RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 70
RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF COTATI CITY COUNCIL APPROVING A LOCAL ROAD SAFETY PLAN

WHEREAS, A Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP) creates a framework to systematically identify and analyze transportation safety issues, collaborate with partner agencies and stakeholder, and develop a multidisciplinary tool box of traffic safety countermeasures; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is one of the City’s main source of traffic safety grant funding; and

WHEREAS, the HSIP now requires an adopted LRSP in order to be eligible for funding on their program; and

WHEREAS, the City embarked on an effort to develop an LRSP in accordance with State and Federal requirements and guidance; and

WHEREAS, the City engaged with partner agencies and the public in the development of this LRSP; and

WHEREAS, the LRSP will serve not only as a requirement for grant fund eligibility but also a blueprint for addressing traffic safety issues throughout the County across the 4 E’s of traffic safety disciplines; Engineering, Education, Enforcement, & Emergency Services; and

WHEREAS, the action of approving a planning document for future road safety improvements does not constitute a project as defined by California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15378; therefore, no further environmental review is required.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City Council of the City of Cotati hereby finds the Local Road Safety Plan is approved and the City’s Director of Public Works and City Manager or his/her appointed designee(s) are authorized to implement the LRSP through their authorities under the City’s municipal code and as funding is authorized by the City Council.

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Cotati held on the December 14th, 2021, by the following vote, to wit:

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Mark Landman, Vice Mayor
SECONDER: Susan Harvey, Councilmember
AYES: Moore, Landman, Harvey, Sparks, Ford

Approved: Mayor

Attest: Laurent Bergès, City Clerk
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CITY COUNCIL

Mayor: John C. Moore
Vice Mayor: Mark Landman
Councilmember: Susan Harvey
Councilmember: Laura Sparks
Councilmember: Ben Ford

PARTNERS

Caltrans District 4
Kimberly Overton, Associate Transportation Planner *
Jacob Buffenbarger, Associate Transportation Planner*
Jake Freedman, Associate Transportation Planner*

Rancho Adobe Fire District
Rancho Adobe Fire Chief: Leonard C. Thompson
Rancho Adobe Fire Marshall: Andy Taylor

Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Seana Gause, Senior – Programming of Projects

CITY STAFF

City Manager: Damien O’Bid
City Engineer/Public Works Director: Craig Scott**
Community Development Director: Noah Housh
Police Chief: Michael Parish*
Senior Planner: Jon-Paul Harries*
Traffic Officer: Ryan Reinke*
City of Cotati Public Works Civil Engineer: Jonathan Caldwell*
Public Works Superintendent: Al Martinoni*

Prepared by: GHD Consulting Engineers
669 Pacific Street, Suite A
San Luis Obispo, CA 9341

* LRSP Working Group
** Project Manager
# Contents

Acknowledgements 5

1. Executive Summary 6
   1.1 Historical Collision Trends 6
   1.2 Systemic Citywide Patterns & Countermeasures 6
   1.3 Location Specific Patterns & Countermeasures 7

2. Introduction 8

3. Vision and Goals 9
   3.1 Vision Zero Statement 9
   3.2 Goals 10

4. Plan Development and Process 11
   4.1 Highway Safety Improvement Program Funding 11
   4.2 Systematic Citywide Safety Pattern Analysis 11
   4.3 Site Specific Analysis 11
   4.4 City Leadership Review 11
   4.5 Public Outreach 11
   4.6 Adoption 12

5. Organization & Safety Partners 13
   5.1 Safety Leadership 13
   5.2 Stakeholders 15

6. Evaluation & Implementation 16

7. Existing Efforts 17

8. Data Summary 18
   8.1 Citywide Collision Trend 18
   8.2 Overall Collision Trend 19
   8.3 Injury and Fatal Collision Trends 19
   8.4 Pedestrian collision trend 20
   8.5 Bicycle Collision Trend 21
   8.6 Factors contributing to collisions 22
   8.7 Human and Economic Impact 23
   8.8 Education Campaigns 23

9. Citywide Systemic Collision Pattern Analysis 24
   9.1 Collision Types & Predominant Contributing Factors 24
   9.2 Pedestrian Collision Types and Contributing Factors 25
   9.3 Bicycle Collision Types and Contributing Factors 25

10. Emphasis Areas 26
    10.1 Emphasis Area #1: High Incident Locations 27
        Emphasis Area #1: High Incident Locations 28
    10.2 Emphasis Area #2: Speeding 29
        Emphasis Area #2: Speeding 30
    10.3 Emphasis Area #3: Intersection Visibility 31
        Emphasis Area #3: Intersection Visibility 32
10.4 Emphasis Area #4: DUI
Emphasis Area #4: DUI 33
Emphasis Area #4: DUI 34

10.5 Emphasis Area #5: Traffic Control Compliance
Emphasis Area #5: Traffic Control Compliance 35
Emphasis Area #5: Traffic Control Compliance 36

11. High Incident Location Pattern Analysis 37
11.1 Intersections 37

12. Preliminary Design, Cost Estimates, and Benefit to Cost Ratios 49
1. Old Redwood Hwy at George St. 50
   1.1 Cost Estimate and Cost/Benefit Analysis 51
2. Hwy 116 at W. Cotati 52
   2.1 Cost Estimate and Cost/Benefit Analysis 53
3. St. Joseph at Old Redwood Hwy. 54
   3.1 Cost Estimate and Cost/Benefit Analysis 55
4. Cotati Ave at La Salle Ave. 56
   4.1 Cost Estimate and Cost/Benefit Analysis 57
5. Gravenstein Hwy. at Old Redwood Hwy. 58
   5.1 Cost Estimate and Cost/Benefit Analysis 59

Table index
Table 1: Intersection Countermeasures Recommended 7
Table 2: Preliminary Cost and Benefit-Cost Analysis 7
Table 3: 2019 City of Cotati Comprehensive Collision Cost 23
Table 4. Citywide High Collision Rate Intersection 37

Figure index
Figure 1. Local Road Safety Plans courtesy of Federal Highway Administration 8
Figure 2. A New Vision for Safety 9
Figure 3. Systemic Traffic Safety Assessment Organization & Hierarchy 15
Figure 4. 2015-2019 Citywide Collision Concentrations 18
Figure 5. Overall Collision Injury Severity 19
Figure 6. Injury and Fatal Collisions 19
Figure 7. Citywide Pedestrian Collision Injury Severity 20
Figure 8. Citywide Pedestrian Collision Concentrations 20
Figure 9. Citywide Bicycle Collision Trend 21
Figure 10. Citywide Bicycle Collision Concentrations 21
Figure 11. Violation by Vehicle Code Section 22
Figure 12. Predominant Collision Factors 24
Figure 13. Pedestrian Collision Contributing Factors 25
Figure 14. Predominant Bicycle Collisions Contributing Factors 25
Figure 15. Top 11 High Incident Intersections 37
## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>Public Outreach Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>FHWA Crash Modification Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C</td>
<td>Glossary and Definition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acknowledgements

This Plan is indebted to the contributions of the members of the working group, agency partners and the Public. Spurred on by the State - Caltrans sponsored workshop back in November 2019, Seana Gause, myself and Alejandro Perez from the Town of Windsor strategized to combine efforts to prepare and issue a single request for proposals (rfp) for Sonoma County jurisdictions. Ms. Gause took the lead in preparing the rfp and the best qualified consultant was selected for the seven participating cities. The Working Group was dedicated to the effort and met bimonthly over the course of the plan preparation. Police Chief Parish and Traffic Officer Ryan Reinke provided valuable insights from their first hand experience on traffic conditions, Andy Taylor, Fire Marshal likewise was invaluable with his input from the first responder perspective. Caltrans was also well represented by Kimberly Overton who faithfully attended the Working Group meetings and filled the ever important roll of being the Caltrans liason to the City. Thanks also goes to Jon Paul Harries for his attention to detail in finalizing the Plan and Jon Caldwell with his insights into the traffic safety devices and overall project support. In addition, thanks must also be given to the Public that provided a wealth of valuable input on the Plan's Social Pinpoint website and attended the Plan's workshop. Without this input, the Plan would not be nearly so meaningful.
1. Executive Summary

The City of Cotati is pleased to present its Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP). The purpose of this plan is to provide the City a framework and toolbox for identifying priority road safety improvements by performing collision analysis, identifying safety issues on Cotati’s Streets, and developing citywide systemic as well as location specific countermeasures. The recommended countermeasures are multimodal and span four traffic safety disciplines: Engineering, Enforcement, Education, and Emergency services. These countermeasures then can be used to identify priority projects and programs for capital & operating funding, the development of fee programs, identifying appropriate mitigation measures and conditions of approval for development, and prepare future grant funding applications to program such as the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP).

This LRSP is divided into 3 core parts. The first is an assessment of historical collision trends and patterns. The second is identification of systemic Citywide collision patterns, not at any specific location, with a framework and toolbox for countering those collision patterns. The third is identification of the highest location specific collision patterns, with recommended countermeasures to reduce collisions.

1.1 Historical Collision Trends

Section 8 of this report provides a comprehensive analysis of Cotati collision trends between 2015 & 2019. Although 2020 data is available it has been omitted due to the unique nature of travel patterns during the global pandemic. Over the course of this five-year period overall collisions rose by approximately 79% and Injury & Fatal collisions rose by approximately 72%. However it’s important to note that Cotati has a relatively low number of collision each year, therefore even a very small number of additional collisions would result in a large percent increase. Collisions within the City have primarily been concentrated along Old Redwood Highway and along E. Cotati Ave.

1.2 Systemic Citywide Patterns & Countermeasures

One of the most effective ways to reduce citywide collisions is to identify the highest incident locations, analyze the collision patterns at those locations, develop targeted countermeasures to those patterns, then prioritize and implement the measures regularly and systematically.

Section 9 of this report assesses the most common collision types and the contributing factors leading to those collision trends. Speeding is the number one factor leading to collisions throughout the City, followed by visibility then impaired driving. To counter these types of collisions the plan recommends a series of emphasis areas and toolboxes which follow these general approaches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Making Safety Improvements at the Highest Incident Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Conducting Focused Speed Enforcement &amp; Implementing Speed Reduction Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ensuring Intersection Sight Lines are Clear of Obstructions &amp; Managing access at private driveways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Conducting Focused DUI Enforcement and Targeted Education Campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Enhancing Traffic Signal &amp; Stop Controls to Improve Compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Location Specific Patterns & Countermeasures

Section 10 of this report identifies and ranks the top collision rate locations within the City, assesses the collision patterns and contributing factors at the highest ranking locations, and recommends countermeasures for those locations. Section 11 presents the top 11 intersections listed in order of collision rate. These 11 intersections are listed in Table 1 in order based on collision rates below along with the types of countermeasures recommended.

Table 1: Intersection Countermeasures Recommended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Countermeasures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E. Cotati Ave. at Charles St.</td>
<td>Signalize Intersection &amp; Warning Devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Old Redwood Hwy at Gravenstein Hwy</td>
<td>Various Signal Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Commerce Blvd at Old Redwood Hwy</td>
<td>Signal Coordination &amp; Various Signal Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Helman Ln at Redwood Dr</td>
<td>Signal Timing &amp; Various Signal Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Old Redwood Hwy at William St.</td>
<td>Signalize Intersection &amp; Warning Devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Old Redwood Hwy at Charles St</td>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Hybrid Beacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HWY 116 at W. Cotati Ave.</td>
<td>Signalize &amp; Realign Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E. Cotati Ave at La Salle Ave</td>
<td>Signalize Intersection &amp; Warning Devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>E. Cotati Ave at Santero Way</td>
<td>Signal Timing &amp; Various Signal Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Old Redwood Hwy at La Plaza</td>
<td>Signalize Intersection &amp; Warning Devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E. Cotati Ave at Old Redwood Hwy</td>
<td>Pedestrian Marking Upgrades &amp; Warning Devices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 12 of this report also includes 5 intersections selected by City staff where conceptual designs of the recommended countermeasures have been prepared along with preliminary cost estimates and benefit-cost analysis. This list is intended to facilitate applying for grant funding. The list of intersections, countermeasures and intersection projects will be updated at least as frequently as five years for the required updates to the LRSP to reflect completed improvements, new countermeasures develop since the last plan, and current collision patterns. These locations, the cost estimates, and benefit-cost ratios are provided in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Preliminary Cost and Benefit-Cost Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Preliminary Cost Est.</th>
<th>Benefit/Cost Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old Redwood Hwy at George St. / William St.</td>
<td>$820,000</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HWY 116 at W. Cotati Ave.</td>
<td>$4,235,000</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>St. Joseph at Old Redwood Hwy</td>
<td>$820,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E. Cotati Ave at La Salle Ave</td>
<td>$820,000</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Old Redwood Hwy at Gravenstein Hwy</td>
<td>$291,100</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost estimates include design, environmental, bidding, construction, construction management and contingency. Cost to apply for and administer grant funding and design has not been included.
2. Introduction

The City of Cotati is pleased to present the City’s Local Roadway Safety Plan. The purpose of this Safety Plan is to establish the framework and process for identifying, analyzing, and prioritizing roadway safety improvements on Cotati’s streets. This Safety Plan identifies the top systemic collision patterns throughout the City and top collision locations. This Safety Plan also provides a toolbox of countermeasures to address those systemic collision patterns and proposes projects to reduce collisions at the City’s top collision locations.

Local Roadway Safety Plans are critically important. According to the Federal Highway Administration, over 80% of all public roads are operated by local or rural governments, and approximately 56% of all fatalities occur on these roads. Even beyond the tragedy of severe incapacitating injuries and deaths, traffic collisions have a significant cost to the community. The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) estimated that in 2017 traffic collisions resulted in $836 billion in damages to quality of life and household productivity. The data presented in this report is from 2019 and prior, as this is the most recent data available and is typically due to the time it takes to process collision reports and late reporting by involved parties.

This Safety Plan has been prepared in compliance with the State, and Federal guidelines for eligibility to apply for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding (HSIP) and provides the necessary data to support current and future applications for the recommended projects. Future HISP grant cycles will require an adopted Safety Plan as a prerequisite for grant eligibility.

The City of Cotati is committed to improving transportation safety and reducing the risk of death and serious injury that result from incidents on its transportation systems. The purpose of this report is to establish the framework and process for identifying, analyzing, and prioritizing roadway safety improvements. As part of an ongoing effort to improve safety, this Safety Plan was developed in collaboration between the City, its partner agencies, organizations, and its residents.

This Safety Plan includes the following elements as illustrated in Figure 1:

*Figure 1. Local Road Safety Plans courtesy of Federal Highway Administration*
3. Vision and Goals

3.1 Vision Zero Statement

This plan aims to strive towards eliminating all traffic fatalities and severe injuries while increasing safe, healthy, and equitable mobility for all. Traditionally, traffic deaths and severe injuries have been considered inevitable side effects of modern life. The reality is that these tragedies can be addressed over time by taking a proactive, preventative approach that prioritizes traffic safety as a public health issue.

Vision Zero is a significant departure from the past in two major ways:

- Vision Zero recognizes that people will sometimes make mistakes, so the road system and related policies should be designed to minimize those inevitable mistakes and reduce their likeliness for severe injuries or fatalities. This means that system designers and policymakers are expected to improve the roadway environment, policies (such as speed management), and other related systems to lessen collisions’ severity. Roadway users are, however, still responsible for their mistakes and should follow all applicable laws and use reasonable judgment when conducting themselves within the public right of way.

- Vision Zero is a multidisciplinary approach, bringing together diverse and necessary stakeholders to address this complex problem. In the past, meaningful, cross-disciplinary collaboration among local traffic planners and engineers, policymakers, and public health professionals has not been the norm. Vision Zero acknowledges that many factors contribute to safe mobility -- including roadway design, speeds, behaviors, technology, and policies -- and sets clear goals to achieve the shared goal of zero fatalities and severe injuries.

Figure 2. A New Vision for Safety
3.2 Goals

213 traffic collisions occurred within the City of Cotati from 2015 to 2019, with four of these collisions ending in serious injuries. The total economic impact of these collisions cost more than $2.6 million per year. Based on an assessment of collisions citywide, the major contributing factors to these collisions are unsafe speed, improper turning/auto right of way violation, driving under the influence (DUI), and traffic control compliance. The Vision stated above-to eliminate all traffic fatalities & severe injuries while increasing safe, healthy, and equitable mobility-begins with a set of clear and achievable goals. The City has set a goal to eliminate all traffic fatalities & severe injuries while increasing safe, healthy, equitable mobility for all by:

**Goal #1:** Maintain accurate collision databases. Standardize collision reporting and documentation, systematically identify & prioritize the City’s highest collision locations. Analyze, develop countermeasures, and implement those countermeasures.

**Goal #2:** Reevaluate collision trends and associated countermeasures in the Safety Plan a minimum of every 5 years and engage the community, stakeholders, and City management.

**Goal #3:** Develop an implementation priority for identified countermeasures. Implement countermeasures utilizing strategies across all traffic safety disciplines, engineering, enforcement, education, & emergency services.

**Goal #4:** Strive to reduce excessive speeding behavior, which is the primary contributing factor to traffic collisions in The City.

**Goal #5:** Regularly engage with partner agencies, stakeholders, advocacy groups, & the public to enhance identification of collision patterns and effective countermeasures.
4. Plan Development and Process

4.1 Highway Safety Improvement Program Funding
Beginning with HSIP Cycle 11, an approved Safety Plan will be a requirement for grant eligibility. The City and neighboring agencies applied for and were awarded Federal grants to prepare their respective LRSPs. This Safety Plan has been developed to meet the application requirements of the HSIP program.

4.2 Systematic Citywide Safety Pattern Analysis
Citywide collision patterns were identified along with the most common related contributing factors. These factors establish the top five emphasis areas the City will focus on to reduce traffic collisions. For each factor, multidisciplinary countermeasures were developed, including engineering, education, and enforcement.

4.3 Site Specific Analysis
In addition to collision patterns, the collision incident locations in the City were identified, prioritized, and ranked. The collision patterns at each location were evaluated to determine potential countermeasures. Those countermeasures were then developed into the recommendations included within this report.

4.4 City Leadership Review
City leadership (Public Works, Community Development, Police, & Fire) was engaged in the process throughout the plan's development. The engagement occurred through a series of virtual working group meetings, public workshops, and the project website.

4.5 Public Outreach
Public outreach on the Safety Plan took place from March to July 2021. The public outreach process included a website that hosted draft project documents, surveys, and an interactive map for pinpointing specific safety issues. Visitors were directed to this website thru the City's social media outlets, City staff and official announcements, and collaboration with the larger countywide Vision Zero effort. A workshop and presentation to the City Council are also part of the public outreach effort. A total of 115 comments and 33 survey responses were collected through the public outreach process. In addition to the public outreach conducted thru out the development of the plan, additional feedback was received during the council hearing.
The results of the public outreach found that Speeding is the number one concern among respondents, followed by Intersection Visibility and Impaired Driving. These results show that community sentiment is very closely aligned with the City’s actual systemic collision trends, as speeding, intersection visibility and impaired driving are also the top three contributing factors in traffic collisions within the City of Cotati.

The results of the public outreach also found that of the Traffic safety disciplines; Engineering & Enforcement (beside education and emergency services) are perceived as the most effective approaches to addressing collision trends and patterns.

Feedback received on the draft plan is provided in Appendix B. The combination of collision records and public feedback is the basis for the safety emphasis areas identified as well as the systemic and location specific counter measures recommended.

4.6 Adoption

The plan was presented to the City Council at public hearing on December 14th, 2021. The item received public input supporting recommendations of the plan. The plan was unanimously approved by City Council resolution.
5. Organization & Safety Partners

Safety partners are those departments, agencies, and organizations whose input and support are foundational to a successful Safety Plan. The safety leadership team is primarily comprised of City departments that have critical roles in the development, implementation, and operation of safety projects, programs, and policies. The safety leadership team also includes the Rancho Adobe Fire District and Caltrans. The leadership team met weekly throughout the development of the plan and is ultimately responsible for developing, adopting, and implementing the plan and program. The stakeholder team is distinguished from the leadership team and is comprised of partner agencies and organizations who collaborate with the City and contribute to and assist with developing and implementing the plan. These agencies and their roles in the Safety Plan’s development and implementation are provided below:

5.1 Safety Leadership

I. City Council
The legislative body ultimately responsible for approving/adopting the final plan, setting safety policies, and approving budget and funding levels.

II. Public Works
Public Works is the lead City department in developing and producing the Safety Plan and its periodic updates. The Public Works Department is responsible for assembling other City departments and collaborating with stakeholders. Public Works is responsible for capital project implementation. The City’s Public Works staff may also lead or collaborate in education campaigns.

III. Police Department
The City’s Police Department collaborates with and assists the City’s Public Works Department in developing and producing the Safety Plan and its periodic updates. The Police Department maintains collision records and is responsible for carrying out enforcement practices and activities. The City’s Police Department may also lead or collaborate in education campaigns.

IV. Community Development
The Community Development Department supports the implementation of the Safety Plan through its development review responsibilities and through updates of City planning documents (i.e. General Plan and Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan) and Land Use code revision. The Community Development Department assigns conditions of approval and mitigation measures to new development applications in collaboration with Public Works and ensures new development requirements are implemented. Additionally, CDD provides input on projects included in the Capital Planning documents.

V. Fire Department
The City contracts with the Rancho Adobe Fire District (RAFD) for roles typically provided by municipal fire departments. The RAFD primarily serves as a support role to other City leadership in proactive traffic safety measures. The RAFD also functions as a primary first responder to injury traffic collisions.
VI. Caltrans
Within The City limit Caltrans District 4 has jurisdiction over US 101 and Highway 116. Caltrans also provides oversight of various grant funding sources. Many of the City's streets and intersections border State-controlled roadways and ramps. Caltrans provides feedback on the development of this plan and confirms its compliance with HSIP requirements for future funding eligibility.
5.2 Stakeholders

Stakeholders generally include the City’s partner agencies, advocacy groups, and interested parties. Stakeholders play a key role in the development and implementation of this plan by providing insight and recommendations based on their unique roles within the community that may not be evident to City Staff.

I. Sonoma County & Sheriff

Roadways and functional areas of intersections along these borders require communication and collaboration, with the Sheriff and County of Sonoma to implement this plan. Sonoma County and Sheriff oversees bordering facilities, collaborates with local jurisdiction regarding regional safety goals and policies.

II. Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)

The Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) coordinates regional transportation programs and projects and regional funding allocations. SCTA the plan and updates in context to regional planning activities and potential funding allocations.

III. General Public

The general public provides feedback and insight on recommended emphasis areas, high incident locations, countermeasures, and implementation. Although collision records and statistics are foundational to this plan, public feedback is a critical supplement to that data. This feedback provides staff with a holistic view of safety issues and a gauge for what types of countermeasures are and are not desired by the community.

Figure 3 depicts the organizational structure and hierarchy for how the City conducts is comprehensive systematic traffic safety analysis and engages with its partner agencies & organizations. The figure below also indicates each agency or City department’s role in the sustained implementation of this plan. Starting from the bottom are agencies and department primarily responsible for development and implementation of the plan, moving up are those partner agencies that provide an advisory role as well as collaboration on joint safety projects & efforts, at the top is the final decision-making authority for approving the plan as well as approving staffing and funding resources for implementation. This plan was also developed in coordination with other neighboring Cities to achieve regional collaboration on larger safety issues and setup regional collaborative projects and programs for funding and implementation.

Figure 3. Systemic Traffic Safety Assessment Organization & Hierarchy
6. Evaluation & Implementation

This Safety Plan is a living document; the lists of emphasis areas and recommended countermeasures should be updated approximately every five years and coincide with the City’s Capital Improvement Program budget and HSIP grant cycles for potential inclusion. Emphasis Areas and countermeasures for Citywide systemic patterns should be updated by Public Works approximately every five years. Updated high incident lists and emphasis areas should be presented to the City’s Public Works Department for review and feedback and presented to the City Council as an information item for review and an opportunity for public feedback.

Grant Funding

This Safety Plan is primarily a requirement for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding. However, this document will provide valuable justification and guidance for other grant applications such as Active Transportation Program (ATP), Regional State Highway Account (RSHA), Congestion Management and Air Quality (CMAQ), and other available funding sources.

Fee Programs

The City of Cotati has adopted development impact fee programs for transportation improvements. Countermeasures for high incident locations & corridors should be considered for inclusion if justified, on projects listed in the Traffic Impact Fee Study and a nexus can be established as part of AB1600 studies. An example of nexus is if a project increases the volume of a particular turning movement that has been specifically identified as a contributing factor in a primary collision pattern. Safety Plan recommendations should be considered for inclusion when updating fee programs or developing/updating development reimbursement agreements.

City Capital Improvement Program

The recommendations identified in this plan, and the high incident location list, serve as a source for Capital Project request consideration. The recommendations also serve as a cross-reference for other capital projects that could be leveraged to implement Safety Plan recommendations. For example, a roadway rescaling project may provide an opportunity to revise a corridor lane re-configuration by installing proposed Safety Plan striping recommendations instead of reusing prior striping. The City’s Capital Improvement Program and operating budget will also continue to provide a source of funding for grant local match requirements. For example, pre-emptive timing can be included in a traffic signal design.

The recommendations identified in this plan should be referenced when conducting roadway maintenance activities. Priority should be considered for maintenance activities that further the recommendations of this plan or provide opportunities to implement countermeasures at high incident locations.

Development Review

The safety plan's recommendations and high incident locations should be referenced when considering development applications. City staff should recommend conditions of approval and mitigation measures for consistency with the Safety Plan. City Public Works and Engineering staff should review development proposals to identify implementation opportunities for this plan.
7. **Existing Efforts**

The City is actively implementing its various safety policies/guidelines from the General Plan Circulation Element and Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (2014). Additionally, findings from this LRSP are being addressed in the current update to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Several safety projects and programs are currently in progress, nearly complete, recently completed, or will begin shortly. These projects are:

- Trucks banned from ORH through downtown. Detour signs installed. 2016
- Stamped crosswalks across ORH and side streets from Hwy 116 to Page Street. 2016
- Wide sidewalk and decorative streetlights installed along ORH from Hwy 116 to E. Cotati Ave. 2016
- Installed bike lane paint, improved striping at ORH and Hwy 116. Installed improved push buttons and voice crossing controls. 2016
- Bike lane striping in ORH from Hwy 116 to E. Cotati Ave. 2016
- Solar powered flashing stop sign at William/George and ORH. 2017
- Solar powered flashing stops sign at E. Cotati Ave and La Salle. 2017
- Remove tree and roots on E. Cotati Ave at Sunflower Park and repave bike lane. 2017
- Posted 25 mph speed signs on William Street. 2017
- Citywide lighting project: Lights installed in parks and the McGinnis trail. 2017
- SMART crossing improvements at E. Cotati Ave and RR Tracks for train operations. 2017
- Speed feedback signs at 3 locations: ORH N/B at Clothier Lane, Valparaiso Ave NW/B, W. Sierra Ave E/B at Bus Stop. 2018
- Crosswalk striping across La Plaza at E. Cotati Ave. 2018
- Improved crosswalk visibility (new signage and striping) across W. Sierra Ave at Cypress. 2018
- Flashing crosswalk (RRFBs) at ORH and Page Street. 2019
- Flashing crosswalk (RRFBs) at ORH and La Plaza. 2019
- Sharrows on Benson Lane, Loretto Ave, Lincoln Ave. 2019
- Improved crosswalk visibility (new signage and striping) across E. School Street at El Rancho Drive
- ADA Ramp upgrades associated with street projects
- Wayfinding signs throughout town. 2020
- Speed humps on William Street, Charles Street, Olof Street. 2020
- Speed Hump Charles Street. 2020
- Added delayed light (allowing pedestrians a head start) and a chirping controller at Valparaiso Ave and ORH. 2020
- 3-way stop at W. Sierra Ave at W. School Street. Spring 2021
- Improved crosswalk and sidewalk ramp and RRFBs at crossing at Water Rd. and Cypress Ave. completed July 2021
- RRFBs at E. Cotati Ave crossing at Charles Street. Fall 2021
8. Data Summary

8.1 Citywide Collision Trend

Traffic Collision data from the past five complete years (2015-2019) were obtained and processed from the City of Cotati Crossroads Analytic Database. This database is maintained and updated by City’s staff.

Figure 4 below depicts the citywide collision frequency; areas in red have the highest frequency of traffic collisions, and areas in blue or grey have the lowest. As shown in Figure 4, the highest concentration of collisions in the City area is along Old Redwood Hwy, W. Sierra Ave, E. Cotati Ave, and Redwood Dr.

*Figure 4. 2015-2019 Citywide Collision Concentrations*
8.2 Overall Collision Trend

Figure 5 below shows collisions from 2015 to 2019; the total reported collisions in the City increased each year except for a reduction from 2017 to 2018. This purely represents collision trends and does not include other external factors. It should be noted that the overall collision chart below does not represent all collisions that may have occurred in the City—instead only incidents are included where a collision report is generated. Many collisions are either unreported by the involved parties or reported by the parties without an officer investigation. Additionally, near-misses are not reported.

Figure 5. Overall Collision Injury Severity

8.3 Injury and Fatal Collision Trends

Injury collisions are the most accurate representation of overall collision trends because these types of collisions are most consistently reported and investigated. In 2019, injury collisions increased by 63% compared to 2018 and had no change compared to 2017. Again, it’s important to note that Cotati experiences a relatively low number of collision each year, therefore even a small increase results in a large percentage.

Figure 6. Injury and Fatal Collisions
It’s challenging to identify a trend in fatal collisions for the City of Cotati because these types of collisions are typically sporadic, uncommon, and occur under unusual circumstances. There was no fatal collision between 2015 and 2019.

8.4 Pedestrian collision trend

A collision is classified as a pedestrian collision when a pedestrian is identified as at least one of the parties struck in the collision itself. Pedestrian collisions have been relatively static since 2015, with an unexpected spike in 2017 where five pedestrian collisions were reported. Because of pedestrians’ vulnerable nature compared to motor vehicles, pedestrian collisions typically have a higher number of injuries, serious injuries, and fatalities.

*Figure 7. Citywide Pedestrian Collision Injury Severity*

*Figure 8. Citywide Pedestrian Collision Concentrations*
Although collision data from 2020 was excluded from this report due to atypical travel patterns resulting from the global pandemic, it's important to note that in November of 2020 a fatal pedestrian collision occurred at the intersection of Myrtle & Macklin Drive.

### 8.5 Bicycle Collision Trend

Bicycle collisions have remained relatively static since 2015. 2015, 2018, and 2019 had the lowest reported bicycle collisions on record, a total of 1 collision for the whole year. Like pedestrians, cyclists are also considered vulnerable users and require special attention when it comes to safety.

*Figure 9. Citywide Bicycle Collision Trend*

![Figure 9. Citywide Bicycle Collision Trend](image)

*Figure 10. Citywide Bicycle Collision Concentrations*

![Figure 10. Citywide Bicycle Collision Concentrations](image)
8.6 Factors contributing to collisions

Figure 11 below depicts the distribution of vehicle code violations by type for 2019. 19% of the violations in Cotati reported involved unsafe speed. Since speeding is one of the top collision types in the City, accounting for a third of all collisions, this violation is to be expected. Driving offenses such as failure to yield and driving under the influence contributed to 17% of citywide traffic collisions.

The most frequent contributing Factors in reported Collisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation by Vehicle Code Section</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed (§22348-22413)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Yield (§21800-21809)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Under Influence (§23152)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated or Unknown</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Too Closely and Improper Passing (§21703 &amp; 21750)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning &amp; Signals (§22100-22113)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control Devices (§21350-21468)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Sign (§22450-22456)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Violation (§21949-21971)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.7 Human and Economic Impact

Traffic collisions also result in direct costs, including wages and productivity losses, medical expenses and legal fees. However, this represents only a portion of the total costs associated with collisions. Traffic collisions also have indirect impacts on the families of those involved, employers, and society as a whole. The National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA) found that more than 75 percent of collision costs are born by society in the form of insurance premiums, taxes, and congestion-related costs such as travel delay, excess fuel consumption, and lost quality of life associated with deaths and injuries.

Comprehensive costs include the economic cost components but also the indirect societal costs. Using cost estimates by crash severity published in the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Highway Safety Manual, adjusted to reflect 2019 dollars, the comprehensive costs associated with the 52 Citywide traffic collisions occurring in 2019 were calculated to be slightly more than $3 million. Comprehensive collision costs for 2019 by collision type are summarized in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collision Severity</th>
<th>Number of collisions</th>
<th>Cost per Collision</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$6,655,420</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabling injury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$358,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Incapacitating Injury</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$131,100</td>
<td>$1,311,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible injury</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$74,500</td>
<td>$1,564,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property damage only</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$12,200</td>
<td>$256,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,131,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


8.8 Education Campaigns

There are several ongoing traffic safety education and outreach campaigns provided to the community of Cotati each year. Key education and outreach activities are summarized below:

- **City Public Works and Police Partnership**
  These efforts are focused on traffic safety, including the installation of bike/ped safety features and roadway improvements.

- **Public safety concern report**
  The public can report a concern regarding street, park, water, or sewer within the City limit using the City’s web portal.

- **National Night Out**
  An annual community-building campaign that promotes police-community partnerships and neighborhood camaraderie to make our neighborhoods safer, more caring places to live.

- **Social Media Posts**
  The City has a social media program which aims to regularly cover a variety of topics including public safety. Sample posts include recently completed and upcoming traffic safety improvements as well as public service messages highlighting changed traffic conditions.
9. Citywide Systemic Collision Pattern Analysis

9.1 Collision Types & Predominant Contributing Factors

As shown in Figure 12 below, rear-end, broadside, and hit object were the most common types of collisions reported in 2015-2019, representing 80% of the total recorded incidents. Rear-end and broadside collisions were the most prominent, with unsafe speed and auto right of way violation as the leading contributing factors. Broadside and sideswipes collisions, typically occur at intersections and often at higher speeds. These types of collisions can be largely eliminated with a roundabout intersection configuration. There is a limit to how much the City can reduce or eliminate collisions that cause injuries at signalized or stop controlled intersections. Therefore, it is recommended that the City have all countermeasures available to address traffic safety, including proven countermeasures such as roundabouts.

*Figure 12. Predominant Collision Factors*
9.2 Pedestrian Collision Types and Contributing Factors

Between 2015-2019, vehicles failing to yield to pedestrians have been the leading contributing factor as shown in figure 13 below. Drivers were at fault in approximately 80% of a vehicle versus pedestrian collisions. The most common circumstance where drivers were at fault involved cars turning from a side street and colliding with pedestrians in a crosswalk while looking for a gap in oncoming traffic.

Figure 13. Pedestrian Collision Contributing Factors

9.3 Bicycle Collision Types and Contributing Factors

Broadside collisions were the most common type of bicycle collisions reported beside sideswipe and vehicle-pedestrian in 2015-2019, with failure to yield as entering a highway from an alley, public or private property, and improper turning as the leading contributing factors as shown in figure 14 below.

Figure 14. Predominant Bicycle Collisions Contributing Factors
10. Emphasis Areas

The City's Local Roadway Safety Plan is a tool intended to assist City staff in efficiently focusing education, enforcement, engineering, and emergency response resources towards the highest priority systemic and location-specific collision patterns for safety improvements.

The Safety Plan relies on traffic collision history and professional judgment to the operational indicator of potentially needed safety improvements. This plan is required to apply for Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds beginning in 2022. Since these funds are competitive, the City must be prudent in identifying applicable safety projects that have a definite and measurable safety benefit.

The table below identifies key systemic emphasis areas within the City for further focus, including the general purpose and how often it should be updated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis Areas</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Update Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 High Incident Locations</td>
<td>To evaluate and enhance areas experiencing high collision rates</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Speeding</td>
<td>To evaluate and enhance areas experiencing high speed violation</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Intersection Visibility/Access Management</td>
<td>To identify high incidences of right-of-way violations that may have sight distance constraints or need for longer clearance intervals or that might benefit from access management</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 DUI</td>
<td>To evaluate and enhance areas experiencing driving under influence violation</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Traffic Signal and Sign compliance</td>
<td>To evaluate and enhance areas experiencing signal and sign violation</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.1 Emphasis Area #1: High Incident Locations

Between 2015 and 2019, the City experienced 213 traffic collisions. The City’s highest incident collisions occurred along ORH, W. Sierra Ave, E. Cotati Ave, and Redwood Dr.

One of the most effective ways to reduce citywide collisions is to identify the highest incident locations, analyze the collision patterns at those locations, develop targeted countermeasures to those patterns, then prioritize and implement the measures regularly and systematically.
Emphasis Area #1: High Incident Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Systemic Countermeasure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Engineering | • Identify and rank the highest incident locations within the City every five years.  
• Seek out and consider information obtained from public input and feedback regarding unreported and “near-misses” collision in future plan updates.  
• Assess collision patterns at each of the highest incident locations and develop countermeasures to address those patterns.  
• Maintain an official list of prioritized safety locations and the associated countermeasures for:  
  o Grant Funding Requests such as HSIP, ATP, SHA, etc.  
  o Capital Improvement Funding Requests  
  o Leveraging other Capital Projects to Implement safety measures (i.e., Changing striping as part of a roadway resurfacing project)  
  o Informing Safety Analysis of Development Proposals and potentially establishing those as mitigation measures or conditions of approval where nexus is established.  
  o Informing updates to existing fee programs or establishing new fee programs.  
  o Leveraging the analysis and prioritization for defense against tort liability claims.  
• Continue to monitor collision patterns after implementation of countermeasures. |
| Education   | • Publish results of high incident location analysis and countermeasure recommendations.  
• Regularly initiate and engage with local media outlets such as the KRON, ABC7, Press Democrat, The Community Voices, KSRO and City’s other own social media platforms to publish articles & interviews regarding high incident locations and contributing factors.  
• Consider “pop-up” safety events on-site at high incident locations. (i.e., on-site staff handing out flyers and discussing the primary factors for bicycle collisions at a high bicycle incident location) |
| Enforcement | • Prioritize patrol patterns and overall presence at high incident locations.  
• Target driver behavior that correlates with the predominant contributing factors for collisions at high incident locations |
| Emergency Services | • Support Engineering, Education, & Enforcement, Activities.  
• Consider targeted training for responding to specific high incident locations and treatment of predominant injury types at those locations. |
10.2 Emphasis Area #2: Speeding

Speeding is one of the primary contributing factors for traffic collisions in the City of Cotati. Speeding collisions are most commonly occurring along E. Cotati Ave and Old Redwood Hwy. It is estimated that the economic impact from these collisions was greater than $3.9 million over a span of 5 years.

Speeding-related collisions along Old Redwood Hwy and E. Cotati Ave; are likely due to the relatively wide and straight geometry. These conditions are conducive to higher speeds, especially near US 101 N onramp when drivers attempt to clear both traffic signals without stopping. This speeding behavior most commonly results in rear-ends collisions.
### Emphasis Area #2: Speeding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Systemic Countermeasure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Engineering | • On signalized corridors consider management of traffic speeds with signal coordination and advanced dilemma zone detection.  
• Where possible create a perceived sense of narrowed roadway through pavement treatments, street trees, and other roadside features.  
• Where lanes are 12’ or more consider narrowing travel lanes and utilizing excess space for such features as buffered bike lanes, wider parking stalls, or medians as space permits. At intersections consider bulbouts, traffic circles, and dedicated turn lanes.  
• Evaluate Speed Segment Transitions, install incremental downward speed zoning where necessary per MUTCD.  
• Develop and implement Neighborhood traffic calming programs such as but not limited to speed bumps along W. Cotati.  
• Adjust the default speed limit based upon certain findings determined by an engineering and traffic survey, when necessary, per AB 43. |
| Education   | • Consider the installation of speed feedback signs with photoflash simulation on approaches into areas with a high incidence of speed-related collisions.  
• Regularly initiate and engage with local media outlets such as KRON, ABC7, Press Democrat, The Community Voices, KSRO and City’s other own social media platforms to publish articles & interviews regarding where high-speed collisions are occurring, the damages and injuries involved, and enhanced enforcement activities. |
| Enforcement | • Where possible increase frequency and visual presence of patrol activity in high-speed incident areas. Utilize PD citizen volunteers to increase presence.  
• Consider conducting and advertising periodic speeding checkpoints in high-speed incident areas. Utilize PD citizen volunteers to increase presence.  
• Increase Focused Speed Enforcement along Old Redwood Hwy and E. Cotati Ave.  
• Track speeding citation dismissals and trends. Coordinate with Sonoma Superior Court Commissioner and Overseeing Judges to resolve common dismissal patterns. |
| Emergency Services | • Continue to conduct training targeted at responding to speed-related collisions.  
• Consider prepositioning emergency assets such as fire and ambulance apparatus in close proximity to high incident areas. |
10.3 Emphasis Area #3: Intersection Visibility

The intersection of a public road and private driveway can be complex, unique, and affected by a number of potential conflicts. Drivers need an unobstructed horizontal and vertical view to be able to see oncoming traffic from any direction. In addition, a higher level of complexity and decision-making are required to navigate turning movements near each other and to controlled intersections to the degree that drivers are not typically accustomed.

Broadside and rear end collisions, primarily resulting from vehicles turning from a side street, are the City’s most common collision type.

Intersection visibility has been the primary contributing factor in the vast majority of these collision types. Visibility limitations are most commonly on-street parking, street furniture, and vegetation. These collision types are most concentrated along Old redwood Hwy and E. Cotati Ave.
Emphasis Area #3: Intersection Visibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Systemic Countermeasure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Engineering** | • Continue enforcing City Municipal Code 17.30.040 E requiring property owners to maintain vegetation clear of minimum sight distance requirements if vegetation is within their property line.  
  - Annually inspect side street sight distance along high incident corridors and issue requests to property owners to trim vegetation where necessary.  
• Revisit Measure U in future. Consider roundabouts instead of signals at new intersections or as part of intersection retrofits to reduce injury collisions including broadsides and to reduce traffic control violations. Where feasible move side street stops bars forward to the maximum extent possible without obstructing bike lanes and maintaining ADA clearances.  
• Require sight distance studies as part of development applications and require minimum visibility clearances at driveways and adjacent intersections.  
• Consider conducting all-way stop control and signalization warrant studies at high incident locations and following up with potential installations where warrants are satisfied, and public support is demonstrated. |
| **Education** | • Provide targeted public information and education on safety problems at specific intersections  
• Consider installation of “cross-traffic does not stop” supplemental warning placards on side street approaches.  
• Regularly initiate and engage with local media outlets such as KRON, ABC7, Press Democrat, The Community Voices, KSRO, and the City’s other own social media platforms to publish articles and interviews regarding turning onto Old Redwood Highway and E. Cotati Ave and the importance of ensuring an adequate gap is available before proceeding from the side street |
| **Enforcement** | • Provide target enforcement to reduce stop sign violations  
• Prioritize patrol patterns and overall presence at high incident locations |
| **Emergency Services** | • Support engineering, education, and enforcement activities |
DUI (driving under the influence), OUI (operating under the influence), DWI (driving while intoxicated), or “buzzed” driving are severe offenses and should not be taken lightly. From 2015-2019, 23 reported collisions in the City of Cotati involved alcohol or drug impairment.

The highest concentration of impaired driving collisions was on Charles St, Henry St, E. Cotati Ave, and Old Redwood Hwy. Collisions with a fixed object are primarily the result of these types of collisions.

Engineering solutions are much less effective in addressing impaired driving patterns. Education and enforcement will be the predominant disciplines for combating this systemic collision trend.
Emphasis Area #4: DUI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Systemic Countermeasure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>• Support Education, Enforcement, &amp; Emergency Services Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regularly engage with alcohol serving establishments in the downtown area. Annual meeting between bar owners and the PD &amp; ABC is an opportunity to discuss preventive measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engage via social and news media outlets. Provide press releases, articles, and interviews regarding driving under the influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seek opportunities for public service advertisements such as billboards and public utility box wraps in the downtown area. Include options for alternative rides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>• Conduct DUI checkpoints within impaired driving collision concentrations in downtown. Advertise as required, engage with media outlets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase perception of DUI enforcement presence and higher probably of being arrested if driving under the influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue pedestrian police patrols during high activity events such as “Thursday night Crawls”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue to prioritize patrols in high incidence areas during peak collision times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>• Support Education, Enforcement, &amp; Emergency Services Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.5 Emphasis Area #5: Traffic Control Compliance

Another top collision trend in the City of Cotati involves failing to comply with traffic controls and vehicular signage. This collision pattern derives from drivers disobeying traffic signals, control devices or signs such as traffic lights, turn restriction, yield signs, school zone markings, etc.

The reduced visibility from side streets at Old Redwood Hwy and William St./George St. intersection combined with driver disobedience make this intersection a more vulnerable to this issue.
## Emphasis Area #5: Traffic Control Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Systemic Countermeasure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Engineering | • Upgrade signalized intersections to 12” indications  
• Upgrade signalized intersections with retroreflective backplates.  
• Implement Advanced Dilemma Zone Detection at signals with low red-light compliance.  
• Review and increase signal clearance timing as necessary.  
• Monitor multilane intersection stop controls, install signalization where warranted.  
  a. As interim measures:  
  i. Upgrade stop signs to 48 x 48 oversized with led flashing boarder.  
  ii. Install retro-reflective signpost panels  
• Proactively monitor traffic sign retro reflectivity and replace when signs fade to non-conformance levels per California MUTCD Table 2A-3.  
• Revisit Measure U in future. Consider roundabouts instead of signals at new intersections or as part of intersection retrofits to reduce injury collisions including broadsides and to reduce traffic control violations.  
• Monitor vegetation overgrowth that could obstruct signage, signals, or visibility of side streets and maintain as appropriate.  
• Install warning devices & beacons on approaches to signalized or stop controlled intersections with high collision concentrations. |
| Education | • Publish results of high incident location analysis and countermeasure recommendations.  
• Regularly initiate and engage with local media outlets such as the Patch, ABC7, Community Voice, and the City’s own social media platforms to publish articles & interviews regarding stop sign and red light running. |
| Enforcement | • Installation of red-light indicators for officers at signalized intersections.  
• Prioritize patrol patterns and overall presence at low compliance locations.  
• Target driver behavior associated with stop sign and red light running, i.e., inattention, speeding, talking/texting on mobile devices. |
| Emergency Services | • Targeted training for responding to specific high incident locations and treatment of predominant injury types at those locations. |
11. High Incident Location Pattern Analysis

11.1 Intersections

Table 4 and figure 15 below depict a focused view of the areas with the highest concentration of collisions in the City. The vast majority of collisions within this section involved a rear end collision from an unsafe speed. The intersections are listed in the table and presented with recommended countermeasures in order of highest to the lowest collision rate.

Table 4. Citywide High Collision Rate Intersection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>5 Yr. Collisions</th>
<th>ADT-2015</th>
<th>Collision Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Cotati Ave. at Charles St.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17200</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Redwood Hwy. at Gravenstein Hwy.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Blvd at Old Redwood Hwy.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helman Ln. at Redwood Dr.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9400</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Redwood Hwy at William St.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Redwood Hwy at Charles St.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18700</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY 116 at W. Cotati Ave.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15700</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cotati Ave. at La Salle Ave.</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17200</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cotati Ave. at Santero Way.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17200</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Redwood Hwy. at La Plaza</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cotati Ave at Old Redwood Hwy.</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38550</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADT = Average Daily Traffic, Collision rate in units of crashes per million entering vehicles

Figure 15. Top 11 High Incident Intersections
High Incident Intersections Recommendations

#1 E. Cotati Ave at Charles St.

Pattern:

The primary collision pattern involves Eastbound Cotati automobiles slowing or stopped for pedestrians/bicyclists crossing in marked crosswalk being rear-ended.

There is also a secondary pattern that involves the same conditions except in the Westbound direction.

Speeding and inattention are the most common contributing factors at this location.

Recommended Countermeasures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>FHWA CMF Code</th>
<th>Crash Reduction Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Install traffic signal.</td>
<td>NS03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Install adv. warning devices &amp; beacons.</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Install speed feedback signs on Cotati.</td>
<td>R26</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pattern:

The primary collision pattern involves Northbound Old Redwood Hwy automobiles slowing or stopped for the traffic signal at Gravenstein being rear-ended.

There is also a secondary pattern that involves the same conditions except in the Southbound direction.

Speeding and inattention are the most common contributing factors at this location.

Recommended Countermeasures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>FHWA CMF Code</th>
<th>Crash Reduction Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Implement advanced dilemma zone detection.</td>
<td>S04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Install signal warning beacon on north bound Old Redwood Hwy approach.</td>
<td>S10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Focused speed enforcement.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Assess narrow lane widths and install buffered bike lanes if feasible.</td>
<td>R32PB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pattern:

The primary collision pattern involves Northbound Old Redwood Hwy automobiles slowing or stopped for the traffic signal at Commerce Blvd being rear-ended.

The Northbound approach to this intersection also faces the Northbound 101 on ramp which is metered. Speeding and inattention are the most common contributing factors at this location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Countermeasures</th>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>FHWA CMF Code</th>
<th>Crash Reduction Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Implement advanced dilemma zone detection.</td>
<td>S04</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Implement signal coordination and adaptive timing along Old Redwood Hwy programmed at travel speeds consistent with or less than posted speed limit.</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Coordinate with Caltrans to install programable signal heads at NB 101 Ramp Meter.</td>
<td>S02</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#4 Helman Ln at Redwood Dr.

Pattern:

The primary collision pattern involves Northbound Redwood Dr. automobiles turning left and colliding with Southbound thru automobiles. In all cases the Left turning driver violated the left turn signal leading to the collision.

Recommended Countermeasures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>FHWA CMF Code</th>
<th>Crash Reduction Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement Advanced dilemma zone detection.</td>
<td>S04</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and increase signal clearance timing as necessary.</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pattern:
The primary collision pattern involves both Northbound & Southbound Old Redwood Highway automobiles colliding with automobiles turning from both side streets.

Stop sign compliance is the primary contributing factor followed by Speeding and visibility.

Recommended Countermeasures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>FHWA CMF Code</th>
<th>Crash Reduction Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Signalization.</td>
<td>NS03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Install retroreflective stop sign pole panels.</td>
<td>NS06</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Install advance warning signs with beacons.</td>
<td>NS09</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Conduct focused enforcement.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pattern:
The primary collision pattern involves both Northbound and Southbound on Old Redwood Highway automobiles colliding with automobiles slowing or stopped at Charles Street.

Impaired driving, inattention, and lack of compliance with stop sign are contributing factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Countermeasures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countermeasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pattern:

The Primary Pattern involves automobiles turning left from Hwy 116 to W. Cotati Ave. colliding with East Bound automobiles. Rear end due to unsafe speed and following too closely and unexpected stopping on an accelerating portion of roadway.

Speeding and inattention are contributing factors.

Recommended Countermeasures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>FHWA CMF Code</th>
<th>Crash Reduction Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Install full signalization.</td>
<td>NS03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Widen 116 to provide turn pockets.</td>
<td>NS18</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Install speed feedback signs on EB 116 traffic.</td>
<td>R26</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Install warning devices and signs on EB 116 traffic.</td>
<td>NS06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Add intersection lighting</td>
<td>NS01</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pattern:
The Primary Pattern involves automobiles failing to obey stop sign controls on all approaches and colliding with opposing traffic.

Speeding, inattention, and stop indication visibility are contributing factors.

**Recommended Countermeasures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>FHWA CMF Code</th>
<th>Crash Reduction Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Supplemental stop sign pole markers.</td>
<td>NS06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Advance warning signs with beacons.</td>
<td>NS09</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Signalization.</td>
<td>NS03</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Conduct focused enforcement.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pattern:

The Primary Pattern involves Eastbound automobiles colliding with Eastbound automobiles stopped or slowing for a red signal indication the traffic signal.

Speeding, inattention, and visibility are contributing factors. Eastbound driver looking beyond intersection at railroad crossing may confuse green indication with E. Cotati Ave and Santero Way.

Recommended Countermeasures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>FHWA CMF Code</th>
<th>Crash Reduction Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Review and increase signal clearance timing as necessary.</td>
<td>S03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Install speed feedback signs on approaches.</td>
<td>R26</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Assess narrow lane widths and install buffered bike lanes if feasible.</td>
<td>R32PB</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Install Programable visibility head</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Pattern:**
The Primary Pattern involves SB Old Redwood Highway automobiles colliding with SB automobiles stopped or slowing for the intersection with La Plaza.

Speeding, inattention, and visibility are contributing factors.

---

**Recommended Countermeasures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>FHWA CMF Code</th>
<th>Crash Reduction Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Signalization.</td>
<td>NS03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Install stop sign with led flashing boarder.</td>
<td>NS06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Install retroreflective stop sign pole panels.</td>
<td>NS06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Install advance warning signs with beacons.</td>
<td>NS09</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Close ORH between La Plaza North and La Plaza South and Convert La Plaza to be one-way counter-clockwise.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pattern:

The Primary Pattern involves SB Old Redwood Highway automobiles colliding with SB automobiles stopped or slowing for the intersection with South La Plaza past the intersection.

There is also a secondary pattern of automobiles on all approaches not obeying red light indications.

Lastly, there are also a number of collisions from drivers Westbound on E. Cotati Ave. making an illegal left turn into Downtown.

Speeding, inattention, and visibility are contributing factors.

Recommended Countermeasures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
<th>FHWA CMF Code</th>
<th>Crash Reduction Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Installation of red-light indicators for officers. Focused speed enforcement.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Install advance warning signs with beacons on WB E. Cotati Ave approach.</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Implement advanced dilemma zone detection.</td>
<td>S04</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Preliminary Design, Cost Estimates, and Benefit to Cost Ratios

The collision patterns have been evaluated at each of the top incident locations identified above. Countermeasures to address those patterns and the preliminary estimated cost of those measures have been developed. The following sections of this report summarize those results.

One of primary purposes of the Safety plan is to establish the City’s eligibility for Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) grant funding. HSIP grant funding is prioritized and awarded based on the grant funding’s economic effectiveness, which is established by a benefit-cost ratio. A summary of the benefit to cost ratios is also provided in the following sections. Project cost estimates are calculated on a line-item basis using the Caltrans Contract Cost Database. In some cases, recent construction bids and benefit values are calculated based on Caltrans established countermeasure values. Under the current HSIP call for projects, the minimum Benefit to Cost Ratio is 3.5.

Depending on the City’s priorities, it is highly recommended that multiple projects are grouped into one HSIP application to maximize potential funding allocations.
1. Old Redwood Hwy at George St.

Exhibit A: Old Redwood Hwy at George St.
1.1 Cost Estimate and Cost/Benefit Analysis

The cost estimate provided to the right represents the preliminary line-item cost for the upgrade at Old Redwood and George St. Line-item cost is derived from the BKF contract cost database.

This project's total cost is estimated at $820,000, which include the design, bidding, construction, CM and construction contingency costs. The estimated benefit of these improvements is $882,240 based on the State adopted HSIP Cost-Benefit Calculator. The Resulting B/C ratio is 1.08.

The current HSIP cycle program has a minimum B/C ratio of 3.5. With a B/C ratio of 1.08 the proposed new signal device would not be an eligible HSIP project.
2. Hwy 116 at W. Cotati

Exhibit B: Hwy 118 at W. Cotati.
2.1 Cost Estimate and Cost/Benefit Analysis

The cost estimate provided to the right represents the preliminary line-item cost for the upgrade at Highway 116 at W Cotati Ave. Line-item cost is derived from the Caltrans contract cost database for District 4 and BKF.

This project's total cost is estimated at $4,235,000 which include the design, bidding, construction, CM and construction contingency costs. The estimated benefit of these improvements is $485,401 based on the State adopted HSIP Cost-Benefit Calculator. The Resulting B/C ratio is 0.11.

The current HSIP cycle program has a minimum B/C ratio of 3.5. With a B/C ratio of 0.11 the proposed new signal would not be an eligible HSIP project.

Exhibit C: St. Joseph. at Old Redwood Hwy.
3.1 Cost Estimate and Cost/Benefit Analysis

The cost estimate provided to the right represents the preliminary line-item cost for the upgrade at St. Joseph Way at Old Redwood Hwy. Line-item cost is derived from the BKF contract cost database.

This project's total cost is estimated at $820,000, which include the design, bidding, construction, CM and construction contingency costs. The estimated benefit of these improvements is $0 based on the State adopted HSIP Cost-Benefit Calculator as no collisions ever recorded on site. The Resulting B/C ratio is 0.

The current HSIP cycle program has a minimum B/C ratio of 3.5. With a B/C ratio of 0, the proposed new signal would not be an eligible HSIP project.
4. Cotati Ave at La Salle Ave.

Exhibit D: Cotati Ave at La Salle Ave.
4.1 Cost Estimate and Cost/Benefit Analysis

The cost estimate provided to the right represents the preliminary line-item cost for the upgrade at Cotati Ave. at La Salle Ave. Line-item cost is derived from the BKF contract cost database.

This project’s total cost is estimated at $820,000, which include the design, bidding, construction, CM and construction contingency costs. The estimated benefit of these improvements is $477,961 based on the State adopted HSIP Cost-Benefit Calculator. The Resulting B/C ratio is 0.58.

The current HSIP cycle program has a minimum B/C ratio of 3.5. With a B/C ratio of 0.58, the proposed new signal would not be an eligible HSIP project.
5. Gravenstein Hwy. at Old Redwood Hwy.

Exhibit D: Gravenstein Hwy. at Old Redwood Hwy
5.1 Cost Estimate and Cost/Benefit Analysis

The cost estimate provided to the right represents the preliminary line-item cost for the upgrade at Gravenstein Hwy. at Old Redwood Hwy. Line-item costs are derived from the Caltrans contract cost database for District 4. Cost Estimates should be updated at 50% design.

This project’s total cost is estimated at $291,100, excluding the design/engineering costs. The estimated benefit of these improvements is $845,839 based on the State adopted HSIP Cost-Benefit Calculator. The Resulting B/C ratio is 2.91.

The current HSIP cycle program has a minimum B/C ratio of 3.5. With a B/C ratio of 2.91, the proposed signal upgrades and additional signage would not be an eligible HSIP project.
Appendix A
Public Outreach Comments

Below are public comments solicited for the report preparation using a variety of methods including the Social Pinpoint software application, the City’s “Report a Problem” feature on its website, and e-mails and phone calls directly to City staff. Although the source of the comment is not presented, the vast majority of the comments are from the Social Pinpoint source.

1. Better lighting at the corners where pedestrians cross or flashing lights. – E Cotati Ave at Lasalle Ave.

2. Crosswalk needed at intersection of Valparaiso and Fehler or Lund Hill. - Valparaiso Ave. and Fehler Ln. or Lund Hill Ln.

3. People cross from one side to the other to get to the park or nearby corner store, etc. using the median as a halfway point between the 4 lanes. – E Cotati Ave in front of Sunflower Park.

4. Signals don’t seem to respond to bicycles generally for crossing ORH. – ORH at Valparaiso Ave.

5. Many folks either in a hurry or not used to seeing pedestrians in this crosswalk will start to drive through when pedestrians are crossing. Suggest a flashing crosswalk like the one down E Cotati by the creek. – E Cotati Ave at Lasalle Ave.

6. Pedestrians are in danger. Cars speed around corner from Loretto onto Benson. There should be a stop sign. – Loretto Ave. at Benson Ln.

7. Very few yield to the keep clear for the fire department driveway. It has gotten better since the lines were painted back onto the pavement. - E Cotati Ave between ORH and La Plaza.

8. Double left turn CONTINUOUSLY has people going from the far left all the way over to the freeway on ramp. I have been almost hit more times than I can count one of which stopped just before hitting me at my driver side front tire and then started threatening me and my child in the vehicle. – Gravenstein Hwy. near onramp

9. With no sidewalk on either side of the street, this area is super dangerous. I’ve had to hop into driveways to avoid getting hit. – Valparaiso Ave

10. You need shocks on your bike if you try to ride through this park. The pavement very uneven. Dangerous for little kids to ride on. – Delano Park

11. Lots of potholes for these kids riding to school. - Richardson Ln

12. Narrow road- too many cars parked - lots of pedestrians and speeding drivers. Please consider limiting parking to one side of the road and/or speed bumps to slow traffic. – W. School St.maybe

13. New stops signs are great! However, the stop sign that stops the westbound traffic sneaks up on people (it’s a bit hidden behind the cement structure of the overcrossing. On several occasions I’ve seen people blow through this stop sign. Maybe more signage? - W Sierra Ave at Water Rd

14. There is a crosswalk here, but since drivers are exiting the freeway, they are going too fast to stop, or just don’t. I suggest a light indicating people are crossing. - W Sierra Ave at Cypress Ave

15. "Unsafe for pedestrians. A lot of parked vehicles force people onto road." – W school St. at Oak Cir.

16. Need to have a pedestrian connection from walking on W Cotati Ave to Alder Ave/Cottages. - W Cotati Ave to Alder Ave/Cottages.
17. "There is often a high vehicle parked on the South side of the road, and blocks visibility to pedestrians/bicyclist standing waiting. Could be changed to no parking to ensure good sight line." - E Cotati Ave at Laguna de Santa Rosa trail entrance.

18. Parking on Santero is horrible. The street is very narrow. One side of the road it prohibits cars from parking overnight 10pm to 6am for emergency vehicles to use in case of emergencies. However, that doesn’t make sense, do emergencies only happen at night? There’s plenty of open space on this road that would make great parking lots. – Santero Way

19. "The police department needs to be more considerate and follow the law when parking their speed advisory sign. In California it is illegal to park ANYWHERE in a bicycle lane." – W Sierra Ave at Henry St

20. Vehicles turning left from southbound Old Redwood Highway to eastbound E. Cotati Ave. sometimes run the red light. Twice when I have tried to cross as a pedestrian heading north on Old Redwood on the east side of the road, I have almost been struck by a vehicle running the red light. If I was visually impaired and relying on the audible cue, I would almost certainly have been hit. - ORH at E Cotati Ave.

21. People drive really fast through here and sometimes don't stop for the crosswalk. Maybe this is pedestrian related concern? – Old Redwood Hwy.

22. We have needed this left hand turn onto West Cotati corrected for 30 years. I know it will cost $2 million to complete, but some day, it is going to cause a major accident like what happened at Madrone. - W Cotati Ave at Gravenstein Hwy.

23. Ever since a vehicle hit and knocked out the pedestrian crossing signal at this spot last year just south of the businesses, it has become more and more dangerous to cross Old Redwood at that crosswalk. Many cars do not stop for pedestrians at this location. How much longer until the flashing light signal is replaced, please? – Old Redwood Hwy.

24. "Nov 16,2020 - Pedestrian Augustus died here walking dog. How can it be made safer here? (also reported as pedestrian issue 04DFC9 but didn't seem to take" – Myrtle Ave at Macklin Dr.


26. Often when a pedestrian is waiting to cross, the first car will stop but sometimes the second or third does not and either slams on the brakes at the last minute or even attempts to overtake the first stopped car. I've heard of one accident when the third car slammed into the second and the second into the first. I've seen near accidents several times. - E Cotati Ave at Charles St.

27. Cars turning east from Old Redwood Highway onto Myrtle frequently make an immediate left turn onto Park without checking in for oncoming traffic heading west on Myrtle. This has always seemed dangerous to me. – Park Ave. at Myrtle Ave.

28. I have been communicating concern for speeding and recklessness since 2009. I live on this street and the common vehicle speed is about 35 mph. - Valparaiso Ave

29. It is very difficult to see vehicles traveling eastbound on W. Sierra from the stop sign on Cypress due to obstructions like the fence and vegetation. Couple this with said vehicles moving much faster than the posted limit of 30moh, it has created several near misses. – W Sierra Ave at Cypress Ave

30. A bicycle doesn't seem to trigger the left turn at lights. That is turning left from Myrtle onto Old Redwood Hwy has been problematic. – ORH at Valparaiso Ave.

31. Constant incomplete stops at this intersection, and failure to give pedestrians the right of way. - W Sierra Ave at E School St

32. Food delivery drivers are using the disabled parking spaces around these restaurants. - ORH at Charles St

33. "Vehicles turning left onto Old Red from Speedway rarely have enough distance and time to safely cross the northbound traffic, especially when said traffic fails to come to a complete stop, and or takes off like it's a drag race. It happens at Loud & Clear as well because traffic is now doing well over the posted limit of
30mph. I've seen the radar in use in the past several days, thanks! I recommend banning left turns from these business, and a solid double yellow on the northbound side.” – Old Redwood Hwy

34. There were pedestrian push buttons on either side of the crosswalk but now only one side of the street. If this hasn't yet been fixed it does require it. Cars fly through. – Old Redwood Hwy

35. Too many cars think this is another way out from Walgreens. We have had the fire hydrant broken as well as cars trying to evade police. Could we get a sign that says no outlet or something along those lines. - Gilbert Ct. at Wilford Ln.

36. The right turn signal should be timed to be green here for those turning from west bound East Cotati onto northbound ORH when the southbound ORH traffic is turning left onto east bound East Cotati Avenue. That would keep things moving smoothly. - ORH at E Cotati Ave.

37. Badly need safe way for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Gravenstein Hwy here. – Madrone Ave. at Gravenstein Hwy.

38. This portion of the bike lane ends and either the cyclist must go into traffic or forced onto the sidewalk. This makes for a dangerous transition for the cyclist. – ORH at Page St.

39. "Benson is a thoroughfare to E. Cotati. Many speed down and roll through stop sign @Loretto. We need speed bumps. Kids & dogs are in danger, plus we have no slow down signs around the trail crossing. We need another stop sign too!" – Benson Ln.

40. Speeding on Valparaiso Ave. The sign telling drivers to slow down and letting them know their speed is not sufficient to slow down traffic. Speed bumps like the ones on Olaf and William Streets at both ends of Valparaiso would be more effective. Speeding is dangerous for pedestrians--children, people walking with animals, and turkeys. – Valparaiso Ave.

41. This is where I meant to place the comment about the first car stopping, the second or third not stopping, the third slamming into the second and pushing the second into the first. And have seen several near accidents because driver of the second car stopped at the last minute or tried to overtake the first stopped car. – E Cotati Ave at Charles St.

42. An unsafe crosswalk area is "technically" RP, so wonder how we can give input to them. The crosswalk near Commerce & Southwest as Laguna de Santa Rosa path crosses over Commerce wasn’t painted correctly when they redid that part of the road (it should be a “slant”; now it’s a perpendicular crossing which doesn’t match the flow), & flashers are WAY too inadequate! Drivers speed from Commerce to Southwest, and the continuous right turn also has speeders. Really have to be careful in that area! – Commerce Blvd & Southwest Blvd

43. While crossing this intersection, I paused in the island while waiting to be sure the approaching car saw me. The car slowed to a stop for me to cross but the truck behind did not stop and plowed into the car. Luckily, I had not stepped into the crosswalk yet or I would have been struck down as the car was pushed forward many feet. - E Cotati Ave at Charles St.

44. It would be nice if there were a curb cut here for bicyclists. Easy to get on/off the path on McGinnis but awkward on the Loretto side of the bridge/path. – Loretto Ave at Lincoln Ave.

45. Turning out from Marsh Way is challenging. Cars fly down E. Cotati Ave, many go from the freeway to the homes to the West. Aggravating the situation are cars coming from Charles Street to turn right onto E. Cotati Ave. Drivers don’t see a car waiting to pull out from Marsh Way, they make their right turn and hit the gas, then in a very short span encounter Marsh Way cars. A neighbor was hit by a police car who had just turned onto E. Cotati from Charles. A traffic light/stop at Charles is needed. – E Cotati Ave at Marsh Way.

46. Benson lane is a 25 mph, however, drivers do not respect the limit. It is a shortcut for many drivers going east to RP, even when I pull into my driveway is dangerous because drivers tailgating. Needs speed bumps and better signs for speed!! It’s been going on for a long time. - Benson Ln.

47. Benson Lane/Loretto Ave rolling stops, speeding. I have almost been hit several times by people turning left off Benson onto Loretto. Seems many assume I’m turning on to Benson and pull in front. Happens whether on bicycle or car. - Benson Ln.
48. "Vehicles not yield at Left turn from 116 for Vehicles going South on Old Redwood with the Green Light. People just fly through that turn and don't even look. Also, the Right turn at Old Redwood and 116. So many people Turn on the Do not turn on red." - ORH at HWY 116

49. Cars heading east on 116 under the freeway cutting off 2 lanes of traffic to get in the south most lane to head South on ORH. – Hwy 116 at Hwy 101 on-ramp southbound

50. Parking spaces along the park block the view of oncoming traffic making it extremely difficult to turn left onto W Cotati. – W cotati Ave at La Plaza

51. Fencing at the preschool is obstructing the view of oncoming cars, making it difficult to cross over to Olof St. from henry St. You have to pull into the crosswalk and almost to the bicycle lane to see if cars are coming or not. – W Sierra Ave/Henry St/ Olof St.

52. "Left turn onto ORH south needs to be allowed with a green arrow. Please paint lines for cars turning left from ORH to W. Sierra Ave. With the double turn lanes coming at you it cuts it close and can be hard to see where everyone should be." - ORH at E Cotati Ave.

53. Inefficient use of the roadway here as the one lane going onto 101N backs up often impairing other roadways causing people to rush to beat the light. I think the area here should be reconfigured so that the left turn lane (that goes into a vacant field at the edge of the freeway) is opened up for cars wanting to go onto 101N. It would be a better use of the space - about 4 cars could wait there while the light is red and traffic would move faster onto 101 when the light is green. – ORH at Commerce Blvd.

54. Three way Stop Sign requested. When turning left off of Benson Ln onto Loretto Ave, there is impaired visibility due to landscaping and parked cars. This means you have to pull out into oncoming traffic before you can see if it's clear to turn. – Loretto Ave. at Benson Ln.

55. "Turning off of Valparaiso onto W. Sierra Ave is difficult due to obstructed view from landscaping. There are also lots of cars during busy times, and due to the stop sign at the City building, all cars are perfectly spaced apart so you don't have any openings to turn. A Three way stop sign might help" – W Sierra Ave at Valparaiso Ave.

56. New roadway to come in soon. How about considering speed bumps, like some of the other streets around the city? They will slow down speeders (unless they are morons) and maybe we can back out of our driveways without getting nailed or walk across the street to get the mail. CPD can't be everywhere. – W Cotati Ave.

57. Cars on Myrtle frequently exceed 45 or even 50 mph. A recent fatality in Myrtle is a prime example of how people treat this street as a highway and neglect to consider pedestrians and bicyclists. – Myrtle Ave

58. In an effort to avoid the light at Redwood Hwy and Myrtle, people heading to L-Section cut through this neighborhood at excessive speeds. There are children in this neighborhood who frequently ride bikes and are hidden from view. – John Roberts Dr at Aguirre Way.

59. "Drivers excessively speeding down William St. to cut through the neighborhood to avoid the light at old Red and W. Sierra. Drivers speed down our street even with the new speed bumps installed they don't care. We have 2 daycare facilities on our street that cross children daily and many pedestrians on foot walking. I've always suggested to the City to place the "Your Speed" trailer on our but it has never happened." – William St.

60. "Speeding drivers on w School St. before and after Clifford Ave, Drivers cutting through on W School St to find the on Hwy 101 N on ramp (lost), Speed limit is 25 in neighborhoods and drivers are travelling excessive speeds at this corner and W School St to W. Sierra. This route is very popular with dog walkers and elderly pedestrians out for a walk." – W. School St. before and after Clifford Ave.

61. Southbound cyclists with green light have to cross in front of fast-moving cars turning right from 116 eastbound onto ORH southbound who have a red light but are not required to stop. - Hwy 116 and ORH.

62. ORH northbound too narrow for cyclists, so they have to go on the sidewalk, also too narrow for bikes+pedestrians. Also, cyclists have to suddenly re-enter street when bike lane resumes; drivers do not expect this. Needs to be separate bike lane and sidewalk in this vicinity from Peet's past the Chevron station. – Hwy. 116 and ORH.
63. Narrow road with lots of vehicles parked on the shoulder - and protruding into the roadway. Not enough room for cars going in opposite directions to pass at times. – W. School St.

64. Awkward transition from W. School to Richardson Ln. The change in elevation is very abrupt, especially when towing a trailer. In addition, the pavement on Richardson Ln is in horrible shape. - W. School st. at Richardson Ln.

65. Over the past few weeks (May 2021) there has been an increase in very fast cars racing/speeding to get in and out of the lights at this intersection, particularly late at night. It's common for north bound drivers to race through the lights at high speeds and southbound drivers to do the same. It's become terribly disruptive. I wake in the middle of night, can't keep windows open, house is often rattling. – ORH at Valparaiso Ave.

66. Overweight semi-trucks, trucks with trailers, and RVs etc. travel north and south bound through this intersection 24/7 - illegally given the posted weight limits. These trucks are enormously disruptive to peace and quiet, tear up the roads, and also threaten pedestrian/cycling safety. – Old Redwood Hwy.

67. Stop sign needs to be installed at intersection of Olaf / William/W Cotati to deter speeding. - Olaf / William/W Cotati

68. No sidewalks for preschool drop offs and pick ups as well as walkers and cars speeding on William street. Stop sign next to Korean church and Olaf would help slow down also making it safer for all. – William St

69. Top Light missing after pole removal SW Corner ORH/Valparaiso. - ORH at Valparaiso Ave

70. There is a terrible transition from the bridge to the street. If pushing a stroller, wheelchair or small child riding a bike, it does not work. There should be a better transition and also a safe area to walk. There is no sidewalk or shoulder on either side of the road in this area. Also the cars drive fast. - Valparaiso Ave

71. Parking is allowed on both sides of the street often creating too narrow of a passage lane for traffic as well as causing blind spots for drivers not seeing pedestrian. - Valparaiso Ave

72. This neighborhood is used as a short cut during commute hours. People drive very fast and round a blind turn (W. Cotati Ave at W. Cotati Oaks) on the other side of the road. Speed bumps would help slow down traffic and maybe discourage commuters from using this street. - W. Cotati Ave at W. Cotati Oaks

73. Recommend only one left turn lane from ORH north onto 116. Currently, drivers in leftmost left turn lane will often turn directly into rightmost lane of 116. - Hwy 116 and ORH

74. Would prefer to see this stop sign removed. It slows traffic with no material improvement to safety. – W. Sierra Ave. at Hansen Rd.

75. Cyclists have to cross in front of fast-moving cars which are turning right from 116 eastbound on to ORH southbound. - Hwy 116 and ORH

76. Exiting my driveway is dangerous. Auto/Truck traffic often exceeds the 25mph limit coming from the west and rounds a blind corner where I often back out of the driveway. A couple of close calls over the last 9 years. Generally, people drive too fast and I’d like the city to consider installation of devices to slow, or calm traffic. – W. Cotati Ave.

77. Dangerous intersection, drivers do not wait for pedestrians to cross completely (as it should), seems as if drivers want to ram pedestrians because we are crossing. Needs more patrol in the area, or something to help with bad driver behavior. – ORH at Valparaiso Ave.

78. Benson Lane is used as a cut thru. The cars go very fast and don't slow down for pedestrians crossing the corner by the Vets Building. We need speed bumps. – Benson Ln.

79. Make this a yield. So many vehicles do not stop or even look for the vehicles that have the right of way and just plow thru this turn and do not slow down. So frustrating - Hwy 116 and ORH

80. Anyone with a sports car or car that is low to ground will get scratched coming out of this parking lot.- E Cotati Ave. at Dyquisto Way.

81. No sidewalk either side. Must jump in brush if car comes. – Cypress Ave at Oretsky Way
82. Signage in road needed for NB freeway lane. If you paint the far-left lane with NB freeway only, it might help the last-minute lane changes on Old Redwood by the freeway entrance. – NB Hwy 101 on-ramp

83. "There should be a speed bump on Valparaiso. Cars fly through there and it's a tight street to drive/walk on especially on the section with no sidewalk" - Valparaiso Ave

84. The pavement for most of the Laguna de Santa Rosa trail from Commerce Blvd. to E. Cotati Ave needs to be redone. Many sections of this walking/biking trail are filled with potholes and uneven pavement. - Laguna de Santa Rosa trail

85. A bit off topic, but the noise from the freeway coming across St. Joseph's field from where the noise barrier wall becomes lower is a constant source of stress impacting the nerves of those who live nearby. Why wasn't the noise barrier wall constructed at the same height as it is right behind St. Joseph's church, all the way up to Hwy 116? Couldn't the wall be built up to block the constant roar of traffic for the wellbeing of all who live close? The decibel level is truly punishing over time. – Rainbow Bridge Montessori trail school.

86. "Crossing 116 for pedestrian (and bikes) is hazardous here and could greatly be improved by at least crosswalk painting and a sign. A pedestrian engaged flasher would be even better. Sight lines are good, but traffic is moving fast in both directions at this location." – Madrone Ave. at Gravenstein Hwy.

87. Vehicle exiting the southbound freeway and turning left onto 116 from the far-left hand turn lane enter into the right lane mid turn or just after they turn nearly causing collisions. – Hwy 101 off-ramp Southbound at Hwy 116.

88. "Please put the solid white line back at the corner of 116 and Old Redwood Highway. It is a yield sign turning right onto old redwood Highway from 116. Without the solid white line too many people make a complete stop because they are afraid that the oncoming traffic will change lanes. This is a safety hazard!" – Hwy 116 and Old Redwood Highway

89. There’s no yield sign, but yet cars never stop at the red light and just plow thru even with oncoming traffic from north bound. Not safe when others have a green light and these cars turning are going without stopping. - Hwy 116 and Old Redwood Highway

90. We cross at this crosswalk almost daily. It is quite scary at times. A flashing pedestrian light would be helpful. - E Cotati Ave at Charles St.

91. Remove this crosswalk! A high number of crashes happen due to cars stopping for pedestrians. There is a cross walk just before this closer to the stop lights pedestrians should use. Cars have not sped up as fast by the first crosswalk. By the time they reach the crosswalk at the church they are speeding at 40mph+. Dangerous and unnecessary crosswalk here at the creek path. - E Cotai Ave at Laguna de Santa Rosa trail entrance.

92. This intersection cannot safely handle current traffic (cannot imagine how it will handle proposed 3 story, 27-unit building!) This is a well-known area for accidents. The recent two-lane merge has only increased this safely issue as cars speed up to merge. Charles St is a residential street with a lot of pedestrian traffic. – E Cotati Ave Charles St.

93. Merge here sucks during heavy traffic times as most try to ice out the other driver and purposely stay neck and neck instead of being like a zipped and doing every other car. - E Cotati Ave at La Plaza.

94. No sidewalk either side of street. If you live down Valparaiso, very difficult to walk or ride downtown this way. – Old Redwood Hwy.

95. Just put in a traffic light already. Often times people don’t know how to use the 4 ways stop correctly and pedestrians are at risk constantly here. – E Cotati Ave at Lasalle Ave.

96. The yield from 116 E onto Old Redwood S is very confusing to drivers not from the area. People turning onto Old Redwood S from 116 E often stop, which causes everyone else expecting to continue to go to slam on their brakes. - Hwy 116 and ORH

97. After waiting patiently in the correct land to enter the northbound to 101 near Peet's, I am constantly cut off by numerous cars every day who feel they can cut in at the last Minute from the designated lane into
Rohnert Park. I have had to slam on my brakes and have nearly gotten hit so many times it’s hard to count. – ORH at Commerce Blvd.

98. Constant stop sign runners. Almost hit by multiple GG transit busses who run this sign often. - W Sierra Ave at E School St

99. Would it be too radical to examine building a round-about traffic system here? Maybe in other parts of Cotati as well? They seem to work very well for calming traffic in Windsor and Healdsburg, which incidentally are also bisected by ORH. It could be a very effective way to dramatically slow down the late-night drivers that plow through, AND it could minimize 5,000lb+ vehicles that are not permitted through the downtown core. – ORH at Valparaiso Ave.

100. "Almost get in a head on collision every day here. Too many cars parked on both sides of the street! Valparaiso this too narrow for all of these vehicles." – Valparaiso Ave

101. "I'm writing to ask for help with the traffic on Myrtle. One in twenty come to a full stop at either stop signs is my unscientific observation while at Helen Putman Park. (Actually, this poor behavior is citywide.) Enforcement is warranted but will only be a short time solution. An educational campaign has a better chance of success. If the standard explained to me is 'a complete stop is when a car rocks back' it is lost on drivers. Here’s a slogan: “Rock back before you roll”" – Myrtle Ave.

102. Early morning (3:30-5am) this stop sign is often ran/ rolled through by folks in a hurry. I see it almost daily on my morning commute. Especially by guys in pickups with toolboxes in the back. – E Cotati Ave at Lasalle Ave.

103. Drivers routinely ignore the 4-way stop signs, & racers use them as a starting line to race toward downtown on a regular basis. Pedestrians/cyclists take their lives in their hands just attempting to cross within the cross walks, as drivers that DO stop don't check for them. – E Cotati Ave at Lasalle Ave.

104. There are no crosswalks across Valparaiso. – Valparaiso Ave

105. Too many cars are parked on both sides of the street. Valparaiso is too narrow, and cars are often nearly missing a head on collision. There needs to be designated no parking signs on one side of the street. It is the worst at the park and across the street from the park. Too many cars parked on the street. - Valparaiso Ave

106. Speeding cars, narrow street filled with too many cars occupying both sides of the street. The worst area is I'm front of the park and across the street. Pleas add speed bumps, signage to slow down and only allow parking on one side of the street. Way too dangerous, avoiding collisions daily. - Valparaiso Ave

107. This street is not safe for pedestrians who are Constantly walking in fear from being hit by a speeding vehicle - Valparaiso Ave

108. Cobblestone crosswalk is a serious trip hazard. Dangerous intersection for pedestrians as cars coming up Benson often do not come to a complete stop at the stop sign and cars coming down Park do not yield to pedestrians. Having a safer, non-bumpy surface to walk on would help pedestrians navigate this intersection safer and faster. – Park Ave. at Benson Ln.

109. White lines need to be redone. Several times, vehicles are in the left lane going straight from Myrtle to Valparaiso. The left lane is a left turn only and the right lane is to continue straight or turn right onto Old Redwood toward downtown Cotati. Maybe put a sign up on Myrtle Ave as well to direct traffic to correct lane. Lots of speeding vehicles and impatient drivers who do not follow traffic correctly in this area. – ORH at Valparaiso Ave.

110. Cars gun it after the second stop sign. It’s loud and dangerous. Speed bumps should be placed to detour this behavior. This is a residential area with lots of kids, elderly, and pets. – Myrtle Ave at Veronda Ave

111. No sidewalks in this neighborhood. People also speed like maniacs onto West school street. – W School St.

112. Cars are dodging each other from head-on collisions due to so many cars parked on both sides of the streets in front of the park and across the street. This street is too narrow for commercial vehicles/vehicles to park on both sides of Delano Park. Pedestrians are ducking vehicles pulling left and right side of the
road to allow passing. Pedestrians are at risk daily from speeding cars and are getting pushed to jump into driveways as cars compete to use both sides of the road. – Valparaiso Ave

113. "Vehicles going West view of pedestrian/bicyclist standing at crossing can be blocked by large, parked vehicles. While there is an overhead flashing warning sign that can be activated, it would be safer for drivers to be able to see a pedestrian standing. For pedestrian safety I would recommend better sight lines, and two vehicle slots to be removed." - E Cotati Ave at Laguna de Santa Rosa trail entrance.

114. "City of Cotati Informational Sign on "'Measure G Dollars at Work'" blocking bicycle lane. June 25/2021. Should not cause safety issue, by being in bike lane and forcing bikes into traffic- see picture - should be off road. I can see some urgent temporary warning signs being placed temporarily in bicycle lane, but not an informational sign." – ORH at Clothier Ln.

115. Heading East 116 to cross old redwood highway, because of the way lanes are set up it is constantly causing drivers to cut one another off to get into needed lane. This needs some kind of reconfiguration. Also, quite frequently there are car chases coming off freeway hwy from CHP to LE cars fly into the city neighborhood past Walgreens, there needs to be a speed bump past Walgreens into is so dangerous to residents, pedestrians and very unfair to residents.

116. Fire hazard, along creek pathway high brush, trees from creek touching residential fences, foliage not maintained! No fire hydrant on pathway to battle blaze. PD will not chase suspect at night due to no light. FD won't respond to request for brush maintenance, Laguna De Santa Rosa won't respond for maintenance, City of Cotati won't respond for maintenance. It is hard for a homeowner-renter to transport proper landscape tools to go out trim and dispose of brush. – Laguna de Santa Rosa Trail at Gravenstein Way.

117. Thank you for taking into consideration our concerns of traffic and traffic patterns on West Cotati Ave. I live at 506 located on a curve, so the driveway is really a hidden driveway. Getting in and out of the driveway can be difficult, because of drivers driving over the speed limit, texting on the phone or talking on the phone. Over the years I have noticed and increase in traffic, however what is so alarming is the speeding cars and trucks. – W Cotati Ave.

118. Folks who live out on Helman Ln. were very concerned about potholes/poor road condition on Helman and felt that the city did not care about them. - Helman Ln.

119. People drive too fast past Charles St. Village, and the speed bumps aren’t marked clearly enough. - Charles St.

120. "Traffic light sensor does NOT recognize bicycles (left turn lane, from Santero onto East Cotati). I have reported this more than once via the city's app, never got a response..." – E Cotati Ave at Santero Way.

121. "This Class I path is full of uplifted pavement, potholes, longitudinal cracks, overgrown brush, etc. Please give it some overdue maintenance! One of these days someone's going to trip or their wheel will stick and they'll go flying!" - Laguna de Santa Rosa Trail.

122. There is both a bike lane AND a sharrow here, which is confusing to drivers and cyclists alike. – Park Ave.

123. Coming from eastbound East Cotati, crossing tracks and turning right onto the train platform, there is a weird pavement mismatch that is a hazard if you don't know it's there. – E Cotati Ave at Santero Way.

124. It would be nice if there were a curb cut here for bicyclists. – End of E. School St.

125. I love the little path that connects from the end of Maple to behind the gas station at 116 & Redwood Drive. Would be nice if there were curb cuts at either end. – Maple Ave.

126. W Sierra is narrow, no shoulder, drivers mostly OK but some speeding. – W Sierra Ave at Cypress Ave

127. Need a bike rack for shopping at these businesses. – Crossroad shopping center.

128. Maybe 5 years ago, the city put in a disabled cut-out that is standalone with no sidewalk. The cut out is not usable for people in wheelchairs or walkers because the top of the ramp goes to rocks. The w/c's and walkers can't go over the rocks. – W. School St. at Clifford St.

129. "I have been nearly hit 3 times by people going straight through the intersection instead of turning left onto E. Cotati Ave. Is it possible to paint a solid white line to guide them, separate the signage by the lights, or
have the left turn go separately from the straight light? Also there is still the yellow sign a block north advising through traffic to merge left, maybe that adds to the confusion.” - ORH at E Cotati Ave.

130. Need a curb cut here to facilitate bicycle access from the Laguna bike path to the True Value shopping center. – Wilford Ln. at Creek Ct.

131. Revisit measure U as part of a toolbox. Design for safe pedestrian and bicycle crossing across state route 116. Bicycles need to clearly be represented in a busy area. Safe route to Thomas Page Academy. Calming measure tools need to be implemented more to address the speeding problem. – Received at the Council meeting.

132. Need to address near misses and/or areas where people and bicycles are too afraid to use. Have a better timeline for the plan to be implemented. – Received at the Council meeting.

133. Need to distinguish the difference between bike on bike and bike on vehicle collisions. Crossing area along Hwy 116 at Madrone Ave and Derby Ln. Keeping the Bicycle Lane clear and clear of any hazard. – Received at the Council meeting.
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Appendix C

Glossary and Definition

HSIP – Highway Safety Improvement programs
LRSP – Local Roadway Safety Plan
SSAR – Systemic Safety Analysis Report
Agency – A public entity.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) - Federal civil rights law to establish a clear and comprehensive prohibition of discrimination on the basis of disability. The Districts must follow established procedures to certify that the project “as-built” complies with the ADA standards in DIB 82.

Average Daily Traffic (ADT) – The average 24-hour volume of traffic, being the total number during a stated period divided by the number of days in that period. The period is a year, unless stated otherwise. (HDM Topic 62.8 (1))

Buffer Strip – That portion of the roadside, usually vegetated, between the curb or curb line and the sidewalk, or extending about 1.21 meter (4') or more from the curb where there is no walk.

California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD) – Statewide adopted standards and specifications for all official traffic control devices.

Caltrans – California Department of Transportation.

CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) – The State environmental legislation that establishes procedures for conducting an environmental analysis for all projects in California (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et. seq.).

Communication Line – A transmission circuit, such as fiber optic, telephone line, telegraph wire, fire alarm, or television cable.

Conductor – A material that contains movable electric charges such as a wire carrying electric current.

Conduit – An enclosed casing for protection of wires, cables, or lines. Conduits often occur in multiple, usually are jacketed, and often extend from manhole to manhole.

Electric Lines – Overhead conductors with supporting structures or underground conductors and the conduit in which they are contained.

Encroachment – Includes any tower, pole, pole line, pipe, pipe line, fence, billboard, stand or building, or any structure, object of any kind or character not particularly mentioned in this section, or special event, which is in, under, or over any portion of the State highway right-of-way. (S&H Code, Section 660).

Encroachment Permit – A revocable permissive authority for the permittee to enter State highway right-of-way to construct facilities or conduct special events. An encroachment permit is a valid contract between the State and the permittee. It is not a property right and is not transferable.

Existing facility – A facility installed in a prior era of time (months, years).

Facility – Something installed to serve a particular purpose.
FHWA – Federal Highway Administration.

Freeway – A divided arterial highway with full control of access and with grade separations at intersections.

Frontage Road – A local street or road auxiliary to and located on the side of an arterial highway for service to abutting property and adjacent areas and for control of access.

Highway, Street, or Road – A general term denoting a public way for the transportation of people, materials, goods, and services but primarily for vehicular travel. Includes the entire area within the right-of-way.

Highway Right-of-way – Any public street or highway or portion thereof which is within the boundaries of a state highway, including a traversable highway adopted or designated as a state highway, shall constitute a part of the right-of-way of such state highway without compensation being paid therefore, and the department shall have jurisdiction thereover and responsibility for the maintenance thereof. (Streets and Highways Code, section 83).

Interchange – A system of interconnecting roadways in conjunction with one or more grade separations that provides for the movement of vehicles between two or more roadways on different levels.

Local Assistance Project – A local agency project involving federal or State highway funds.

Median – The portion of a divided highway separating traveled ways for traffic in opposite directions.

Modification – a revision to or change of an existing installation/facility, which does not increase size or capacity.

NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) – The national environmental law that establishes procedures for conducting an environmental analysis for a project involving federal action.

New Installation – An installation placed in a location where none exists.

Operational Right-of-way – The area between the right-of-way limits utilized for the purpose and protection of public travel.

Overcrossing – A structure carrying a road or street over a State highway.

Overhead – An elevated structure carrying a highway over a railroad.

Owner – The individual, corporation, or organization responsible for an encroachment.

Public Road Connection – Provides an access opening through the right-of-way line which serves abutting land ownerships whose remaining access rights have been acquired by the State.

Public Utility – Includes every common carrier, toll bridge corporation, pipeline corporation, gas corporation, electrical corporation, telephone corporation, telegraph corporation, water corporation, sewer system corporation, and heat corporation, where the service is performed for, or the commodity is delivered to, the public or any portion thereof.

Public Works - All road, bridge, street lighting, or installation of signal work performed under an encroachment permit issued and for acceptance into the State highway system, except work performed solely to allow private encroachments onto the State highway or for utility and/or drainage encroachments within the State highway.

Relocation – Removal, rearrangement, reinstallation, or adjustment of a public utility facility required by highway construction or improvement.

Resolution – A written expression of the will of a legislative body, such as a city or town council, county board, of the California Assembly or Senate.
Right-of-way – A general term denoting land, property, or interest therein (usually in a strip) acquired for or devoted to transportation purposes.

Roadside – A general term denoting the area adjoining the outer edge of the roadbed to the right-of-way line. Extensive areas between the roadways of a divided highway also may be considered roadside.

Roadway – That portion of the highway included between the outside lines of the sidewalks, or curbs and gutter, or side ditches including also the appertaining structures, and all slopes, ditches, channels, waterways, and other features necessary for proper drainage and protection.

Shoulder – The paved or unpaved portion of the roadway contiguous with the traveled way for accommodating stopped vehicles, for emergency use, and for lateral support of base and surface courses.

Special Event – A street festival, sidewalk sale, or community-sponsored activity, or community approved activity as defined in Streets and Highway Code Sections 660 (b) and 682.5.

Temporary Traffic Barrier – An object used to prevent vehicular access into construction or maintenance work zones, and to redirect an impacting vehicle so as to limit damage to the vehicle and injury to the occupants while providing worker protection.

Traffic Barrier – A device used to prevent a vehicle from striking a more severe obstacle or feature located on the roadside or in the median to prevent crossover median accidents.

Undercrossing – A structure providing passage for a road or street under a State highway.

Underpass – A structure providing passage for a highway under a railroad.