest recall rate was “Don’t Let Drunk, or ‘High’ Drive,” a new item introduced in the 2022 survey, with 44.5% of surveyed drivers having seen or heard the slogan (Tables Q8a-Q8c). There was a significant 6.9% drop in recall of the “Go Safely California” campaign compared to 2021, and an insignificant 1.6% decrease in recall of “Slow the Fast Down.”

Campaign	Recall Rate 2022	Recall Rate 2021	Recall Rate 2020	Recall Rate 2019
“Go Safely California”	28.5%	35.4%	30.2%	16.4%
“Slow the Fast Down”	17.5%	19.1%	--	--
“Don’t Let Drunk, or ‘High’ Drive”	44.5%	--	--	--

Alcohol-Impaired Driving (Q9)

The number of surveyed drivers who reported driving after having too much to drink in the past six months was a significant 2.0% fewer compared to the previous year (Table Q9_1).

Use of Ride Services (Q10)

A total of 43.3% of respondents reported that they “Always” or “Sometimes” use alternate transportation when drinking, a significant increase of 7.7% from 2021 (Table Q10).

Recall of Sobriety Checkpoints (Q11)

More than half (52.1%) of respondents have seen or heard about police sobriety or DUI checkpoints in the past 6 months, similar to the 2021 wave (Table Q11_1). However, there was a significant regional difference in the recall of sobriety checkpoints, with drivers in Central California reporting a significantly higher recall (61.6%) compared to Northern and Southern California (Table Q11_2).

Likelihood of Arrest for Impaired Driving (Q13)

Overall, 78.1% of California drivers believed it to be “Very Likely” or “Somewhat Likely” to be arrested for driving impaired. Central California drivers especially had a significantly lower rate of thinking it is “Somewhat Unlikely” to be arrested for driving impaired (Table Q13).

Marijuana Impairing Driving Functions (Q14)

In 2022, 76.3% of respondents believed marijuana can impair driving functions, similar to 2021 data (Table Q14), with no significant differences between California regions.

Safety of Driving 10 MPH Over Speed Limit on Freeways (Q16)

Between 2021 and 2022 there is no significant change in the number of respondents who believe it is safe to drive 10 miles over the speed limit on freeways. However, a significantly higher number of drivers in Central California (33.5%) believe that it is not safe to drive 10 miles per hour over the speed limit on freeways (Table Q16).

Safety of Driving Over Speed Limit on Residential Streets (Q17)

The majority (73.9%) of respondents believe it is unsafe to drive over the speed limit on residential streets, with a significant increase of 22.2% compared to 2021 data (Table Q17). Additionally, there was also a significant difference between California regions, with significantly more Central California drivers believing it to be unsafe to drive over the speed limit on residential streets (Table Q17).

Chances of Being Ticketed for Speeding (Q18)

Compared to 2021, there was a significant 5.0% increase of drivers stating it to be “Very Unlikely” to get a ticket for driving over the speed limit on residential streets. Additionally, Central California drivers were significantly more likely to report this to be “Very Likely” compared to the other two regions (Table Q18).

Perception of Components of Safe System Approach (Safe1)

Overall, almost half or more than half of the respondents rated the five factors of the Safe System Approach as “Very Important, and “Improve safe streets design to design roads that support all road users, including drivers, pedestrian, bicyclists and transit” was the highest-rated factor overall (Table Safe1).

Most Important Factor Resulting in Traffic Injuries/Fatalities (Safe2)

More than half of the respondents (52.9%) selected “Driver Behavior” as the most important factor resulting in traffic injuries/fatalities, followed by “Speeding Vehicles,” selected by 26.4% of all drivers surveyed (Table Safe2).

Legality of Bicyclists on Roadways (Q20)

When asked whether they believe it is legal to ride bicycles on roadways when there is no bike lane, 68.2% of surveyed drivers believed so, compared to 62.2% respondents in 2021, a significant increase of 6.0% (Table Q20).

Comfort Sharing Road with Bicyclists in Bike Lanes (Q21)

There was a significant 6.7% decrease in respondents who were “Very Comfortable” or “Somewhat Comfortable” sharing the road with bicyclists when there is a bike lane. Regionally, drivers in Central California were significantly more likely to indicate that they are “Very Uncomfortable” (Table Q21).

Sharing Road with Bicyclists when Driving (Q22)

In a newly added question in the 2022 survey, 56.4% of respondents answered they are comfortable sharing the road with bicyclists “When there is a protected bike lane divider,” with a similar distribution among California regions (Table Q22).

Safety Problems Experienced as Pedestrian or Bicyclists (Q23)

The most reported safety problems experienced as a pedestrian or bicyclist remained “Cars going too fast,” with a similar distribution between California regions, and consistent with previous years’ data (Table Q23_1 and Q23_2).

OVERVIEW OF 2022 STUDY

Ewald & Wasserman Research (E&W) conducted the 2022 California Traffic Safety Public Opinion Study on behalf of the California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) and the Safe Transportation Research and Education Center of UC Berkeley (SafeTREC). Similar to previous years and since 2020, the data collection transitioned from an intercept survey to an online panel with survey panelists provided by Marketing Services Group, a commercial sample and panel vendor.

Panelists consisted of California drivers who were forwarded to an online survey portal programmed and managed by E&W. The criteria for eligibility included possessing a valid California driver's license and being 18 years or older. To manage the sample composition and to ensure a similar distribution of age and gender compared to the California census and previous waves of the Traffic Safety Study, quotas by gender and six age group ranges were implemented. Participation was anonymous and no personal data was collected, and a total of 2,768 responses were collected in April of 2022.

SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS YEARS

The data for the survey waves since 2020 were collected using online panels, as compared to the previous waves since 2010, which were intercepts with survey respondents. The findings per wave are compared where possible, recognizing the impact of different data collection methods as well as the circumstances and impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

While the 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 presented all the response options to the respondent. This method facilitated a greater number of responses than previous years, but a smaller number of open-ended comments. In addition, overall travel behavior and travel mode and frequency of travel were likely affected since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020 and will have contributed to different perceptions of travel safety, in addition to the different data collection method used for the Traffic Safety Study. The 2022 survey also underwent a more substantial revision with new survey items added and others removed, including questions on the Safe System approach (https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/zerodeaths/docs/FHWA_SafeSystem_Brochure_V9_508_200717.pdf) introduced by the U.S. Department of Transportation.

2,768 drivers participated in the survey, resulting in an overall confidence interval of +/- 1.86, at a confidence level of 95%.

In the comparison tables of survey findings over the years, all statistically significant differences in the 2022 data compared to the previous year are highlighted in the 2022 data column, and the statistically significant differences within regions are highlighted in the respective region column. Every effort has been made to match the 2022 sample with previous waves by age, gender and geographic region, to minimize the effects of sample differences between data collection years.

The number of total survey responses differ by question, and therefore the total number of responses reported varies by table. The total number of answers reported reflects the 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

The data collected was weighted against Census data derived from the 2020 American Community Survey 5-year estimates for the California population age and gender ratios. The Census data, summarized survey data, and calculated weights applied to the data and calculations are shown in 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	51.4%	48.6%	29.2%	70.8%	1.76	0.69	51.1%	48.9%
25-34	51.6%	48.4%	33.7%	66.3%	1.53	0.73	51.6%	48.4%
35-44	50.5%	49.5%	56.7%	43.3%	0.89	1.14	50.6%	49.4%
45-54	49.8%	50.2%	57.0%	43.0%	0.87	1.17	49.7%	50.3%
55-70	48.2%	51.8%	51.5%	48.5%	0.94	1.07	48.2%	51.8%
71 +	45.8%	54.2%	60.5%	39.5%	0.76	1.37	46.0%	54.0%
Average	49.7%	50.3%	45.5%	54.5%	1.09	0.92	50.2%	49.8%

*Source: Census.gov: ACS DEMOGRAPHIC AND HOUSING ESTIMATES 2020 American Community Survey 5-year estimates



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 survey findings summarized in this report are based on a sample size similar to previous years' data collection and tests for significance were calculated and will be noted where applicable.

-  For questions with multiple choice answers, a respondent could give more than one answer. The listed "Percent of cases" column in respective tables are calculated from the total number of 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 is added 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 similar to the 2021 survey instrument, but with a range of questions removed and a set of new survey items on the Safe System approach added.

Region Variable

The region was based on the county panelists live in and stated in the survey. The 54 California counties included in the online survey were 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	Mono	San Mateo	Sutter
Alpine	Glenn	Napa	Santa Clara	Tehama
Amador	Humboldt	Nevada	Shasta	Yolo
Butte	Lake	Placer	Sierra	Yuba
Colusa	Lassen	Plumas	Siskiyou	
Contra Costa	Marin	Sacramento	Solano	
Del Norte	Mendocino	San Francisco	Sonoma	
Central California			Southern California	
Calaveras	Monterey	Tuolumne	Imperial	
Fresno	San Joaquin		Los Angeles	
Inyo	San Luis Obispo		Orange	
Kern	Santa Barbara		Riverside	
Kings	Santa Cruz		San Bernardino	
Madera	Stanislaus		San Diego	
Merced	Tulare		Ventura	

For the 2022 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	109	3.9%	Calaveras	10	0.4%	Imperial	6	0.2%
Alpine	5	0.2%	Fresno	67	2.4%	Los Angeles	776	28.0%
Amador	4	0.1%	Inyo	3	0.1%	Orange	208	7.5%
Butte	13	0.5%	Kern	51	1.8%	Riverside	155	5.6%
Colusa	3	0.1%	Kings	4	0.1%	San Bernardino	170	6.1%
Contra Costa	99	3.6%	Madera	7	0.3%	San Diego	225	8.1%
Del Norte	4	0.1%	Merced	9	0.3%	Ventura	52	1.9%
El Dorado	8	0.3%	Monterey	22	0.8%	Total	1,592	
Glenn	4	0.1%	San Joaquin	50	1.8%	% of total	57.5%	
Humboldt	8	0.3%	San Luis Obispo	24	0.9%			
Lake	6	0.2%	Santa Barbara	21	0.8%			
Lassen	2	0.1%	Santa Cruz	8	0.3%			
Marin	11	0.4%	Stanislaus	34	1.2%			
Mendocino	3	0.1%	Tulare	21	0.8%			
Mono	1	0.0%	Tuolumne	3	0.1%			
Napa	5	0.2%	Total	334				
Nevada	7	0.3%	% of total	12.1%				
Placer	25	0.9%						
Plumas	4	0.1%						
Sacramento	149	5.4%						
San Francisco	91	3.3%						
San Mateo	50	1.8%						
Santa Clara	127	4.6%						
Shasta	14	0.5%						
Sierra	1	0.0%						
Siskiyou	3	0.1%						
Solano	33	1.2%						
Sonoma	25	0.9%						
Sutter	5	0.2%						
Tehama	4	0.1%						
Yolo	10	0.4%						
Yuba	9	0.3%						
Total	842							
% of total	30.4%							

The number of completed surveys by region are outlined in Table R3, together with the weighted percentage of completes. Comparable to previous years of data collection, the majority of responses (1,592; 56.8% weighted) are from Southern California.

Table R3. Completed surveys by region and year

Region	Number Completes	Percent	Weighted Percent	2021 Percent	2020 Percent	2019 Percent
Northern California	842	30.4%	30.8%	28.1%	29.5%	32.6%
Central California	334	12.1%	12.4%	12.6%	12.7%	12.6%
Southern California	1,592	57.5%	56.8%	59.3%	57.8%	54.9%
Total	2,768	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Respondent Demographics

The distribution of age and gender in total and by the region variable are outlined in Table D1, showing a slightly higher percentage of respondents age 25-34 (male and female), compared to the previous year.

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

Gender	Age Group	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total	2021 Total	2020 Total	2019 Total
Male	18-24	16.4%	26.8%	16.3%	17.7%	18.7%	10.7%	11.9%
	25-34	24.4%	31.7%	24.9%	25.6%	20.7%	23.1%	25.0%
	35-44	19.0%	17.5%	18.0%	18.2%	21.0%	23.6%	25.6%
	45-54	16.4%	10.9%	20.2%	17.8%	19.2%	25.1%	19.8%
	55-70	19.0%	10.4%	16.7%	16.6%	16.7%	14.6%	14.8%
	71 or older	4.9%	2.7%	3.9%	4.0%	3.6%	2.9%	3.0%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Female	18-24	13.4%	23.1%	17.8%	17.0%	17.7%	10.1%	17.1%
	25-34	20.2%	26.9%	25.8%	24.2%	19.5%	21.7%	25.3%
	35-44	23.0%	11.2%	16.5%	17.9%	20.6%	23.3%	19.3%
	45-54	19.0%	20.0%	17.4%	18.2%	19.4%	25.2%	19.9%
	55-70	20.0%	15.6%	17.3%	17.9%	17.9%	15.9%	15.5%
	71 or older	4.5%	3.1%	5.3%	4.8%	4.9%	3.9%	2.9%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The distribution of respondent gender by region is shown in Table D2.

Table D2. Gender distribution by geographic regions

Gender	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total
Male	50.1%	53.5%	49.5%	50.2%
Female	49.9%	46.5%	50.5%	49.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Safety Concerns (Q2)

Table Q2_1 shows the answering options for the multiple-choice question on the biggest safety problems on California roadways.

Table Q2_1. “In your opinion, what are the biggest safety problems on California roadways?”

Drunk Driving
Speeding/Aggressive Driving
Distracted Driving because of TALKING
Distracted Driving because of TEXTING
Internal Car Distractions (passengers, eating, grooming, adjusting radio/stereo)
Bad Road Surfaces
Not Wearing Seatbelts
Drugged Driving
Other (un-coded)

The combined and weighted frequencies for the multiple-choice responses on the biggest safety problems on California roadways resulted in 10,506 answers. The “% of Drivers” column shows the percentage of all respondents who provided a response to a specific answering option, with 75.0% stating that “Speeding/Aggressive Driving” is a safety concern, followed by 71.5% of drivers also indicating that “Distracted Driving because of TEXTING” is a concern. The third most frequently mentioned was “Drunk Driving,” noted by 67.4% of drivers (green highlights in 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
Speeding/Aggressive Driving	2,060	19.6%	75.0%
Distracted Driving because of TEXTING	1,963	18.7%	71.5%
Drunk Driving	1,850	17.6%	67.4%
Bad Road Surfaces	1,244	11.8%	45.3%
Drugged Driving	1,157	11.0%	42.1%
Distracted Driving because of TALKING	869	8.3%	31.6%
Internal Car Distractions (passengers, eating, grooming, adjusting radio/stereo)	671	6.4%	24.4%
Not Wearing Seatbelts	605	5.8%	22.0%
All Other Responses Combined	87	0.8%	3.2%
Total	10,506	100.0%	384.0%

The multiple-choice combined frequency ratings of the biggest safety problem on California roadways are shown in Table Q2_3, with the three most frequently mentioned responses in 2022 being: “Speeding/Aggressive Driving,” “Distracted Driving because of Texting,” and “Drunk Driving,” similar to the previous waves of the panel survey data.

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	2022 % Answers	2021 % Answers	2020 % Answers	2019 % Answers	2018 % Answers	2017 % Answers	2016 % Answers	2015 % Answers	2014 % Answers	2013 % Answers	2012 % Answers	2011 % Answers	2010 % Answers
Speeding/Aggressive Driving	19.6%	18.8%	19.1%	20.3%	19.4%	27.7%	19.2%	18.1%	20.2%	14.3%	15.6%	17.6%	18.2%
Distracted Driving because of Texting	18.7%	18.9%	19.8%	19.4%	16.9%	14.7%	18.2%	16.1%	21.2%	20.3%	17.1%	18.5%	9.9%
Drunk Driving	17.6%	17.5%	17.9%	9.2%	6.5%	22.9%	5.6%	6.6%	6.2%	5.7%	4.3%	12.6%	7.9%
Bad Road Surfaces	11.8%	10.9%	10.5%	11.0%	15.3%	3.8%	12.2%	13.0%	10.4%	9.2%	11.4%	11.6%	11.6%
Drugged Driving	11.0%	11.2%	10.6%	1.8%	1.3%	1.5%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Distracted Driving because of Talking	8.3%	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	13.0%	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%	100.0%

Safety Concerns (Q2) by California Region

The biggest safety concerns by region by percentage of answers provided show a comparable distribution of responses, with Northern California and Southern California most frequently stating “Speeding/Aggressive Driving,” while Central California respondents most frequently citing “Drunk Driving” as the biggest safety problem (Table Q2_4, highest percentage single answer highlighted in green).

Table Q2_4. Frequencies of top five safety concerns by region

Q2 by Region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California
Speeding/Aggressive Driving	19.9%	18.6%	19.7%
Distracted Driving because of TEXTING	19.0%	17.5%	18.7%
Drunk Driving	17.1%	19.8%	17.4%
Bad Road Surfaces	12.9%	11.9%	11.2%
Drugged Driving	10.7%	11.8%	11.0%
All other responses combined	20.4%	20.4%	22.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Safety Concerns (Q2) by Age

The cross-tabulation of stated safety concerns by age group 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
Speeding/Aggressive Driving	18.9%	18.9%	20.5%	20.2%	20.1%	19.1%
Distracted Driving because of TEXTING	16.5%	17.9%	19.4%	20.1%	20.2%	17.3%
Drunk Driving	20.3%	19.4%	16.3%	16.2%	15.7%	15.9%
Bad Road Surfaces	10.1%	12.4%	13.2%	12.7%	11.1%	10.9%
Drugged Driving	12.6%	10.7%	9.5%	11.0%	11.1%	11.7%
All other responses combined	21.6%	20.7%	21.1%	19.8%	21.8%	25.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

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

The survey item on behavioral changes noticed from drivers since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic was added in the 2021 data collection wave. The frequencies of answers by region are shown in Table COVID_1, “Aggressive Driving/Road Rage” being the most frequently given response(s) in all three regions. Compared to the 2021 survey, the 8.2% increase of “Aggressive Driving/Road Rage” as the biggest change in behavior is significant ($p < 0.01$).

Table COVID_1. “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 2022	Total 2021
Aggressive Driving/Road Rage	35.3%	30.4%	35.3%	34.7%	26.5%
Have Not Noticed Any Changes	22.2%	30.4%	22.3%	23.3%	23.8%
Speeding	20.9%	13.3%	18.3%	18.5%	24.2%
Distracted Driving because of TALKING and/or TEXTING	15.0%	14.5%	16.0%	15.5%	16.4%
Impaired Driving	3.1%	7.4%	4.1%	4.2%	5.7%
Not Wearing Seatbelts	2.0%	3.2%	1.8%	2.1%	1.8%
Other (uncoded)	1.5%	0.9%	2.2%	1.8%	0.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

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

All age groups of drivers stated “Aggressive Driving/Road Rage” as the biggest change in behavior since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic (Table COVID_2).

Table COVID 2. “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
Aggressive Driving/Road Rage	31.9%	32.3%	33.9%	36.2%	39.4%	38.0%
Speeding	20.2%	15.6%	19.8%	17.5%	20.1%	19.0%
Have Not Noticed Any Changes	24.9%	24.0%	19.0%	24.3%	23.5%	25.6%
Distracted Driving because of TALKING and/or TEXTING	14.9%	18.2%	15.7%	15.7%	12.5%	13.2%
Impaired Driving	4.3%	5.5%	6.9%	3.0%	1.1%	0.8%
Not Wearing Seatbelts	3.8%	2.5%	2.8%	1.0%	0.4%	1.7%
Other (uncoded)	0.0%	1.9%	2.0%	2.2%	3.0%	1.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Most Serious Distraction (Q3) by Survey Wave

Similar to data collection waves since 2013, “Texting or Checking Phone While Driving” has been the most frequently given response as the biggest distraction for drivers.

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

Table Q3_1. Frequencies of Q3 by survey year

Q3	Total 2022	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*	71.9%	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	14.4%	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***	6.3%	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	1.9%	2.5%	1.7%	2.4%	0.5%	1.3%	0.6%	1.5%	1.8%	0.5%	0.8%	1.2%	1.9%
Dashboard/Navigation Systems**	1.8%	1.5%	1.7%	2.5%	0.8%	1.3%	1.7%	0.7%	0.9%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%
Passengers in Car	1.7%	2.4%	1.2%	4.1%	2.3%	1.7%	0.6%	1.2%	2.0%	1.5%	1.4%	1.8%	3.3%
Roadside Billboards	0.7%	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	1.3%	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%	100.0%

**“Texting while Driving” in 2020 and earlier surveys

***“GPS/Navigation System” in 2020 and earlier surveys

****“Car Crashes/Vehicle Issues” in 2020 and earlier surveys

Most Serious Distraction (Q3) by Region

The most commonly stated distraction in all regions was “Texting or Checking Phone While Driving,” though the number of responses from drivers in Central California is significantly lower than the other regions ($p < 0.05$, Table Q3_3).

Table Q3_2. Frequencies of Q3 by California region

Q3 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California
Texting or Checking Phone While Driving	73.0%	65.4%	72.8%
Talking on Phone While Driving	13.3%	18.8%	14.0%
Car Crashes causing Rubbernecking	5.7%	6.7%	6.6%
Passengers in Car	2.7%	1.8%	1.2%
Dashboard/Navigation Systems	1.8%	1.8%	1.7%
Eating While Driving	1.7%	3.8%	1.7%
Roadside Billboards	1.1%	0.6%	0.4%
All Other Responses Combined	0.8%	1.2%	1.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Using Cell Phone in a Non-Hands-Free manner when Driving (Q4) by Region and Wave

A total of 29.9% of respondents stated that they “Regularly” or “Sometimes” used a cell phone in a non-hands-free manner while driving in the past 30 days, without any significant differences between California regions. Compared to 2021, there is a significant decrease of 3.9% of drivers who say they “Regularly” or “Sometimes” use a wireless device while driving ($p < 0.05$, Table Q4).

Table Q4. “How often in the past 30 days have you used a cell phone in a non-hands-free manner when driving?*” by region and year

Q4 by Region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Regularly	88 10.4%	40 11.7%	213 13.7%	341 12.4%	423 15.2%	428 15.1%	458 15.4%	443 15.2%
Sometimes	138 16.3%	58 17.0%	285 18.3%	481 17.5%	518 18.6%	528 18.6%	380 12.9%	295 10.5%
Rarely	228 26.9%	105 30.8%	414 26.5%	747 27.2%	792 28.5%	872 30.7%	268 9.3%	298 10.5%
Never	394 46.5%	138 40.5%	648 41.5%	1,180 42.9%	1,046 37.6%	1,015 35.7%	188 6.7%	348 12.5%
Total	848 100.0%	341 100.0%	1,560 100.0%	2,749 100.0%	2,779 100.0%	2,843 100.0%	1,294 100.0%	1,384 100.0%

* The phrasing of Q4 up to 2021 data collection was: “How often in the past 30 days have you used an electronic wireless device, like a cell phone while driving”?

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

Between 2021 and 2022, a comparable number of respondents stated to having ever made a driving mistake while talking or texting on a cell phone, as shown in Table Q5.

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

Q5 by year	Total 2022	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	1,104 40.6%	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	1,617 59.4%	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	2,721 100.0%	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

Slightly more than half (50.2%) of respondents reported to have been hit or nearly hit by a driver who was talking or texting on a cell phone, similar to 2021 numbers (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 2022	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	1,370 50.2%	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	1,361 49.8%	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	2,732 100.0%	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

Table Q7 shows respondents’ perception of the likelihood of being ticketed for using a hand-held cell phone or texting while driving. Combined, 49.9% of respondents stated it to be “Very Likely” or “Somewhat Likely” to get a ticket, similar to previous waves.

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

Q7 by year	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014	Total 2013	Total 2012	Total 2011	Total 2010
Very Likely	593 21.6%	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%	368 20.1%	368 20.1%
Somewhat Likely	778 28.3%	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%	570 31.2%	570 31.2%
Neither Likely or Unlikely	381 13.9%	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%	154 8.4%	154 8.4%
Somewhat Unlikely	451 16.4%	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%	356 19.5%	356 19.5%
Very Unlikely	546 19.9%	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%	379 20.7%	379 20.7%
Total	2,750 100.0%	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%	1,827 100.0%	1,827 100.0%

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

The recall of the safety campaign “Go Safely California” was 28.5% with no significant differences between the California regions. Compared to 2021, the 6.9% drop in recall in 2022 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 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019
Yes	185 26.1%	100 34.5%	383 28.5%	668 28.5%	840 35.4%	744 30.2%	207 16.4%
No	525 73.9%	190 65.5%	963 71.5%	1,678 71.5%	1,535 64.6%	1,716 69.8%	1052 83.6%
Total	710 100.0%	290 100.0%	1,346 100.0%	2,346 100.0%	2,375 100.0%	2,460 100.0%	1,259 100.0%

Recall of “Slow the Fast Down” (Q8b) by Region and Wave

The “Slow the Fast Down” campaign was recalled by 17.5% of respondents, with a comparable distribution across regions and similar to the 2021 survey results (Table Q8b).

Table Q8b. “In the past 6 months, do you recall: Slow the Fast Down?” by region and year

Q8b by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021
Yes	129 16.9%	64 21.5%	240 17.0%	433 17.5%	479 19.1%
No	634 83.1%	234 78.5%	1,168 83.0%	2,036 82.5%	2,023 80.9%
Total	763 100.0%	298 100.0%	1,408 100.0%	2,469 100.0%	2,502 100.0%

Recall of “Don’t Let Drunk, or ‘High’ Drive” Campaign (Q8c) by Region

The safety campaign “Don’t Let Drunk, or ‘High’ Drive” was recalled by 44.5% of respondents, with a comparable distribution among the California regions (Table Q8c). This campaign recall question was introduced in the 2022 data collection wave.

Table Q8c. “In the past 6 months, do you recall: “Don’t Let Drunk, or ‘High’ Drive” by region and year

Q8c by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022
Yes	337 43.7%	166 52.4%	619 43.2%	1,122 44.5%
No	435 56.3%	151 47.6%	815 56.8%	1,401 55.5%
Total	772 100.0%	317 100.0%	1,434 100.0%	2,523 100.0%

Source of Recall of Safety Campaigns

The source of the recall of the three safety campaigns is shown in Table Q8a_c, with the most frequent response – “Roadside billboard” highlighted for each campaign.

Table Q8a_c Follow-Up: “Where did you See or Hear...?” respective campaign source

Q8a-c	Go Safely California	Slow the Fast Down	Don’t Let Drunk, or ‘High’ Drive
Roadside billboard	22.6%	24.9%	40.1%
TV	16.8%	11.5%	15.1%
Facebook	16.0%	18.9%	10.6%
Instagram	14.9%	15.5%	10.4%
Radio	11.9%	8.0%	8.8%
Twitter	8.9%	12.0%	6.8%
Web	8.5%	8.2%	7.8%
Other	0.5%	1.2%	0.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Intoxicated Driving (Q9) by Wave

Asked if they had driven when they thought they had too much alcohol to drive safely in the past six months, 7.2% of respondents confirmed this, compared to 9.2% in 2021. The decrease of 2.0% of reported driving after drinking too much is significant ($p < 0.05$, 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 2022	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	197 7.2%	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	1,897 69.0%	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	654 23.8%	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	2,748 100.0%	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

The comparison of driving after having too much alcohol to drive safely by region shows no significant differences (Table Q9_2).

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	59 7.0%	23 6.7%	114 7.3%
No	580 68.6%	232 67.8%	1,086 69.7%
I do not drink at all	207 24.5%	87 25.4%	359 23.0%
Total	846 100.0%	342 100.0%	1,559 100.0%

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

A total of 43.3% of survey respondents “Always” or “Sometimes” used alternate transportation when drinking with others or alone, compared to 35.6% of respondents in 2021. This increase of 7.7% in alternate transportation use between survey waves is significant ($p < 0.01$, Table Q10).

Table Q10. “In the past 6 months, how often have you used alternate transportation when drinking with others or alone?” by region and year

Q10 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Always	167 26.3%	62 24.5%	305 25.5%	534 25.6%	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	125 19.7%	37 14.6%	206 17.2%	368 17.7%	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	70 11.0%	40 15.8%	166 13.9%	276 13.3%	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	272 42.9%	114 45.1%	519 43.4%	905 43.4%	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	634 100.0%	253 100.0%	1,196 100.0%	2,083 100.0%	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%

Recall of Sobriety/DUI Checkpoints in Past 6 Months (Q11) 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 drivers surveyed (52.1%) stated that they had seen or heard about police setting up sobriety/DUI checkpoints in the past six months, similar to 2021 findings (Table Q11_1).

Table Q11_1. “In the past 6 months, have you seen/heard anything about police setting up sobriety/DUI checkpoints to catch drunk drivers?” by year

Q11 by year	Total 2022	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	1,277 52.1%	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	1,173 47.9%	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	2,450 100.0%	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 (Q11) by Region

The comparison of California regions of whether respondents had seen or heard about police setting up sobriety/DUI checkpoints in the past six months shows significant differences. Drivers in Central California reported a significantly higher recall of sobriety/DUI checkpoints compared to drivers in Southern and Northern California (61.6% compared to 53.1% and 46.4%, respectively, $p < 0.01$, Table Q11_2).

Table Q11_2. “In the past 6 months, have you seen/heard anything about police setting up sobriety/DUI checkpoints to catch drunk drivers?” by region

Q11 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California
Yes	351 46.4%	189 61.6%	736 53.1%
No	405 53.6%	118 38.4%	650 46.9%
Total	756 100.0%	307 100.0%	1,386 100.0%

Awareness of DUI (Q12) by Region and Wave

The comparison of drivers’ awareness of getting a DUI if driving under the influence of legal or illegal drugs by region is shown in Table Q12, with a comparable distribution between regions and a similar percentage compared to 2021 data.

Table Q12. “Did you know that you can get a DUI if you drive under the influence of legal or illegal drugs?” by region and year

Q12 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total			Total 2017
				2022	2021	2020	
Yes	750 89.1%	305 89.2%	1,409 90.4%	2,464 89.9%	2,449 88.5%	1,132 90.0%	1,263 93.8%
No	92 10.9%	37 10.8%	149 9.6%	278 10.1%	317 11.5%	126 10.0%	83 6.2%
Total	842 100.0%	342 100.0%	1,558 100.0%	2,742 100.0%	2,766 100.0%	1,258 100.0%	1,346 100.0%

Likelihood of Getting Arrested for Driving Impaired (Q13) by Region and Wave

The perceived likelihood of getting arrested for driving while impaired, by region and wave, is outlined in Table Q13. Overall, 78.1% of California drivers believed it to be “Very Likely” or “Somewhat Likely” to be arrested for driving impaired, similar to 2021 results. The data comparison between the California regions shows that only 10.9% of drivers in Central California believe it to be “Somewhat Unlikely” to get arrested, a significantly lower number compared to the other regions ($p < 0.05$).

Table Q13. “In your opinion, how likely is it for someone to get arrested if they drive impaired?” by region and year

Q13 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Very Likely	281 33.6%	148 43.8%	588 37.8%	1,017 37.2%	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	349 41.7%	136 40.2%	632 40.6%	1,117 40.9%	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	158 18.9%	37 10.9%	267 17.2%	462 16.9%	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	49 5.9%	17 5.0%	69 4.4%	135 4.9%	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	837 100.0%	338 100.0%	1,556 100.0%	2,731 100.0%	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 (Q14) by Region and Wave

There are no significant differences in the perception of marijuana impairing driving between the California regions or when compared to 2021 data, with over three-quarters of survey respondents (76.3%) believing that marijuana impairs driving related functions (Table Q14).

Table Q14. “Do you think marijuana can impair driving related functions, such as reaction time, distance perception, lane tracking, coordination and balance?” by region and year

Q14 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Yes	657 78.3%	251 73.8%	1,183 75.7%	2,091 76.3%	2,138 77.0%	2,271 80.1%	1,019 80.0%	1,048 77.3%
No	72 8.6%	30 8.8%	132 8.5%	234 8.5%	237 8.5%	209 7.4%	125 9.8%	98 7.2%
It Depends	110 13.1%	59 17.4%	247 15.8%	416 15.2%	401 14.4%	356 12.6%	130 10.2%	210 15.5%
Total	839 100.0%	340 100.0%	1,562 100.0%	2,741 100.0%	2,776 100.0%	2,836 100.0%	1,274 100.0%	1,356 100.0%

Perception of DUI of Drugs, Legal and Illegal (Q15) by Region and Wave

Half of all respondents (50.0%) 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 years’ data (Table Q15).

Table Q15. “How serious of a problem is driving under the influence of drugs: including marijuana, prescription, and illegal?” by region and year

Q15 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015
A Very Big Problem	393 46.8%	190 55.9%	782 50.4%	1,365 50.0%	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	347 41.3%	120 35.3%	566 36.5%	1,033 37.8%	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	85 10.1%	28 8.2%	178 11.5%	291 10.7%	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	15 1.8%	2 0.6%	26 1.7%	43 1.6%	42 1.5%	63 2.2%	37 3.0%	48 3.6%	39 2.9%	24 1.9%	48 2.7%
Total	840 100.0%	340 100.0%	1,552 100.0%	2,732 100.0%	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 (Q16) by Region and Wave

About a third of surveyed drivers (33.3%) believe that it is safe to drive 10 miles per hour over the speed limit on freeways, similar to 2021 survey findings. The comparison between California regions shows significant differences in that perception between drivers in Central California, where a higher percentage of respondents state that it is not safe to drive 10 miles per hour over the speed limit on freeways ($p < 0.05$, Table Q16).

Table Q16. “Do you think it’s safe to drive 10 miles over the speed limit on freeways?” by region and year

Q16 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Yes	275 32.7%	98 28.8%	540 34.6%	913 33.3%	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	215 25.6%	114 33.5%	386 24.7%	715 26.1%	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	351 41.7%	128 37.6%	636 40.7%	1,115 40.6%	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	841 100.0%	340 100.0%	1,562 100.0%	2,743 100.0%	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 Over the Speed Limit on Residential Streets (Q17) by Region and Wave

The vast majority of surveyed drivers (73.9%) do not believe that it is safe to drive over the speed limit on residential streets. This finding is a significant 22.2% increase compared to 2021 (Table Q17, $p < 0.001$). This may partly be the result of item re-phrasing from previous survey waves which asked: “Do you think it’s safe to drive five miles over the speed limit on residential streets?”. The comparison among regions also shows significant differences, with significantly more Central California drivers believing it to be unsafe to drive over the speed limit on residential streets (83.6% compared to 71.9% and 73.4%, respectively, $p < 0.001$).

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

Q17 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Yes	76 9.0%	21 6.1%	162 10.4%	259 9.4%	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	622 73.4%	286 83.6%	1,126 71.9%	2,034 73.9%	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	149 17.6%	35 10.2%	277 17.7%	461 16.7%	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	847 100.0%	342 100.0%	1,565 100.0%	2,754 100.0%	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%

*Verbiage changed in 2022. In earlier years, the question was “Do you think it’s safe to drive five miles over the speed limit on residential streets?”

Chance of Being Ticketed for Driving Over Speed Limit on Residential Streets (Q18) by Region and Wave

A combined 63.7% of respondents believe it to be “Very Likely” or “Somewhat Likely” to get a ticket for driving over the speed limit on residential streets, and the percentage of Central California drivers believing it to be “Very Likely” (31.5%) is significantly higher than in the other two regions ($p<0.01$). The comparison to the 2021 findings shows a significant 5.0% increase of drivers stating it to be “Very Unlikely” to get a ticket for driving over the speed limit on residential streets (Table Q18, $p<0.01$).

Table Q18. “What do you think the chances are of getting a ticket if you drive over the speed limit on residential streets?” by region and year*

Q18 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Very Likely	182 21.6%	106 31.5%	357 22.9%	645 23.6%	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	334 39.7%	132 39.3%	631 40.5%	1,097 40.1%	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	219 26.0%	57 17.0%	391 25.1%	667 24.4%	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	107 12.7%	41 12.2%	180 11.5%	328 12.0%	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	842 100.0%	336 100.0%	1,559 100.0%	2,737 100.0%	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%

*In surveys before 2021 this question was not specific to residential streets.

Perception of Components of Safe System Approach (Safe1)

A survey item added to the 2022 data collection wave included the rating of factors which describe ways to increase safety for all road users, based on the Safe System Approach. A series of five statements, outlined in Table Safe1, were rated on a scale from one to five, with “1” being “Not at all Important” to “5” being “Very Important.” Overall, almost half or more than half of the respondents rated the five factors as “Very Important,” and “Improve safe streets design to design roads that support all road users, including drivers, pedestrian, bicyclists and transit” was the highest-rated factor overall (57.0% “Very important” rating).

Table Safe1. Rate the importance of the following factors to increase safety for all road users

Safe1 Statements	1-Not at all Important	2	3	4	5-Very Important
Promote safe speeds and reduce driver speeds to reduce injury severity for all road users	79 2.9%	115 4.2%	416 15.3%	729 26.8%	1,378 50.7%
Improve safe streets design to design roads that support all road users, including drivers, pedestrian, bicyclists and transit	45 1.7%	99 3.6%	305 11.2%	722 26.5%	1,551 57.0%
Expand awareness of safe walking, biking, and rolling	72 2.6%	118 4.4%	445 16.4%	761 28.0%	1,323 48.7%
Provide physical and emotional care to crash survivors and their families	88 3.2%	172 6.3%	535 19.7%	663 24.5%	1,254 46.2%
Support communities to plan for safe streets and public areas	64 2.3%	92 3.4%	443 16.3%	803 29.6%	1,312 48.3%

Most Important Factor Resulting in Traffic Injuries/Fatalities (Safe2) by Region

A second survey item added to the 2022 Traffic Safety Survey was a question on factors resulting in traffic injuries/fatalities, which included a set of described factors for respondents to choose the most important factor. The results by California region are shown in Table Safe.2, with the most frequently selected factor “Driver behavior” causing traffic injuries or fatalities selected by more than half of all respondents (52.9%), followed by “Speeding vehicles,” selected by over a quarter of all drivers surveyed (26.4%), without significant differences among California regions.

Table Safe2. “In your opinion, what is the most important factor resulting in traffic injuries/fatalities?” by region

Safe2 by Region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022
Driver behavior	441 52.4%	170 50.0%	835 53.7%	1,446 52.9%
Speeding vehicles	219 26.0%	93 27.4%	411 26.4%	723 26.4%
Lack of enforcement	71 8.4%	34 10.0%	107 6.9%	212 7.8%
Roadway conditions	51 6.1%	24 7.1%	81 5.2%	156 5.7%
Lack of sidewalks/bike lanes/crossing opportunities	28 3.3%	7 2.1%	61 3.9%	96 3.5%
Lack of speed limit/road signages	28 3.3%	11 3.2%	51 3.3%	90 3.3%
Other (Uncoded)	3 0.4%	1 0.3%	8 0.5%	12 0.4%
Total	841 100.0%	340 100.0%	1,554 100.0%	2,735 100.0%

Main Form of Transportation (Q19) by Region

A survey question added in the 2022 data collection wave asked respondents about their main form of transportation. In a typical week, as a single choice selection. The results, by California region, show that the majority of respondents, 82.3%, “Mostly Drive,” followed by 7.6% of respondents who “Mostly Walk.” The distribution of answers is comparable between California regions (Table Q19_1).

Table Q19_1. “In a typical week, what is your main form of transportation?” by region

Q19 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022
Mostly Drive	669 79.3%	290 85.3%	1,293 83.3%	2,252 82.3%
Mostly Walk	70 8.3%	22 6.5%	115 7.4%	207 7.6%
Mostly Ride a Bike	36 4.3%	8 2.4%	35 2.3%	79 2.9%
Mostly Ride a Motorcycle/Scooter	11 1.3%	7 2.1%	26 1.7%	44 1.6%
Mostly take Public Transit	35 4.1%	7 2.1%	53 3.4%	95 3.5%
Mostly use Ride Share Services/Taxis/Ride as passenger	21 2.5%	6 1.8%	29 1.9%	56 2.0%
Other	2 0.2%	0 0.0%	2 0.1%	4 0.1%
Total	844 100.0%	340 100.0%	1,553 100.0%	2,737 100.0%

Perception of Legality for Bicyclists on Roadways (Q20) by Region and Wave

A total of 68.2% of surveyed drivers confirmed that they believe it is legal to ride bicycles on roadways when there is no bike lane. The increase of 6.0% between survey waves 2021 and 2022 is significant ($p < 0.01$, Table Q20).

Table Q20. “Do you think it is legal for bicyclists to ride on roadways when there is no bike lane?” by region and year

Q20 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Yes	569 69.4%	212 64.8%	1,043 68.2%	1,824 68.2%	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	251 30.6%	115 35.2%	486 31.8%	852 31.8%	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	820 100.0%	327 100.0%	1,529 100.0%	2,676 100.0%	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 (Q21) by Region and Wave

Combined, 65.3% of respondents were “Very Comfortable” or “Somewhat Comfortable” sharing the road with bicyclists when there is a bike lane, compared to 72.0% in 2021, a significant 6.7% decrease ($p < 0.01$). Between the California regions, respondents in Southern California significantly more often stated to be “Very Uncomfortable” sharing the road with bikes when there is a bike lane, compared to respondents in Central California ($p < 0.05$, Table Q21).

Table Q21. “When driving, how comfortable are you with sharing the road with bicyclists when there is a bike lane?” by region and year

Q21 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Very Comfortable	239 28.4%	118 34.7%	461 29.6%	818 29.8%	986 35.7%	1,034 36.2%	570 45.1%	634 46.3%
Somewhat Comfortable	317 37.6%	119 35.0%	536 34.4%	972 35.4%	1,004 36.3%	1,045 36.6%	395 31.3%	369 27.0%
Somewhat Uncomfortable	190 22.6%	77 22.6%	348 22.3%	615 22.4%	529 19.1%	506 17.7%	171 13.5%	205 15.0%
Very Uncomfortable	96 11.4%	26 7.6%	215 13.8%	337 12.3%	246 8.9%	269 9.4%	127 10.1%	160 11.7%
Total	842 100.0%	340 100.0%	1,560 100.0%	2,742 100.0%	2,765 100.0%	2,854 100.0%	1,263 100.0%	1,368 100.0%

Level of Comfort Sharing Road with Bicyclists when Driving (Q22) by Region

A new survey question added in 2022 asked specifically about the scenario in which respondents would be most comfortable sharing the road with bicyclists. The most frequently selected answer was “When there is a protected bike lane divider,” which was chosen by 56.4% of all respondents, followed by “When there is a bike lane with painted dividers,” by 31.4% of respondents. The response pattern was comparable between all regions (Table Q22).

Table Q22. “In what situation would you feel most comfortable sharing the road with bicyclists when driving?” by region

Q22 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022
When there is a protected bike lane divider	471 56.0%	191 56.5%	876 56.6%	1,538 56.4%
Where there is a bike lane with painted dividers	269 32.0%	117 34.6%	471 30.4%	857 31.4%
Where there is no bike lane at all	49 5.8%	13 3.8%	75 4.8%	137 5.0%
Other	5 0.6%	3 0.9%	11 0.7%	19 0.7%
I don't feel comfortable sharing the road with bicyclists under any circumstance	47 5.6%	14 4.1%	115 7.4%	176 6.5%
Total	841 100.0%	338 100.0%	1,548 100.0%	2,727 100.0%

Safety Problems Experienced as Pedestrian or Bicyclist (Q23)

The safety problems experienced as a pedestrian or bicyclist, if any, are outlined in Table Q23_1, in order of the most frequently mentioned response. The safety problem most often stated was “Cars going too fast,” accounting for 21.7% of all multiple-choice responses and stated by 57.7% of all surveyed drivers. “Cars not stopping” was the second most frequent response by 54.0% of drivers, followed by “Distracted drivers using cell phones” as the third most frequent response reported by 40.6% of drivers (Table Q23_1 with the three most frequently mentioned responses highlighted).

Table Q23 1. Frequencies by percent of answers and percent of drivers

Q23 all answers combined	Count	% of Answers	% of Drivers
Cars going too fast	1,581	21.7%	57.7%
Cars not stopping	1,479	20.3%	54.0%
Distracted drivers using cell phones	1,114	15.3%	40.6%
Lots of traffic	750	10.3%	27.4%
Lack of sidewalks or bike lanes	705	9.7%	25.7%
Almost getting hit by car or bike*	698	9.6%	25.5%
Bicyclists not stopping	609	8.4%	22.2%
NONE OF THE ABOVE	174	2.4%	6.3%
Have not been a pedestrian/bicyclist in the last 6 months	143	2.0%	5.2%
All Other Responses Combined	30	0.4%	1.1%
Total	7,282	100.0%	269.5%

*Almost getting hit by a car” in 2020 and earlier surveys

Safety Problems Experienced as Pedestrian or Bicyclist (Q23) by Region and Wave

Safety problems experienced as a pedestrian or bicyclist by California region as well by survey wave are outlined in Table Q23_2, with similar results among regions and comparable to the 2021 survey results.

Table Q23 2. “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

Q23 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Cars going too fast	500 22.5%	203 23.5%	878 20.9%	1,581 21.7%	1,507 20.2%	1,598 20.7%	336 17.7%	239 12.3%
Cars not stopping	468 21.1%	173 20.0%	838 20.0%	1,479 20.3%	1,337 17.9%	1,403 18.1%	432 22.8%	336 17.3%
Distracted drivers using cell phones	312 14.1%	143 16.5%	659 15.7%	1,114 15.3%	1,057 14.2%	1,246 16.1%	348 18.4%	426 21.9%
Lots of traffic	212 9.5%	85 9.8%	453 10.8%	750 10.3%	819 11.0%	791 10.2%	98 5.2%	106 5.5%
Lack of sidewalks or bike lanes*	210 9.5%	79 9.1%	417 9.9%	705 9.7%	914 12.3%	858 11.1%	37 2.0%	52 2.7%
Almost getting hit by a car or bike**	197 8.9%	85 9.8%	416 9.9%	698 9.6%	742 10.0%	741 9.6%	197 10.4%	185 9.5%
Bicyclists not stopping	221 10.0%	56 6.5%	332 7.9%	609 8.4%	644 8.6%	718 9.3%	69 3.6%	67 3.5%
NONE OF THE ABOVE	48 2.2%	22 2.6%	103 2.5%	174 2.4%	385 5.2%	320 4.1%	308 16.3%	352 18.1%
Have not been a pedestrian/bicyclist in the last 6 months	41 1.9%	18 2.1%	83 2.0%	143 2.0%	15 0.2%	--	--	--
All Other Responses Combined	8 0.3%	2 0.2%	20 0.5%	30 0.4%	32 0.4%	62 0.6%	55 2.9%	162 8.4%
Total	2,217 100.0%	866 100.0%	4,199 100.0%	7,282 100.0%	7,451 100.0%	7,736 100.0%	1,894 100.0%	1,942 100.0%

*"Lack of sidewalks" in 2020 and earlier surveys

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

Safety Problems Experienced as Driver around Pedestrians and Bicyclists (Q24)

The multiple-choice question on safety problems which respondents experience as drivers around pedestrians and bicyclists resulted in 7,032 answers provided, out of which the three most frequently mentioned answers (highlighted in the Table Q24_1), were: “Pedestrians not using crosswalks,” reported most frequently by 46.6% of respondents, followed by “Pedestrians stepping off curb without looking” and “Bicyclists not stopping at stop signs or traffic lights.”

Table Q24_1. Frequencies Q24 by percent of answers and percent of drivers

Q24 all answers combined	Count	% of Answers	% of Drivers
Pedestrians not using crosswalks	1,261	17.9%	46.6%
Pedestrians stepping off curb without looking	1,086	15.4%	40.2%
Bicyclists not stopping at stop signs or traffic lights	1,049	14.9%	38.8%
Pedestrians/bicyclists distracted behavior (phones, ear pods, headsets)	902	12.8%	33.3%
Bicyclists being in the road or blocking traffic	872	12.4%	32.2%
Pedestrians/bicyclists not being visible enough	838	11.9%	31.0%
Lack of sidewalks or bike lanes	757	10.8%	28.0%
None of the above	238	3.4%	8.8%
All Other Responses Combined	29	0.4%	1.1%
Total	7,032	100.0%	260.0%

Safety Problems Experienced as Driver around Pedestrians and Bicyclists (Q24) by Region and Wave

The safety problems experienced as a driver around pedestrians and bicyclists by California region and survey wave are presented in Table Q24_2, with no significant difference between California regions or compared to the 2021 survey.

Table Q24 2. “Think of the times you have been a DRIVER around pedestrians or bicyclists in the last 6 months. What safety problems did you experience, if any?” by region and year

Q24 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Pedestrians not using crosswalks	385 17.3%	181 21.7%	694 17.5%	1,261 17.9%	1,548 18.2%	1,612 18.5%	300 15.2%	294 14.8%
Pedestrians stepping off curb without looking	355 16.0%	134 16.0%	597 15.0%	1,086 15.4%	1,399 16.4%	1,453 16.7%	321 16.2%	179 9.0%
Bicyclists not stopping at stop signs or traffic lights	374 16.8%	117 14.0%	557 14.0%	1,049 14.9%	1,255 14.7%	1,385 15.9%	321 10.7%	179 10.6%
Pedestrians/bicyclists distracted behavior (phones, ear pods, headsets)	296 13.3%	107 12.8%	498 12.5%	902 12.8%	1,087 12.8%	1,174 13.5%	332 16.8%	264 13.3%
Bicyclists being in the road or blocking traffic	251 11.3%	93 11.1%	527 13.3%	871 12.4%	960 11.3%	1,047 12.0%	269 13.6%	187 9.4%
Pedestrians/bicyclists not being visible enough	246 11.1%	96 11.5%	497 12.5%	838 11.9%	1,117 13.1%	1,143 13.1%	194 9.8%	169 8.5%
Lack of sidewalks or bike lanes*	228 10.3%	86 10.2%	444 11.2%	757 10.8%	905 10.6%	652 7.5%	38 1.9%	108 5.5%
NONE OF THE ABOVE	78 3.5%	21 2.5%	139 3.5%	238 3.4%	221 2.6%	223 2.6%	242 12.2%	356 18.0%
All Other Responses Combined	7 0.3%	2 0.2%	20 0.5%	29 0.4%	12 0.1%	36 0.4%	47 2.4%	76 3.8%
Total	2,222 100.0%	837 100.0%	3,973 100.0%	7,032 100.0%	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