

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

California Traffic Safety Survey 2026

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7x27h17v>

Journal

Technical Report

Authors

Ewald, Katrin

Wasserman, Lisa

Publication Date

2026-07-01



CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC SAFETY SURVEY 2026

DATA ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON WITH 2010-2025 SURVEY DATA RESULTS

Conducted on Behalf of

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

July 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	3
OVERVIEW OF 2026 STUDY	5
SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS YEARS.....	5
Data Weights and Quality Control Steps.....	5
Analysis Notes	6
Region Variable	7
Respondent Demographics.....	9
Safety Concerns (Q2)	10
Safety Concerns (Q2) by Year.....	11
Safety Concerns (Q2) by California Region and Age	12
Most Serious Distraction (Q3) by Year	13
Most Serious Distraction (Q3) by Region	14
Personal Driving Behavior (Q4)	14
Your Action Toward Others (Q5).....	15
Comfort Level to Take Actions (Q6).....	16
Recall of Safety Campaigns (Q7-Q10) by Region and Year	16
Source of Recall of Safety Campaigns (Q7-Q10)	17
Driving Under the Influence (Q11)	17
Recall of Sobriety/DUI Checkpoints in Past 6 Months (Q12) by Year	18
Recall of Sobriety/DUI Checkpoints in Past 6 Months (Q12) by Region.....	18
Perception of Marijuana Impairing Driving Functions (Q13) by Year	19
Perception of DUI of Drugs, Legal and Illegal (Q14) by Year	20
Perception of DUI of Drugs, Legal and Illegal (Q14) by “A Very Big Problem” Region.....	20
Perception of Danger about Behavior on Public Roads (Q15)	21
Behavior on Public Roads (Q16)	22
Perceptions of Driverless Vehicles (Q17, Q18) by Region.....	23
Perception of Legality for Bicyclists on Roadways (Q19) by Year.....	24
Level of Comfort Sharing Road with Bicyclists with Bike Lanes (Q20) by Year.....	25
Level of Comfort Sharing Road with Bicyclists when Driving (Q21) by Year	26
Level of Comfort Sharing Road with Bicyclists when Driving (Q21) by Region.....	27
Safety Problems Experienced as Pedestrian or Bicyclist (Q22) by Year.....	28

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Biggest Safety Concern

Overall, “Distracted driving” was the most frequently state safety concern (14.2% of all answers), followed by “Driving under the influence of alcohol” and “Speeding or aggressive driving” (14.1% and 13.7%, respectively). About three-quarters of all respondents identified those three behaviors as the biggest safety risks on California roadways (Table Q2_1.)

Most Serious Distraction

The most frequently cited serious distraction remained “Texting or Checking Phone While Driving,” , although with a significant decrease of 11.8% compared to last year. “Talking on Phone While Driving” was the second most frequently cited serious distraction, increasing by 16.3% (Table Q3_1.)

Personal Driving Behavior

44.4% of respondents reported “Sometimes”, “Usually” or “Always” driving 10 mph or more over the speed limit, while 43.0% reported driving while using voice command in their vehicle (Table Q4.)

Action Toward Others

When asked about actions taken in the past 30 days, 38.9% of respondents reported “Never” or “Rarely” having to ask someone to buckle up because they were not wearing a seatbelt, while 37.3% reported “Usually” or “Always” preventing an impaired driver from driving (Table Q5.)

Comfort Level to Take Actions

Most respondents reported feeling comfortable asking a driver to correct an unsafe behavior. Over two-thirds (66.9%) reported feeling “Very” or “Extremely” comfortable asking someone to use a seatbelt, and 71% reported feeling similarly comfortable preventing an impaired person from driving.

Recall of Traffic Safety Outreach Campaigns

The awareness of the “Go Safely California” campaign declined slightly compared to 2025, while recall of the other safety campaigns remained comparable to 2025.

Campaign	Recall 2026	Recall 2025	Recall 2024	Recall 2023	Recall 2022	Recall 2021	Recall 2020	Recall 2019
Go Safely California	33.3%	35.2%	34.0%	31.1%	28.5%	35.4%	30.2%	16.4%
Slow the Fast Down	28.1%	28.2%	25.5%	21.5%	17.5%	19.1%	--	--
Don’t Be the ‘I’ in DUI	35.1%	34.7%	34.4%	--	--	--	--	--

Awareness of the “Go Safely California” campaign was significantly lower in Central California, where only 29.6% of respondents recalled the campaign (Tables Q7–Q10.)

Driving Under the Influence

86.4% of participants reported “Never” or “Rarely” driving a vehicle within an hour of consuming any amount of alcohol, while 84.1% similarly reported “Never” or “Rarely” driving within an hour of using cannabis (Table Q11.)

Recall of Sobriety/DUI Checkpoints

Recall of sobriety checkpoints increased significantly to 65.4%, an increase of 4.3% from 2025 and a gradual increase of recall since 2019 (Table Q12.) Respondents in Central California were significantly more likely than those in the rest of California to recall seeing a sobriety/DUI checkpoint (Table Q12_2.)

Perception of DUI of Drugs, Legal and Illegal

85.5% of respondents believe that driving under the influence of any drug poses “A Very Big Problem,” or “Somewhat of a Problem”, compared to 88.1% of respondents from 2025, a slight but statistically significant decrease of 2.6% (Table Q14.)

Respondents in Southern California were significantly more likely than those in other regions to consider driving under the influence of legal or illegal drugs "A Very Big Problem," with 58.8% selecting this response (Table Q14_2.)

Perception of Driverless Vehicles

A quarter of respondents reported feeling that driverless vehicles will make roadways “Much less safe”, and respondents in Central California were significantly more likely than other regions to hold this view (Table Q17.)

Sharing Road with Driverless Vehicles

47.7% of respondents are “Somewhat uncomfortable” or “Very uncomfortable” sharing the road with driverless vehicles, a significant 9.0% decrease from 2025 (Table Q18.)

Sharing Road with Bicyclists with Bike Lanes

61.2% of drivers are either “Very Comfortable” or “Somewhat Comfortable” sharing the road with bicyclists in bike lanes (Table Q20.)

Sharing Road with Bicyclists when Driving

Central Californians differ significantly from those in the rest of the state in the roadway conditions under which they feel most comfortable sharing the road with bicyclists. Compared with respondents in Northern and Southern California, those in Central California were less likely to prefer protected bike lane dividers and more likely to prefer painted bike lane dividers (Table Q21_2.)

OVERVIEW OF 2026 STUDY

The Traffic Safety Public Opinion Study is conducted annually for the California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) and the Safe Transportation Research and Education Center at UC Berkeley (SafeTREC). Eligible participants were California drivers aged 18 years and older. As in previous years, predetermined quotas were established by age and gender; however, the 2026 study used more detailed age categories aligned with U.S. Census data.

For the 2026 version of the Traffic Safety Public Opinion Study, a substantially larger cross-section of 10,014 drivers were surveyed between June and July 2026. Panelists were recruited through Marketing Services Group, a commercial sample and panel vendor. Pre-screened respondents were forwarded to a brief 10-minute self-administered web survey programmed and managed by Ewald & Wasserman Research.

SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS YEARS

In previous years of data collection (2010 through 2019) the Traffic Safety Public Opinion Study was implemented as an in-person intercept survey at predetermined locations throughout California.

Beginning in 2020, data collection transitioned to using online survey panels, in which respondents select from predefined answering choices, in contrast to the in-person survey, which relied on respondents' open-ended comments. As a result, more responses are recorded as multiple choice selections and fewer open-ended comments.

The longitudinal comparison of the data before and since 2020 should take into account the difference in modality, as well as the impact of COVID-19 on perception and driving behavior of California drivers.

For the 2026 data collection, new questions were added to the survey, while others were deleted. The new questions are noted in the analysis below, and comparisons to previous years of data collection are made wherever possible.

**10,014 drivers
participated in the
survey, resulting in a
confidence interval
of +/- 0.98, with a
confidence level of
95%.**

Data Weights and Quality Control Steps

To ensure the collected data accurately reflected the distribution of California's driver population, additional steps were taken to weight the data by age and gender and to minimize the effects of minor sample differences between data collection years. Additional quality control procedures were implemented to ensure that only valid responses were included in the analysis. All respondents were pre-screened by the panel provider and required to pass CAPTCHA verification. Survey responses with unusually short completion times, inconsistent or low-quality response patterns, or other indicators of suspicious activity were excluded. In addition, responses associated with IP addresses located outside California, duplicate IP addresses, and duplicate or highly similar response patterns—including open-ended comments—were flagged for further review in collaboration with the panel provider.

The raw data were weighted to the California adult population by age and gender based on ratios from the 2024 American Community Survey 1-year estimates. As data was collected with preset quotas of age and gender, and because of the large sample size, only minor weighting adjustments were made to the survey data. The calculated weights, the raw data distribution by gender and age, as well as the resulting adjusted and weighted data percentages, are outlined below in Table Weights by Age and Gender.

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

	Census Data*		Survey Data		Weights		Weighted Survey Data	
Age Range	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
18-20	51.2%	48.8%	53.8%	46.2%	0.95	1.06	51.1%	48.9%
21-24	51.2%	48.8%	44.6%	55.4%	1.15	0.88	51.3%	48.7%
25-34	50.6%	49.4%	53.4%	46.6%	0.95	1.06	50.7%	49.3%
35-44	50.4%	49.6%	49.6%	50.4%	1.02	0.98	50.7%	49.3%
45-54	49.8%	50.2%	57.2%	42.8%	0.87	1.17	49.8%	50.2%
55-64	48.9%	51.1%	36.5%	63.5%	1.34	0.80	49.1%	50.9%
65-74	47.1%	52.9%	40.0%	60.0%	1.18	0.88	47.2%	52.8%
75+	42.6%	57.4%	42.5%	57.5%	1.00	1.00	42.5%	57.5%
Average	49.5%	50.5%	49.6%	50.4%	1.00	1.00	49.8%	50.2%

*Source: Census.gov: ACS DEMOGRAPHIC AND HOUSING ESTIMATES 2024 American Community Survey 1-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 statistically significant differences between different California regions are highlighted in the respective region column. Similarly, the statistically significant differences between 2026 and 2025 data are highlighted in the 2025 data column.
- 🔄 The survey results are reported based on weighted data, with the weights applied as outlined in the Table Weights by Age and Gender, and the total weighted frequency counts in some tables can differ slightly from the individual values.
- 🔄 All tables in this report are based on valid and weighted answers provided but exclude “Don’t know” and “Prefer not to answer” response options; therefore, the total

number of responses varies by table. Additionally, not all questions were displayed to all respondents due to skip patterns programmed in the survey.

-  For multiple choice questions, more than one answer could be provided. 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 would add up to 100.0%.
-  The significances shown refer to a two-tailed probability comparison of column proportions (z-test) and a *p*-value indicating the difference between the listed (and assumed independent) proportion of drivers interviewed per wave as well as in-between regions. Where applicable, the significant differences calculated were adjusted for pairwise comparisons using the Bonferroni correction. Significant findings in table cells are highlighted in orange.

Region Variable

The collected data included respondents in all California counties, grouped into three Region variables: “Northern California,” “Central California” and “Southern California,” as outlined in Table R1.

Table R1. Three geographic region definitions by county

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

The 2026 survey data was collected from all 58 California counties. Completes by county are shown in Table R2.

Table R2. Completed surveys by county (non-weighted data)

Northern California			Central California			Southern California		
County	Count	% of Total	County	Count	% of Total	County	Count	% of Total
Sub Total	2,870	28.7%	Sub Total	1,708	17.0%	Sub Total	5,436	54.3%
Alameda	339	3.4%	Calaveras	54	0.5%	Imperial	44	0.4%
Alpine	18	0.2%	Fresno	385	3.8%	LA	2,793	27.9%
Amador	27	0.3%	Inyo	6	0.1%	Orange	595	5.9%
Butte	128	1.3%	Kern	253	2.5%	Riverside	564	5.6%
Colusa	24	0.2%	Kings	48	0.5%	S. Bernard.	587	5.9%
Contra Costa	254	2.5%	Madera	79	0.8%	San Diego	716	7.1%
Del Norte	31	0.3%	Merced	96	1.0%	Ventura	137	1.4%
El Dorado	63	0.6%	Mono	4	0.0%			
Glenn	13	0.1%	Monterey	75	0.7%			
Humboldt	57	0.6%	San Benito	26	0.3%			
Lake	31	0.3%	San Joaquin	225	2.2%			
Lassen	24	0.2%	S. Luis Obispo	66	0.7%			
Marin	42	0.4%	Santa Barbara	74	0.7%			
Mariposa	16	0.2%	Santa Cruz	36	0.4%			
Mendocino	19	0.2%	Stanislaus	141	1.4%			
Modoc	9	0.1%	Tulare	128	1.3%			
Napa	27	0.3%	Tuolumne	12	0.1%			
Nevada	29	0.3%						
Placer	108	1.1%						
Plumas	6	0.1%						
Sacramento	569	5.7%						
S. Francisco	279	2.8%						
San Mateo	89	0.9%						
Santa Clara	256	2.6%						
Shasta	55	0.5%						
Sierra	3	0.0%						
Siskiyou	17	0.2%						
Solano	114	1.1%						
Sonoma	90	0.9%						
Sutter	27	0.3%						
Tehama	32	0.3%						
Trinity	7	0.1%						
Yolo	35	0.3%						
Yuba	32	0.3%						

The number of unweighted survey completes by the created region variable are shown in Table R3 with a slightly higher number of completes from the Central California region.

Table R3. Completed surveys by region and year (non-weighted data)

Region	2026 Completes	2026 Percent	2025 Percent	2024 Percent	2023 Percent	2022 Percent	2021 Percent	2020 Percent	2019 Percent
Northern California	2,870	28.7%	28.1%	27.2%	30.9%	30.8%	28.1%	29.5%	32.6%
Central California	1,708	17.1%	12.8%	14.9%	13.9%	12.4%	12.6%	12.7%	12.6%
Southern California	5,436	54.3%	59.1%	57.9%	55.2%	56.8%	59.3%	57.8%	54.9%
Total	10,014	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Respondent Demographics

The age groups were expanded in the 2026 Traffic Safety study, with the new distribution including age ranges 18-20 and 21-24 (previously 18-24), and 55-64, 65-74 and 75 and older (previously 55-70 and 71 and older). The distribution of age and gender from 2026 and previous years is shown in Table D1, with age ranges before 2026 combined for comparison.

Table D1. Age and gender distribution and year comparison (non-weighted data)

Gender & Age	2026 Total	2025 Total	2024 Total	2023 Total	2022 Total	2021 Total	2020 Total	2019 Total
Male								
18-20	10.7%	15.8%	18.0%	19.0%	17.7%	18.7%	10.7%	11.9%
21-24	8.9%							
25-34	21.5%	22.2%	27.0%	21.6%	25.6%	20.7%	23.1%	25.0%
35-44	20.0%	22.1%	18.3%	18.6%	18.2%	21.0%	23.6%	25.6%
45-54	23.1%	19.3%	16.8%	17.5%	17.8%	19.2%	25.1%	19.8%
55-64	7.4%	20.6%*	19.9%*	23.4%*	20.6%*	20.3%*	17.5%*	17.8%*
65-74	4.0%							
75+	4.3%							
Female	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
18-20	9.1%	21.7%	17.5%	18.1%	17.0%	17.7%	10.1%	17.1%
21-24	10.9%							
25-34	18.5%	18.3%	25.9%	20.7%	24.2%	19.5%	21.7%	25.3%
35-44	20.0%	19.0%	17.6%	18.0%	17.9%	20.6%	23.3%	19.3%
45-54	17.1%	20.6%	16.6%	17.4%	18.2%	19.4%	25.2%	19.9%
55-64	12.7%	20.4%*	22.4%*	25.8%*	22.7%*	22.8%*	19.8%*	18.4%*
65-74	6.0%							
75+	5.8%							
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* age range 55 and over combined

The gender and region cross-tabulation of survey completes is shown in Table D2.

Table D2. Gender distribution by geographic regions (non-weighted data)

Gender	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total
Male	49.7%	47.0%	50.5%	49.7%
Female	50.3%	53.0%	49.5%	50.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Safety Concerns (Q2)

Question Q2 asked respondents to identify driver behaviors that pose a safety risk on California roadways in a multiple-choice question. Table Q2_1 presents the 51,927 answers given in response to this question, with the three most frequently selected responses highlighted in green.

Overall, “Distracted driving” was the most frequently cited concern, with 14.2% of all answers, followed by “Driving under the influence of alcohol” and “Speeding or aggressive driving” with 14.1% and 13.7% of all answers, respectively. Almost three-quarters of all respondents identified those three behaviors as the biggest safety risks on California roadways.

Table Q2_1. Frequencies of Q2 by percent of answers and percent of drivers

Q2 (multiple choice combined responses)	Count	% of Answers	% of Drivers
Distracted driving	7,375	14.2%	75.4%
Driving under the influence of alcohol	7,347	14.1%	75.1%
Speeding or aggressive driving	7,131	13.7%	72.9%
Driving under the influence of cannabis	5,550	10.7%	56.8%
Inattentive driving	5,526	10.6%	56.5%
Driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs	5,217	10.0%	53.4%
Drowsy driving	4,893	9.4%	50.0%
Failure to yield pedestrians or bicyclists	4,630	8.9%	47.4%
Not using seatbelts or child safety equipment	4,110	7.9%	42.0%
Other specified	147	0.3%	1.5%
Total	51,927	100.0%	531.1%

Safety Concerns (Q2) by Year

Table Q2_2 shows the frequencies of the top three answer options from 2026, with previous years for comparison. For the 2026 data collection, the answer choice “Drunk driving” from previous years was changed to “Driving under the influence of alcohol.” “Distracted driving” was introduced as a single combined response option encompassing both texting and talking while driving, which were separate response options in previous survey waves.

Table Q2_2. Frequencies of top three responses to Q2 by percent of answers and by year of data collection

Q2 all Answers Combined	% Answers 2026	% Answers 2025	% Answers 2024	% Answers 2023	% Answers 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
Distracted driving	14.2%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Driving under the influence of alcohol	14.1%	17.8%	17.6%	17.6%	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%
Speeding/ aggressive driving	13.7%	18.8%	19.2%	19.7%	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%
All other responses**	58.0%	63.4%	63.2%	62.7%	62.8%	63.7%	63.0%	70.5%	74.1%	49.4%	75.2%	75.3%	73.6%	80.0%	80.1%	69.8%	73.9%
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%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**the list of “All other responses” is shown in Q2_1

Safety Concerns (Q2) by California Region and Age

The cross-tabulation sorted by frequency of mentioned safety concerns by California region and age group are shown in Table Q2_3, together with the distribution by the California regions and respondent ages for comparison (Table Q2_3.)

Table Q2_3. Frequencies of top five safety concerns by region and age

Q2 by Region and Age	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	18-20	21-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75 or older
Distracted driving	14.1%	14.3%	14.2%	14.2%	14.1%	14.0%	13.9%	14.6%	14.6%	14.2%	13.9%
Driving under the influence of alcohol	14.1%	14.3%	14.1%	13.9%	14.7%	14.3%	14.2%	14.3%	13.6%	14.0%	13.9%
Speeding or aggressive driving	13.6%	13.6%	13.8%	13.8%	14.4%	14.0%	13.6%	13.5%	13.6%	13.5%	13.6%
Inattentive driving	10.9%	10.1%	10.7%	10.2%	9.8%	10.6%	10.8%	10.8%	10.8%	10.9%	11.2%
Driving under the influence of cannabis	10.4%	10.5%	10.9%	11.7%	11.7%	10.6%	10.3%	10.4%	10.5%	10.7%	10.6%
Driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs	10.2%	10.0%	10.0%	9.5%	9.5%	9.7%	10.6%	10.1%	10.4%	9.8%	10.1%
Drowsy driving	9.4%	9.6%	9.4%	9.8%	9.4%	9.4%	9.5%	9.3%	9.6%	9.2%	9.0%
Not using seatbelts or child safety equipment	7.9%	8.4%	7.8%	8.7%	8.1%	8.1%	7.9%	7.5%	7.4%	7.8%	8.0%
Failure to yield to pedestrians or bicyclists	9.1%	8.9%	8.8%	8.1%	8.2%	9.0%	9.0%	9.1%	9.0%	9.6%	9.2%
Other specified	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Most Serious Distraction (Q3) by Year

Consistent with previous years, the most frequently cited serious distraction for drivers was “Texting or Checking Phone While Driving,” though there was a significant decrease of 11.8% compared to 2025. “Talking on Phone While Driving” was the second most frequently cited serious distraction, with a significant increase of 16.3% from 2025 (Table Q3_1, $p>0.05$, grey highlight.)

Table Q3_1. Frequencies of Q3 by survey year

Q3	Total 2026	Total 2025	Total 2024	Total 2023	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*	57.0%	68.8%	72.7%	72.4%	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	32.5%	16.2%	13.0%	15.0%	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 Rub-bernecking#	3.0%	4.8%	5.1%	4.3%	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%
Passengers in Car	2.6%	2.5%	2.6%	2.5%	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%
Eating While Driving	2.2%	3.1%	2.0%	2.1%	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**	1.6%	2.7%	2.7%	2.1%	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%
Roadside Billboards	0.4%	0.5%	0.7%	0.8%	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%
Other specified	0.7%	1.4%	1.2%	0.8%	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%	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 comparison of the most serious distraction for drivers by California regions shows “Texting or Checking Phone While Driving” as the most frequently stated response throughout California, without any significant regional differences (Table Q3_2.)

Table Q3_2. Frequencies of Q3 by California region

Q3 by Region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California
Texting or Checking Phone While Driving	56.9%	55.5%	57.5%
Talking on Phone While Driving	30.9%	34.6%	32.6%
Car Crashes causing Rubbernecking	3.2%	2.6%	3.1%
Passengers in Car	2.8%	2.8%	2.4%
Eating While Driving	2.5%	2.5%	1.9%
Dashboard/Navigation Systems	2.2%	1.2%	1.4%
Roadside Billboards	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%
Other specified	0.9%	0.4%	0.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Personal Driving Behavior (Q4)

A new question in the 2026 Traffic Safety Survey asked about driving behaviors in the past 30 days, rated on a five-point scale from “Never” to “Always”. Notably, 44.4% of respondents reported “Sometimes”, “Usually” or “Always” driving 10 mph or more over the speed limit, and 43.0% reported driving while using voice command in their vehicle with similar frequency (Table Q4.)

Table Q4. “Your driving behavior: In the past 30 days, how often have you done any of the following?”

Q4. Driving Behavior	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
Driven 10 mph or more over the speed limit	2,406 24.3%	3,081 31.1%	2,893 29.2%	1,006 10.1%	530 5.3%
Driven while holding and talking on a cell phone	5,305 53.4%	2,547 25.6%	1,436 14.4%	427 4.3%	226 2.3%
Driven while reading or looking at a cell phone	5,323 53.5%	2,528 25.4%	1,423 14.3%	434 4.4%	241 2.4%

Table Q4 continued. “Your driving behavior: In the past 30 days, how often have you done any of the following?”

Q4. Driving Behavior	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
Driven while using voice command and in-dash car app	3,910 39.3%	1,767 17.7%	2,385 24.0%	1,308 13.1%	584 5.9%
Driven while manually typing or interacting with a cell phone with your hands	5,798 58.3%	2,198 22.1%	1,237 12.4%	437 4.4%	278 2.8%

Your Action Toward Others (Q5)

Another new item in the 2026 survey asked the frequency of certain actions in the past 30 days towards others, on the same scale ranging from “Never” to “Always”. Markedly, 38.9% of respondents reported “Never” or “Rarely” asking someone to buckle up who is not using a seatbelt, and 37.3% reported “Usually” or “Always” preventing an impaired driver from driving (Table Q5.)

Table Q5. “Your actions towards other: In the past 30 days, how often have you had to do any of the following?”

Q5. Actions Toward Others	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
Ask someone who is not using a seat belt to buckle up	2,507 25.2%	1,363 13.7%	1,720 17.3%	1,255 12.6%	3,104 31.2%
Ask a driver who is using a cell phone or who is distracted to focus on driving	3,042 30.6%	1,650 16.6%	2,070 20.8%	1,278 12.9%	1,891 19.0%
Ask someone who is speeding or driving aggressively to slow down	2,793 28.1%	1,839 18.5%	2,220 22.3%	1,327 13.4%	1,756 17.7%
Prevent someone who is too impaired from driving	3,513 35.5%	1,380 13.9%	1,312 13.3%	1,055 10.6%	2,644 26.7%

Comfort Level to Take Actions (Q6)

Question Q6 asked respondents how comfortable they felt taking specific actions from a set of scenarios, with the answering options ranging from “Not at all” to “Extremely” (Table Q6.) Overall, respondents reported high levels of comfort asking drivers to correct unsafe behaviors. More than two-thirds of respondents (66.9%) reported feeling “Very” or “Extremely” comfortable asking someone to wear a seatbelt, while 71.0% reported the same level of comfort preventing an impaired person from driving.

Table Q6. “How comfortable would you feel taking each of the following actions?”

Q6. Comfort Level	Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Very	Extremely
Ask someone who is not using a seat belt to buckle up	1,005 10.1%	902 9.1%	1,381 13.9%	2,229 22.4%	4,416 44.5%
Ask a driver who is using a cell phone or who is distracted to focus on driving	986 9.9%	998 10.1%	1,895 19.1%	2,505 25.2%	3,538 35.7%
Ask someone who is speeding or driving aggressively to slow down	980 9.9%	1,051 10.6%	1,952 19.7%	2,515 25.3%	3,430 34.5%
Prevent someone who is too impaired from driving	893 9.0%	695 7.0%	1,286 13.0%	2,035 20.5%	5,002 50.5%

Recall of Safety Campaigns (Q7-Q10) by Region and Year

The recall ratings of the 2026 California Office of Traffic Safety campaigns are outlined in Table Q7-Q10 with the additional 2026 campaign “Empty Chair Club”. The results by region and the comparisons to previous years show a significantly lower recall of the “Go Safely California” campaign in Central California compared to other regions, and slight decrease from 2025. The recall of the other campaigns remained consistent with previous years (Table Q7-Q10.)

Table Q7-Q10. Rate of recall of safety campaigns by region and year

Q7-Q10 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2026	Total 2025	Total 2024	Total 2023	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019
Go Safely California	33.6%	29.6%	34.3%	33.3%	35.2%	34.0%	31.1%	28.5%	35.4%	30.2%	16.4%
Slow the Fast Down	29.1%	26.1%	28.3%	28.1%	28.2%	25.4%	21.5%	17.5%	19.1%		
Don’t Be the ‘I’ in DUI	34.6%	33.6%	35.8%	35.1%	34.7%	34.4%					
Empty Chair Club	15.4%	12.9%	14.3%	14.4%							

Source of Recall of Safety Campaigns (Q7-Q10)

As before “Roadside billboard” remained the most frequently selected source of recall for all four campaigns (Table Q7-Q10 Follow-up.)

Table Q7-Q10 Follow-Up: “Where did you See or Hear...” respective campaign source

Q7-Q10	Go Safely California	Slow the Fast Down	Don’t Be the ‘I’ in DUI	Empty Chair Club
Roadside billboard	22.4%	24.5%	27.7%	13.8%
Facebook	17.7%	18.2%	16.5%	23.1%
Instagram	17.4%	17.5%	16.0%	20.2%
TV	15.3%	12.4%	13.6%	11.8%
X (Twitter)	9.3%	10.8%	9.7%	14.4%
Radio	8.7%	7.1%	7.1%	5.6%
Web	8.4%	8.8%	8.6%	10.7%
Other specified r	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Driving Under the Influence (Q11)

Another new question in the 2026 survey asked about behaviors in the past 6 months, with a scale ranging from “Never” to “Always” (Table Q11.) A total of 86.4% of participants reported “Never” or “Rarely” driving a vehicle within an hour of consuming any amount of alcohol, while 84.1% similarly reported “Never” or “Rarely” driving within an hour of using cannabis.

Table Q11 “In the past 6 months, how often have you done any of the following behaviors?”

Actions	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
Driven a vehicle within an hour of consuming any amount of alcohol	5,142 70.8%	1,134 15.6%	600 8.3%	180 2.5%	206 2.8%
Driven a vehicle within an hour of using cannabis (e.g., marijuana, weed, pot, or edibles)	5,074 72.8%	784 11.3%	624 9.0%	279 4.0%	204 2.9%
Used alternate transportation (e.g., taxi, designated sober driver, ride-hailing service, public transit) when drinking with others or alone	2,762 39.3%	939 13.3%	1,252 17.8%	944 13.4%	1,139 16.2%

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

Question 12 asked about the recall of sobriety checkpoints in the past six months. The 2026 responses are summarized with previous years in Table Q12 and show a gradual increase of recall since 2019. The 4.3% increase in recall of sobriety check points since 2025 is significant at $p>0.05$.

Table Q12. “In the past 6 months, have you seen/heard anything about police setting up sobriety/DUI checkpoints to catch drunk drivers?” by year

Q12	Total 2026	Total 2025	Total 2024	Total 2023	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	5,880 65.4%	1,281 61.1%	1,399 61.0%	1,390 56.4%	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	3,110 34.6%	816 38.9%	894 39.0%	1,077 43.6%	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	8,990 100.0%	2,097 100.0%	2,293 100.0%	2,467 100.0%	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 (Q12) by Region

A comparison of the sobriety checkpoint recall by region shows a significant difference in Central California when compared to the rest of California, with 70.4% of drivers recalling a checkpoint in the past 6 months (Table Q12_2, $p<0.05$.)

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	Total 2026
Yes	62.6%	70.4%	65.3%	65.4%
No	37.4%	29.6%	34.7%	34.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perception of Marijuana Impairing Driving Functions (Q13) by Year

Question Q13 asked respondents whether they believed marijuana impairs driving-related functions. The question was retained in the 2026 survey, but the response options were revised from the yes/no format used in previous years to a five-point scale ranging from "Definitely yes" to "Definitely not." Despite this change, the distribution of responses was similar to previous years, with 77.9% of respondents answering "Definitely yes" or "Probably yes," compared with 77.3% responding "Yes" in 2025 (Table Q13.)

Table Q13. "Do you think marijuana can impair driving related functions, such as reaction time, distance perception, lane tracking, coordination and balance?" by year

Q13	Total 2026	Total 2025	Total 2024	Total 2023	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Definitely yes	5,583 56.4%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Probably yes	2,126 21.5%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Maybe	1,385 14.0%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Probably not	468 4.7%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Definitely not	335 3.4%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Yes	--	1,779 77.3%	1,934 77.9%	2,135 77.8%	2,091 76.3%	2,138 77.0%	2,271 80.1%	1,019 80.0%	1,048 77.3%
No	--	216 9.4%	201 8.1%	223 8.1%	234 8.5%	237 8.5%	209 7.4%	125 9.8%	98 7.2%
It Depends	--	307 13.3%	347 14.0%	387 14.1%	416 15.2%	401 14.4%	356 12.6%	130 10.2%	210 15.5%
Total	9,897 100.0%	2,302 100.0%	2,482 100.0%	2,745 100.0%	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 (Q14) by Year

A total of 85.5% of respondents in 2026 believe that driving under the influence of any drug poses “A Very Big Problem,” or “Somewhat of a Problem”, compared to 88.1% of respondents 2025, a small but significant decrease of 2.6% (Table Q14, $p>0.05$.)

Table Q14. “How serious of a problem is driving under the influence of drugs: including marijuana, prescription, and illegal?” by year

Q14	Total 2026	Total 2025	Total 2024	Total 2023	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015
A Very Big Problem	5,622 57.0%	1,252 54.5%	1,326 53.8%	1,388 50.6%	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	2,808 28.5%	771 33.6%	833 33.8%	1,026 37.4%	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	1,054 10.7%	227 9.8%	255 10.3%	281 10.2%	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	375 3.8%	48 2.1%	53 2.1%	47 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	9,858 100.0%	2,297 100.0%	2,467 100.0%	2,742 100.0%	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%

Perception of DUI of Drugs, Legal and Illegal (Q14) by “A Very Big Problem” Region

Compared with respondents in the other California regions, those in Southern California were significantly more likely to rate driving under the influence of legal or illegal drugs as "A Very Big Problem," with 58.8% selecting this response (Table Q14_2, $p<0.05$.)

Table Q14 2. “How serious of a problem is driving under the influence of drugs: including marijuana, prescription, and illegal?” by region

Q14 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2026
A Very Big Problem	54.6%	55.4%	58.8%	57.0%
Somewhat of a Problem	30.0%	28.8%	27.6%	28.5%
A Small Problem	11.5%	12.4%	9.8%	10.7%
Not a Problem at all	3.9%	3.4%	3.9%	3.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perception of Danger about Behavior on Public Roads (Q15)

The newly added Question Q15 (Table Q15) asked respondents to rate how dangerous they considered various behaviors on public roads. Response options ranged from "Not dangerous at all" to "Extremely dangerous." While 55.9% of respondents rated driving 10 mph over the speed limit on residential streets as "Very dangerous" or "Extremely dangerous," 44.4% reported that they "Sometimes," "Usually," or "Always" drove 10 mph or more over the speed limit (Table Q4).

Table Q15. "How dangerous do you feel each of the following is:

Q15. Perception of danger	Not at all dangerous	Slightly dangerous	Moderately dangerous	Very dangerous	Extremely dangerous
Driving a motor vehicle on public roads	1,650 16.8%	2,937 29.8%	3,141 31.9%	1,276 13.0%	835 8.5%
Riding a bicycle on public roads	607 6.1%	2,375 24.0%	3,107 31.4%	2,515 25.4%	1,300 13.1%
Walking or jogging on public roads	766 7.7%	2,557 25.8%	3,025 30.5%	2,258 22.8%	1,306 13.2%
Using public transportation	2,671 27.0%	3,796 38.3%	2,120 21.4%	831 8.4%	488 4.9%
Driving 10 miles over the speed limit on freeways	1,089 11.0%	3,507 35.4%	2,915 29.4%	1,564 15.8%	827 8.3%
Driving 10 miles over the speed limit on residential streets	410 4.1%	1,478 14.9%	2,480 25.0%	3,397 34.3%	2,141 21.6%

Behavior on Public Roads (Q16)

Question 16 was new to the 2026 survey and asked respondents how often they engage in a set of transportation-related behaviors. Response options ranged from "Never" to "Daily" on a five-point scale (Table Q16.) More than half of respondents (53.3%) reported that they never rode a bicycle on public roads, while an even larger proportion (69.1%) reported that they never rode a scooter or motorcycle. By comparison, 68.2% of respondents reported driving a motor vehicle on public roads at least once a week ("About once a week") or more frequently.

Table Q16. "How often do you engage in the following behaviors?"

Q16. Behavior	Never	A few times a year	About once a month	About once a week	Daily
Drive a motor vehicle on public roads	1,392 14.2%	841 8.6%	891 9.1%	1,549 15.8%	5,146 52.4%
Ride a bicycle on public roads	5,271 53.3%	2,169 21.9%	1,046 10.6%	928 9.4%	473 4.8%
Ride a motorcycle/scooter on public roads	6,838 69.1%	1,205 12.2%	775 7.8%	692 7.0%	379 3.8%
Use rideshare services/taxis on public roads	3,214 32.5%	3,283 33.2%	1,782 18.0%	1,160 11.7%	445 4.5%
Walk or jog on public roads (including shoulders and sidewalks)	2,915 29.4%	1,981 20.0%	1,394 14.1%	2,097 21.2%	1,516 15.3%
Use public transportation	3,685 37.2%	2,889 29.2%	1,360 13.7%	1,224 12.4%	736 7.4%

Perceptions of Driverless Vehicles (Q17, Q18) by Region

About a quarter of respondents reported feeling that driverless vehicles will make roadways “Much less safe” and respondents in Central California were significantly more likely than the other two regions to hold this view (Table Q17, $p>0.05$.)

Table Q17. “Do you think driverless vehicles will make our roadways safer?” by region

Q17 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2026
Much less safe	653 23.5%	517 31.1%	1,334 25.1%	2,504 25.7%
Somewhat less safe	611 22.0%	353 21.2%	1,197 22.5%	2,161 22.1%
About the same	744 26.7%	449 27.0%	1,433 27.0%	2,626 26.9%
Somewhat safer	520 18.7%	250 15.0%	911 17.1%	1,681 17.2%
Much safer	254 9.1%	93 5.6%	442 8.3%	789 8.1%
Total	2,782 100.0%	1,662 100.0%	5,317 100.0%	9,761 100.0%

Q18 asked about the level of comfort sharing the road with driverless vehicles, shown in Table Q18 by region and compared to past years. In the 2026 survey, the additional answering option “Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable” was added. Overall, 47.7% of respondents are “Somewhat uncomfortable” or “Very uncomfortable” sharing the road with driverless vehicles, a significant 9.0% decrease ($p<0.05$) when compared to 2025.

Table Q18. “How comfortable are you about sharing the road with driverless vehicles?” by region

Q18 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2026	Total 2025	Total 2024
Very comfortable	319 11.3%	139 8.3%	669 12.4%	1,127 11.4%	354 15.5%	327 13.2%
Somewhat comfortable	636 22.5%	318 18.9%	1,031 19.2%	1,985 20.1%	636 27.8%	630 25.5%

Table Q18. “How comfortable are you about sharing the road with driverless vehicles?” by region - continued

Q18 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2026	Total 2025	Total 2024
Neither uncomfortable nor comfortable	556 19.6%	361 21.5%	1,137 21.1%	2,054 20.8%	--	--
Somewhat uncomfortable	653 23.1%	379 22.5%	1,236 23.0%	2,268 22.9%	701 30.6%	797 32.3%
Very uncomfortable	668 23.6%	485 28.8%	1,304 24.3%	2,457 24.8%	597 26.1%	714 28.9%
Total	2,832 100.0%	1,682 100.0%	5,377 100.0%	9,891 100.0%	2,288 100.0%	2,468 100.0%

Perception of Legality for Bicyclists on Roadways (Q19) by Year

Comparable to last year, 57.6% of respondents believe that it is legal for bicyclists to ride on roadways when there is no bike lane (Table Q19.)

Table Q19. “Do you think it is legal for bicyclists to ride on roadways when there is no bike lane?” by year

Q19	Total 2026	Total 2025	Total 2024	Total 2023	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018	Total 2017	Total 2016	Total 2015	Total 2014
Yes	5,410 57.6%	1,283 57.1%	1,493 61.3%	1,819 68.0%	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	3,987 42.4%	963 42.9%	944 38.7%	856 32.0%	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	9,397 100.0%	2,246 100.0%	2,437 100.0%	2,675 100.0%	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 (Q20) by Year

For question Q20, which asks to rate the level of comfort sharing the road with bicyclists on bike lanes, the answer option “Neither uncomfortable nor comfortable” was added. Similar to the past year, 61.2% of drivers are either “Very Comfortable” or “Somewhat Comfortable” sharing the road with bicyclists on bike lanes (Table Q20.)

Table Q20. “When driving, how comfortable are you with sharing the road with bicyclists when there IS a bike lane?” by year

Q20	Total 2026	Total 2025	Total 2024	Total 2023	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Very Comfortable	3,013 30.5%	656 28.6%	725 29.3%	781 28.6%	818 29.8%	986 35.7%	1,034 36.2%	570 45.1%	634 46.3%
Somewhat Comfortable	3,039 30.7%	820 35.8%	871 35.2%	974 35.6%	972 35.4%	1,004 36.3%	1,045 36.6%	395 31.3%	369 27.0%
Neither uncomfortable nor comfortable	1,493 15.1%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Somewhat Uncomfortable	1,541 15.6%	542 23.7%	578 23.3%	631 23.1%	615 22.4%	529 19.1%	506 17.7%	171 13.5%	205 15.0%
Very Uncomfortable	806 8.2%	274 11.9%	303 12.2%	349 12.8%	337 12.3%	246 8.9%	269 9.4%	127 10.1%	160 11.7%
Total	9,892 100.0%	2,292 100.0%	2,477 100.0%	2,735 100.0%	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 (Q21) by Year

Question Q21 asked respondents under what conditions they would feel most comfortable sharing the road with bicyclists. More than half (55.8%) selected "When there is a protected bike lane divider," a distribution of responses that was similar to 2025 (Table Q21.)

Table Q21. "In what situation would you feel most comfortable sharing the road with bicyclists when driving?" by year

Q21 by year	Total 2026	Total 2025	Total 2024	Total 2023	Total 2022
When there is a protected bike lane divider	5,488 55.8%	1,263 55.3%	1,426 58.1%	1,483 54.5%	1,538 56.4%
Where there is a bike lane with painted dividers	2,865 29.1%	717 31.4%	739 30.1%	886 32.6%	857 31.4%
Where there is no bike lane at all	933 9.5%	169 7.4%	137 5.6%	157 5.8%	137 5.0%
Other	60 0.6%	24 1.0%	16 0.6%	17 0.6%	19 0.7%
I don't feel comfortable sharing the road with bicyclists under any circumstance	483 4.9%	111 4.9%	138 5.6%	178 6.5%	176 6.5%
Total	9,829 100.0%	2,283 100.0%	2,456 100.0%	2,721 100.0%	2,727 100.0%

Level of Comfort Sharing Road with Bicyclists when Driving (Q21) by Region

Central Californians differ significantly from those in the rest of the state in the roadway conditions under which they feel most comfortable sharing the road with bicyclists. Compared with respondents in Northern and Southern California, those in Central California were significantly less likely to prefer protected bike lane dividers and more likely to prefer painted bike lane dividers (Table Q21_2, $p < 0.05$.)

Table Q21_2. “In what situation would you feel most comfortable sharing the road with bicyclists when driving?” by region

Q21 by region	Northern California	Central California	Southern California	Total 2026
When there is a protected bike lane divider	55.7%	52.0%	57.1%	55.8%
Where there is a bike lane with painted dividers	28.7%	33.4%	28.0%	29.1%
Where there is no bike lane at all	10.0%	9.9%	9.1%	9.5%
Other	0.9%	0.4%	0.5%	0.6%
I don't feel comfortable sharing the road with bicyclists under any circumstance	4.6%	4.3%	5.2%	4.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Safety Problems Experienced as Pedestrian or Bicyclist (Q22) by Year

Q22 asked about safety problems respondents experienced in the past six months on roadways as a pedestrian or bicyclist. Slight modifications were made to the answering choices (as noted below). Nevertheless, the results are comparable to last year's data, with "Drivers going too fast" and "Cars not stopping" as the most frequently reported problems.

Table Q22. "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 year

Q22	Total 2026	Total 2025	Total 2024	Total 2023	Total 2022	Total 2021	Total 2020	Total 2019	Total 2018
Drivers going too fast*	5,852 20.8%	1,362 22.2%	1,479 21.4%	1,562 21.5%	1,581 21.7%	1,507 20.2%	1,598 20.7%	336 17.7%	239 12.3%
Drivers not stopping**	5,127 18.2%	1,177 19.2%	1,323 19.1%	1,449 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	4,864 17.3%	956 15.6%	1,092 15.8%	1,117 15.4%	1,114 15.3%	1,057 14.2%	1,246 16.1%	348 18.4%	426 21.9%
Lots of traffic	2,962 10.5%	647 10.5%	732 10.6%	756 10.4%	750 10.3%	819 11.0%	791 10.2%	98 5.2%	106 5.5%
Lack of sidewalks or bike lanes	2,846 10.1%	670 10.9%	782 11.3%	707 9.8%	705 9.7%	914 12.3%	858 11.1%	37 2.0%	52 2.7%
Almost getting hit by a car or bike	2,755 9.8%	613 10.0%	674 9.7%	711 9.8%	698 9.6%	742 10.0%	741 9.6%	197 10.4%	185 9.5%
Bicyclists not stopping	2,334 8.3%	49 7.8%	555 8.0%	617 8.5%	609 8.4%	644 8.6%	718 9.3%	69 3.6%	67 3.5%
Have not experienced any safety concerns***	682 2.4%	128 2.1%	163 2.3%	162 2.2%	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	619 2.2%	94 1.5%	99 1.4%	140 1.9%	143 2.0%	15 0.2%	--	--	--
Other specified	92 0.3%	20 0.3%	26 0.4%	29 0.4%	30 0.4%	32 0.4%	62 0.6%	55 2.9%	162 8.4%
Total	28,134 100.0%	6,146 100.0%	6,925 100.0%	7,250 100.0%	7,282 100.0%	7,451 100.0%	7,736 100.0%	1,894 100.0%	1,942 100.0%

*"Cars going too fast" until 2025 | **"Cars not stopping" until 2025 | *****"None of the above" until 2025