

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

**From:** Murray Fontes <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 18, 2026 8:55 AM  
**To:** Brianna Goodman <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Justin Meek <[REDACTED]> Patrice Theriot  
<[REDACTED]> Daniel Espinosa <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** RE: Draft Rural Highways Safety Plan Report Available for Review

Brianna,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I apologize for the late response.

The city recently completed a road improvement project on Bridge St between Blackburn St and Beck St that incorporates some of the recommendations identified in Figure 31 Highway 129: Blackburn St/Bridge St of the Draft Safety Plan. These include:

- High Visibility Crosswalks across Blackburn St and Bridge St
- Bike Lanes on Bridge St east of Blackburn St
- A striped median island on the portion of Blackburn St between Riverside Dr & Bridge St

**From:** Carla Periat <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 14, 2026 6:17 AM  
**To:** Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
**Subject:** Rural high ways commission

Having lived in Pescadero for many years I traveled this portion of high many times. The accidents are horrendous. I can come up with only two improvements: more passing lanes. Coming into Santa Cruz there seems to be enough but further out towards another Nuevo they seem to be lacking. The other is a reminder to all that a solid yellow line is our life line.

Thank you for looking into this decades long problem.

Carla Periat  
Sent from my iPhone

Tess Fitzgerald, President  
Boulder Creek Business Association  
Boulder Creek, CA  
[REDACTED]  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
February 17, 2026

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

On behalf of the Boulder Creek Business Association (BCBA), we are pleased to offer our general recommendation and support for the Public Draft of the Rural Highways Safety Plan **(RHSP)**.

We appreciated the opportunity for our membership to provide direct feedback to the RTC as part of the development of this plan. Our members were clear and consistent in their input: strategic safety enhancements at town entry points are critical for both public safety and the long-term health of our downtown economy.

Boulder Creek's downtown functions as a central gathering place and economic anchor for the San Lorenzo Valley. The rural highways that serve our town are not simply transportation corridors—they are gateways that shape how people experience, access, and engage with our local businesses. Improvements that promote safer and slower transitions into town directly support a more welcoming, walkable, and economically resilient downtown environment.

Specifically, our membership strongly supports safety treatments such as sidewalk extensions, curb extensions, enhanced crosswalks including RRFBs, and improved signage. These measures will help calm traffic, improve visibility, and create safer conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists alike. Just as importantly, they signal to drivers that they are entering a town center—encouraging slower speeds, greater awareness, and increased comfort for those choosing to stop, park, and support local businesses. The only ongoing area of concern to our membership is the potential placement of traffic medians in the downtown Boulder Creek corridor between Forest Street and the intersection of Highway 236. We appreciate staff taking the time to visit with our members in 2025 and collect feedback about our concerns. We felt heard and confident that our Association will be consulted with prior to any kind of median placement in the downtown Boulder Creek corridor.

We value the RHSP's data-driven approach, emphasis on implementable projects, and commitment to incorporating community input. Aligning rural highway safety investments with downtown placemaking and economic development goals ensures that safety improvements deliver broad and lasting benefits for our community.

The BCBA encourages the RTC to move forward with adoption of the RHSP and to continue collaborating with local business organizations as projects advance toward design and implementation. We believe this plan represents a meaningful step toward safer roadways, stronger downtowns, and more vibrant rural communities throughout Santa Cruz County. Thank you for your leadership and for providing a thoughtful process that recognizes the interconnected nature of transportation safety and local economic vitality.

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

Sincerely,  
Tess Fitzgerald

To: Regional Transportation Commission  
Supervisor Monica Martinez, District 5  
Matt Machado, County of Santa Cruz  
From: Blake Holiday, President Ben Lomond Village Alliance  
James Helmer, Chair of Better Streets Committee  
Subject: Comments to the Rural Highway Safety Plan Milestone 3  
Date: February 12, 2026

The Ben Lomond Village Alliance (BLVA) appreciates and thanks the Regional Transportation Commission for the opportunity to respond to the draft safety enhancements (Milestone 3) prepared by RTC's consultant Fehr & Peers. Comments on this draft reflect those made in Milestone 2 with some changes based upon the consultant's modifications between drafts. While BLVA does not explicitly represent the views of downtown merchants and property owners, we have a membership of over 900 residents and have attempted to share the plans with key stakeholders (such as local businesses and the Fire Department) to gain their input.

The consultant's statement regarding Highway 9 in Ben Lomond is: "The Highway 9 segment through downtown Ben Lomond is a Main Street, has narrow curves and the area is affected by excessive speeds and frequent lane departure crashes." The consultant suggests several key enhancements to slow traffic and improve safety, however, two that need greater clarification are "right-sizing intersections" and "narrow vehicle lanes."

Below are BLVA's comments to the four conceptual plans from north to south.

Plan #1 BLVA supports Vegetation Management as well as removal of trees that are close to the edge of roadway and pose increased risk to pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. A short Gateway Median is supported just north of the bridge at the north end of town and can serve as a reminder to motorists through signage they are entering the village. Retaining the painted median on the curve at Mill St. N. is preferred over a raised median due to the high rate of lane departures on this curve and need to retain driveway access. Before consideration of an electronic speed feedback sign, the BLVA first supports increasing the size of the 25mph signs from the minimum to the standard size coupled with conventional enforcement.

BLVA supports Mountable Curbs, Sidewalk Gap Closures on both sides of Highway 9 and Maintaining Driveway Access. Edge line Rumble Strips are not supported in the village. The High Visibility Crosswalk at Mill Street already exists but BLVA requests standard Accessibility Ramps be installed at each end of the crosswalk. Decorative Street Lighting similar to those that are in place should be added in this stretch of highway. Caltrans should utilize as much of its right of way as feasible on this stretch and remove objects (including trees) close to the lane lines to provide for safer movements of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

Plan #2 As noted in BLVA's prior comments. A new RRFB and Crosswalk is highly desired at Fillmore Av. The median refuge island should be painted and not raised. Heavy duty Class 7 and 8 trucks turn in and out of the storage lot on the northeast corner of this intersection and any raised island will restrict access and result in a significant negative impact to the business owners. A curb extension on the west side of the highway is strongly supported. Any curb extension proposed on the east side of the Highway should be designed with heavy truck turn movements in mind. Curb extensions and shifting of the centerline on Main St. can have negative impacts to the Service Station (where propane trucks and Class A motorhomes park for propane fueling) and to METRO operations on Highway 9. BLVA supports shortening and realignment of the crosswalk after coordination with property owners and METRO.

Plan #3 The BLVA has concerns on installing a standard driveway in front of the Ben Lomond Fire Department (BLFD) engine bays or a raised sidewalk that would block access to existing BLFD volunteer parking. Instead, the BLVA recommends the State coordinate final designs with the BLFD and Valley Churches United (VCU) so as not to impair emergency responses, volunteer firefighter parking, and food distributions and volunteer parking at VCU. The Oak tree root system north of BLFD should not be covered with concrete sidewalks. A small median island housing the stop sign and providing pedestrian refuge at the Love Creek Rd. intersection is supported as long as large delivery trucks and BLFD engines are not restricted in making turns.

Plan #4 Modification to Traffic Signal at Glen Arbor Rd.-Mill St.-Highway 9: This intersection is the busiest in the village connecting the downtown to thousands of residents in the Glen Arbor neighborhoods. The BLVA strongly recommends adding the high-visibility crosswalk across Highway 9 with consideration of a curb extension on the west side of the Highway. BLVA believes there is insufficient lane width on Glen Arbor Rd. and Mill St. for any curb extensions. Any modifications to these local streets need to ensure larger vehicles are not forced to cross the centerline when turning right off of the Highway and should be coordinated with BLFD, County Public Works and property owners. BLVA supports Caltrans' requirements to add leading pedestrian intervals (LPIs) to all pedestrian phases at this signal. The BLVA also asks that the signal be studied for splitting the Mill St. and Glen Arbor Rd. phases to reduce exposure to pedestrians crossing Highway 9 to left turning traffic.

BLVA supports a curb-extension (bus pad) and crosswalk with a RRFB as shown in the Milestone 2 plan on the north side of Hillside Ave. This is also the location where BLVA proposes a short gateway median with the crosswalk cutting through providing pedestrian refuge in the center of the Highway. BLVA does not support the mid-block crossing as shown on the bridge. A sidewalk proposed in front of the Antique Store should not restrict access to the existing parking lot. BLVA also supports extending a sidewalk on the east side of the Highway between Hillside Av. and Lorenzo Av.. Decorative Street Lighting similar to those that are in place should be added in this stretch of highway.

Respectfully,  
Blake Holiday, President James Helmer, Chair  
Ben Lomond Village Alliance Better Streets Committee

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

**DAVENPORT / NORTH COAST ASSOCIATION**  
P.O. Box 251, Davenport, CA 95017 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Katie Webb, Chair  
John Barnes  
Noel Bock  
Don Croll  
Mike Eaton  
Colin Hannon  
Nicole Miller  
Rosanna Petralia  
Rachael Spencer

16 February 2026

Ms. Brianna Goodman, Project Manager  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

[REDACTED]  
[info@scrtc.org](mailto:info@scrtc.org)

**Re: SCRTC Rural Highways Safety Plan: Highway One  
DNCA Comments on Final Draft**

Dear Ms. Goodman,

Members of the Davenport North Coast Association (DNCA) board welcomed the initiation of the RHSP and actively participated at various stages of its preparation. We applaud the Commission and its staff for undertaking the study and for the many opportunities provided for public input.

DNCA board members have reviewed the Public Draft and strongly support its adoption and approval by the Commission. We welcome and support the streetscape improvements proposed for old town Davenport (as qualified below) and the reconfigurations proposed for the Dimio Lane/Highway One intersection and the Scott Creek bridge area.

We do have a few remaining concerns.

The reasons for narrowing the focused project list to ten, and the basis for selecting those ten, are explained in the report, but notwithstanding this we are concerned that decisionmakers in the future will be inclined to use “the ten” as the only important metric for movement toward the “vision zero” objective. The report is clear that the Appendix H Project List is the relevant ranking of sites and priorities, and we urge staff to consider additional language that would help guard against a focus simply on “the ten.”

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

Given the long timeline for implementation, we urge the RTC and Caltrans to adopt an “adaptive management” approach to traffic safety, which would allow for additions or adjustments of projects based on actual field conditions.

The schematic for Davenport improvements identifies a “south-bound transit stop” on the ocean side of Highway One. There is no scheduled transit at this point that arrives in Davenport from the north, and we assume that as long as Davenport remains the turn-around point for public buses (with schedules timed to accommodate students attending Pacific Elementary School) the stop will for safety reasons remain on the inland side of Highway One. There is, however, a need for a designated parking areas for tourist excursion buses traveling both north and south (although the current pattern is for buses to travel south on Highway 1 and return to San Francisco by other routes).

With respect to the Appendix H Project List, we have concerns about one potential omission. The Project List for Highway One includes “Wilder Ranch,” with an identifier of “SR1-8” and cross-road parameters of “Coast Road” and “Coast Road.” We are concerned that this project characterization may conflate risks associated with the turn in and out of the Wilder Ranch headquarters area, the informal hiker and biker shoulder parking area immediately southeast of that intersection, and the separate and significant issues in the Coast Road community, i.e. the Coast Road, Coast Road/Back Ranch, and the two Scaroni Road intersections and the private driveway access between Scaroni Road and the southeastern Coast Road intersection. These intersections are several miles to the northwest of Wilder Ranch proper. Since mid-August 2025 there have been one serious accident associated with the driveway between Scaroni and Coast Roads, one at the southeastern Coast Road/SR1 intersection, one at the Back Ranch Road/SR1 intersection, and one at Scaroni Road/SR1, and three at SR1 and Wilder Ranch. (Dates available on request.) We are concerned that the project list may have missed a significant hazard area (the Coast Road sequence of crossings and highway entries) or inappropriately combined geographical separate risk areas for which no single solution will suffice.

In prior comments, we flagged the corridor-wide common issue of “ledges” that develop at the edge of the highway pavement in areas where informal parking occurs on dirt surfaces. While the “Safety Edge” “Countermeasure” provides a longer-term solution to this problem (correction when major resurfacing projects take place), we suggested that it be characterized as a maintenance issue warranting more frequent monitoring and correction as needed, and we ask that you reconsider including this measure.

On page 40 of the plan the idea of “quick build treatments” is described. We recommend elevating the importance of this strategy by creating a section with this name in bold. These relatively minor improvements can create a disproportionate upgrade to driver/pedestrian/biker safety at low cost. It also is a way to signal to the communities of all the highways in the study that small-scale projects can be implemented under a more accelerated process. (We urge you to read our letter of October 8, 2025 to Caltrans, on

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

which you were copied, regarding the Highway One/Davenport Landing Road/Cement Plant Road as an example of a location deserving of a “quick build treatment” for its low cost to high-risk reduction benefit).

In Footnote 9, page 25, please consider mentioning that there are no marked crosswalks within the Highway 1 study area.

In previous comments we have suggested that a designation of Highway 1 north of the city of Santa Cruz as a scenic corridor or scenic and recreational corridor would alert motorists to the presence of bicyclists, pedestrians, and recreation-focused drivers. Please consider including this as a safety strategy that would complement other measures recommended in the report.

Lastly, we applaud ongoing coordination between the RHSP and the North Coast TDM Plan as articulated in this document.

Thank you again for the opportunity to participate.

Sincerely,



Katie Webb, Chair

From: Adriana Goericke <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2026 5:59 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission [info@scrtc.org](mailto:info@scrtc.org)  
Subject: RHSP

Hello,

I am a Santa Cruz County resident and my family lives in Pescadero. My suggestions are based on 30+ years of personal experience driving Highway 1 north of Santa Cruz.

#### RECOMMENDATION 1

Signs before and after Scott Creek Beach:

- Sign for drivers heading north on the turn before Scotts Beach - "Oncoming Traffic Does not Stop" (map link)
- Sign for drivers heading north on last right hand side pull out spot after Scotts Beach "No U Turns" (map link)

I have had many close calls with oncoming traffic crossing into my lane at the two locations noted above.

#### RECOMMENDATION 2

"Yield to Oncoming Traffic" signs in the following private parking lots:

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

- Rodoni Farms (map link)
- Rodini Farm Fresh Produce (map link)
- Pie Ranch (map link)

We may need to consider lowering traffic speeds near these private parking lots during summer months. (Locals will hate this idea.)

RECOMMENDATION 3

One-way traffic barriers, like those at the new Panther Beach parking lot at the following locations:

- Shark Fin Cove Parking Lot (map link)
- Scott Creek Beach (map link)
- Four Mile Beach Parking Lot (map link)

RECOMMENDATION 4

Lighted flashing signs for crossing traffic here:

- Beach Parking by Laguna Rd (map link)
- Costanoa (map link)

RECOMMENDATION 5

"No U Turn" signs across the street from this pull out area right before Davenport: No U Turns Sign here (map link) Tourists realize they missed Shark Fin Beach and make sudden, last-minute turns without looking.

RECOMMENDATION 6

Along Highway 1, include:

- "Single file cycling" signs
- Signs that encourage slower drivers to pull over, which reduces unsafe passing. If more than 3 cars are behind you and you are driving below the speed limit, pull off the road.

I really hope my suggestions help. If you have any questions or want more info, feel free to call or email. Since I work for the County of Santa Cruz, I want to emphasize that my suggestions above represent my own personal views and not those of my supervisors or department.

Thank you for your service in making Highway 1 safer.

Kind regards,  
Adriana  
Adriana Goericke

**From:** Jim Starr <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 11, 2026 8:43 AM  
**To:** Regional Transportation Commission <[info@scrtc.org](mailto:info@scrtc.org)>  
**Subject:** RHSP comment

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

The segment of HWY1 from Santa Cruz to Davenport (and probably beyond) was cut for rumble strips along the shoulder under the requirement of leaving 5' for cyclists. However, the contract to do so did not include maintaining that passageway and through slope slump and vegetation growth, cyclists are now being forced to thread-the-needle or rattle across the rumble strips into the traffic lanes in places. This should not have happened. Do not be so neglectful in the future. If someone tries to sell you a rumble strip job, do not buy it if it does not include maintenance!

Thank you,

Jim Starr

**From:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 9, 2026 10:41 AM  
**To:** Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
**Cc:** Brianna Goodman <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** RSHP Re: Draft Rural Highways Safety Plan Report Available for Review

Dear Staff and Commissioners:

The strategies promoted in the *Draft Rural Highways Safety Plan* are well-justified, but other complementary approaches deserve more acceptance and support through additional text:

1. Behavioral Change Campaigns: This plan's premise to emphasize physical changes to the roadway that will force speed reductions and hence safer driving should not be perceived as overly downplaying direct persuasive efforts at behavioral change. It is certainly logical that more people will drive slower if the roadway is designed to make driving faster very difficult than if there are just slower-driving campaigns. This is emphasized by Figure 22: Safe Systems Pyramid and associated text. But direct behavioral change campaigns still have their place and should so also be supported in this plan. For example, persuasive and punitive campaigns aimed at increasing seatbelt use seem to have been effective over time, especially since we are not yet at a point where motor vehicles won't run unless everyone is buckled. Targeting certain populations may also be worthy, such as programs for pre- and new young drivers to not drink and drive or face deadly consequences. Also, those engaged in such behavioral campaigns – e.g., teachers, police, non-profit organizations – do not have the ability to directly make physical roadway changes (although they can lobby for them). So, again this plan should still recognize and promote their behavioral modification efforts as complementary to the projects and programs offered through this document. Plus, it is a large, expensive effort to effectuate wholesale roadway design changes. Thus, while these are being implemented over time, other non-physical efforts can still be in effect.

2. Universal Roadway Changes: This plan's prioritization of ten known high priority locations for action should not suspend implementing nor foreclose other more universal measures to potentially reduce collisions, because collisions can happen anywhere, including locations that to date have been free of them. Thus, the plan should also include an action section for measures that could be taken immediately throughout the rural highway system and for those that could be undertaken opportunistically, such as when there is an overlay or restriping

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

project happening. As examples, regarding bicyclist warning signs, it would be economical and efficient to procure and install all the signs needed for the County's rural highways at one time as soon as possible. And, any restriping projects should consider narrowing traffic lanes and wider (6") edge striping separating the traffic lanes from the shoulder to provide for safer shared use (California MUTCD 2026 Edition Sections 3B.09 Edge Line Pavement Markings and Section 9E.14). Additionally, any overlays shall ensure repavement to at least the previous edge and further if possible in order to create a sufficient bikeable shoulder, temporary warning signs for loose overlay material, and sweeping away excess overlay material.

3. Countermeasures Sensitive to Adverse Bicyclist Impacts: The actions recommended in this plan to lead to safer, slower motor vehicle traffic should not be designed in a manner that adversely impede cyclists and pedestrians. Indeed, the major impetus of the plan is to reduce collisions with cyclists and pedestrians; thereby, not only keeping them alive and safer, but, as stated, to "encourage walking and biking." Hopefully, in implementing such measures all collisions and potential collisions will be reduced, and not at the expense of cyclists and pedestrians. Some of the plan's countermeasures do have the potential for making cycling less safe or convenient. Examples where care must be taken include: Floating Transit Island or Bus Boarding Island invites conflicts between cyclists and those waiting for, boarding, or leaving the bus; Separated Bikeway invites conflicts with motor vehicles entering and leaving driveways; Shared-use Path invite conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians; Rumble Strips invite cycling crashes; curb extensions may force cyclists into motor vehicle traffic. Thus, in all cases where the initial consideration of installing a countermeasure might actually result in disrupting safe, convenient cycling, either an adjustment to that measure or a substitute measure should be chosen that would alleviate the adverse impact on the cyclist. The plan acknowledges this to an extent on page 41, but only leaves the choice up to "community preference." To ensure safety and effectiveness, this awareness and flexibility should be incorporated into the plan's recommendations. Appendix G Toolbox should include actual cautions and adjustments for problematic measures, not just references to other documents which may or may not have such analysis. For example, such a cautionary paragraph concerning Floating Transit Island or Bus Boarding Island could state something to the effect: "Although these islands may alleviate the need for bicyclists to stop behind a stopping bus or try to pass it, bicyclists will need to stop for alighting or departing passengers crossing their pathway. Passengers waiting for a bus lingering where cyclists ride could also cause conflict. It may be possible to route cyclists inland of where passengers walk and wait. Otherwise, there should be adequate area for passengers to wait and to get off the bus outside of the pathway of cyclists. Locations where passengers cross cyclists' pathway should be well marked and signed. Demarcating and/or installing a quick-build temporary island and then monitoring motorist, bus, cyclist and pedestrian behaviors to ensure any conflicts are or can be adequately addressed may be prudent before expenditures are made on permanent structures."

As to the Emphasis Areas, further project development should similarly ensure that cyclists are not adversely impacted at, for example:

Highway One: Davenport: While the concepts are welcome, the devil will be in the details. The description should include assurances that there will be bikeable shoulders with adequate

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

widths on both sides of Highway 1. There should be safe and simple ways to leave and access the rail trail and New Town bike paths to and from the bikeable shoulders as part of the “Evaluation of Access and Circulation of Areas North of Davenport” and the “Class I path connecting to New Town.”

Highway 1: Dimeo Ln/Transfer Station: Installing a free right turn adds an unsafe feature. If there is to be a separate right turn lane, then there should be a stop or yield sign at the intersection and a straight bike lane should be striped through the intersection.

Highway 9: Waterman Gap Hairpin Curve: Shoulder rumble strips are hazardous to cyclists. There does not appear to be an adequately wide shoulder (e.g., 5 feet) to also accommodate a continuous rumble strip located on or to the left of the shoulder stripe (the preferred positioning) on the uphill. Beyond installing speed feedback signs (the illustration shows 35 mph, but the posted speed is 10 mph), other measures could include installing a gradual progression of lower speed limit signs approaching the curve, speed reduction pavement markings, and wider edge lines.

Highway 9: Boulder Creek: Rather than just have a note that states the concepts pictured have been superseded, the complete Streets Plan for Boulder Creek should be substituted. For example, the complete streets plan shows bike lanes through Boulder Creek. whereas what is pictured does not.

Highway 9: Ben Lomond: Again, rumble strips are hazardous to cyclists and another method should be substituted. The proposed curb extensions appear to force cyclists into conflict with motor vehicles. They should be redesigned or another method to assist pedestrian crossing, such as a raised crosswalk, should be substituted. Additionally, installation of a sidewalk by the fire station should not result in a narrow bikeable shoulder there.

Rick Hyman

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: Thursday, February 5, 2026 7:38 AM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission [info@sccrtc.org](mailto:info@sccrtc.org)  
Cc: Thomas Travers <[REDACTED]> 'Theresia Rogerson' <[REDACTED]>  
Brianna Goodman <[REDACTED]>

Subject: RHSP

Hi: Regarding Appendix G, page 3Hi of the draft Rural Highway Safety Plan: The following section needs further revision as it is confusing, inconsistent with California MUTCD 2026 Edition, and inadequate:

*Bicycle signage including “Bikes may use full lane signs” or designated bike route signage. Signs should be placed on roads with lanes or shoulders that are too narrow to allow safe side-by-side in-lane passing of a bicyclist by a motorist - signs indicate that bicyclists may occupy the full lane. Intended to encourage motorists to provide ample space between side of the vehicle and an adjacent bicyclist when passing. Bike route signs should be placed every 1-2 miles as*

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

*reassurance in rural areas, but guidance should be provided to bicyclists at major junctions to help navigate the correct routes.*

1. This conflates route signing with warning signing; the two should be discussed separately. Signs indicating that bikes may use the full lane are appropriate “on roads with lanes or shoulders that are too narrow to allow safe side-by side in-lane passing of a bicyclist by a motorist.” On the contrary, Bike Route signs do not convey this message. The former is a regulatory sign; the latter is a guide sign.
2. The relevant sign to install is actually “Bicycles Allowed Use of Full Lane Sign (R9-20).” Please see California MUTCD 2026 Edition Section 9B.14.
3. Neither “Bikes May Use Full Lane” nor Bike Route signs “encourage motorists to provide ample space between side of the vehicle and an adjacent bicyclist when passing.” The relevant sign is the Bicycle Passing Clearance Sign (R4-19). Please see California MUTCD 2026 Edition Section 9B.15.
4. This quote says that bike route signs should be universally placed every one to two miles, plus at intersections. Given the above comments, this should also or instead indicate where Bicycles Allowed Use of Full Lane and/or Bicycle Passing Clearance signs should be installed. If one or both of these two signs are used, it is probably unnecessary to universally also sign for bike routes. Bike route signs could be placed on those portions of rural highways that have some official bike route designation, according to guidance in California MUTCD 2026 Edition CHAPTER 9D. GUIDE AND SERVICE SIGNS.

I had previously commented, “There should be consistent signing of bicycle presence in all of rural highways except where there are official bike lanes. There is a range of official and non-official signs and markings in use or proposed, including sharrows, bicycles have full use of the lane, bicycles in the roadway, 3 feet it’s the law sign, share the road sign, an illustration of a bicycle with no wording on a sign, bike lane ends sign, etc. First, there should be agreement on which sign or signs to use throughout the County. Second, there should be locational criteria (e.g., every certain distance, especially narrow (or no) shoulder locations, at known conflict points, etc.) that serve as adequate reminders to motors without being so prevalent that they become ignored. Third, to guard against that latter point, there should be some temporary bicycle in the roadway warning signs that are moved around, perhaps paired with mobile speed feedback signs.”

This quoted text from the draft Plan does not satisfactorily address the question of consistent signing as noted above. As indicated, the two most relevant signs are the Bicycles Allowed Use of Full Lane and the Bicycle Passing Clearance signs. Assuming the text is meant to support such signage, then the recommended placement is every one to two miles.

I’m thinking that such a general or average distance between such signs is too far -- maybe every half to three quarters mile, and maybe alternating between the two signs. But, as previously indicated, more important locational criteria would seem to be situational, such as at especially narrow (or no) shoulder locations and at known conflict points, and perhaps mobile – i.e., sign locations change over time.

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

Furthermore, beyond my opinion, I'm thinking that this might be a really good topic to bring to the ITAC for feedback, especially because members have experience and expertise and especially since this is relevant to all narrow, rural roads, not just state highways. Also, since the Santa Cruz County Safety Action Plan and Local Road Safety Plan are being prepared, those documents along with this Rural Highway Safety Plan should be consistent in the recommended approach to bicycle warning signs on all rural County roads.

Rick Hyman

PS: I will be submitting some additional comments on the draft Rural Highway Safety Plan.

From: Anthony Valdivia <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: Tuesday, February 3, 2026 9:29 AM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission [info@scrtc.org](mailto:info@scrtc.org)  
Subject: RHSP

Good afternoon,

I, Mr. Valdivia, Dean of Students at St. Francis High School, am excited to see the proposed safety enhancements to Highway 152. The addition of school zone light signage, a high visibility crosswalk, traffic control devices, and a pedestrian refuge island are all much needed measures to help keep our school community safe while maintaining an organized and efficient flow of traffic. I look forward to the day these improvements become a reality. May God bless you and the important work you do.

Sincerely,

Mr. Valdivia

Dean of Students  
St. Francis High School

Mr. Anthony Valdivia  
Dean of Students  
Government & Economics Teacher  
Play, Coach, & Referee Sports Teacher  
St. Francis High School

From: Vivian Leib <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2026 7:46 AM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission [info@scrtc.org](mailto:info@scrtc.org)  
Cc: Jamie <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Hwy 9 safety

We reside on Hwy 9 just south of the Glen Arbor Bridge. It saddens us that we would never consider walking or biking to Highlands Park, a mere quarter mile away, for fear of our lives. As residents of Ben Lomond and the County of Santa Cruz, we beseech you to provide safe pedestrian/bicycle passage along the stretch of highway that would allow us to access our

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

beloved county park. It is more than a bit embarrassing, it is just downright wrong, that we have to drive our doggie Mollie the short distance to the park just to have a safe place for her to walk.

Sincerely, Steve & Vivian Leib

From: Chrissie Klinkowski <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2026 4:30 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission [info@scrtc.org](mailto:info@scrtc.org)  
Cc: Davey Tomasulo [REDACTED]  
Subject: RHSP - Comments- Draft Rural Highways Safety Plan Report Available for Review

Hello,

If you are concerned with crashes and fatalities, you need to stop calling 9 from Saratoga to 236 "green." It is far from it.

We are all experiencing life threatening conditions commuting to work on these roads due to RACING. Do me a favor and drive 9 on a sunny weekend day, a holiday, or even commute hours, night - the racers are out at all times now. A motorcycle flew 200' off of the road and \*died \*yesterday near 35/9. This is just a Thursday occurrence now. They flip Lamborghinis and run corvettes into trees. As sad as it is, I'm just glad when they don't take one of us innocent bystanders out with them when they run off a cliff.

I quite literally call 911 multiple times a week while driving 9 to report someone in my lane, being passed in the oncoming lane on blind corners, and general reckless driving and speed contests. I've almost been hit head on 4x while someone is passing someone in the wrong lane, my lane.

If chp won't patrol, speed cameras need to be installed so chp can afford more police to patrol the road. Or close the castle rock overlook.

Racers fill up at the gas station in Saratoga with \*race fuel, then race going 60+mph in a 25-30 mph zone to skyline. Then they fly 65-75mph to the castle rock overlook, which they call "skid pad."

2) The segment of 9 in Boulder creek near redwood elementary school (at Mitchell drive) needs a center divide, sidewalk, and turn lane onto Mitchell to prevent fatalities. Children are walking along Highway 9 between redwood elementary school and Camp Campbell. They have done it for decades now. People still fly by them and don't slow down. This is supposed to be a "green or safe area." However, I've seen drag racing in this straightaway. Six times now my husband and I have had near hits of being t-boned on our \*driver's side door just turning left onto Mitchell while heading south on 9. When I try to make a legal turn left onto Mitchell drive to try to go home, someone tries to pass the car in front of me by going into oncoming traffic and tries to kill me.

I guess they say you're most likely to die close to home. Please help us or the racers will be taking out a lot more innocent lives.

Rural Highways Safety Plan Milestone 3 – Draft Report  
Public Comments Received via Email

See Instagram: 9burgring (one of the Hwy 9 racing accounts) where they advertise their monthly speed contests.

Sincerely

Chrissie Klinkowski  
Boulder Creek CA