

From: [Regional Transportation Commission](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: RSHP Re: Draft Rural Highways Safety Plan Report Available for Review
Date: Wednesday, February 11, 2026 2:13:00 PM

Thank you for providing your input on the draft Safety Enhancement Concepts for the Rural Highways Safety Plan. They have been forwarded to the RHSP project team for their consideration as the RHSP report is refined and finalized. Please invite your friends and neighbors to visit sccrtc.org/rhsp, we'd love to hear from as many community members as possible.

Best,

Brianna Goodman

RHSP Project Manager

From: [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 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 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: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.ccsend.com>

Sent: Friday, January 30, 2026 2:29 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Draft Rural Highways Safety Plan Report Available for Review

