

The 2001 Summary of Safe Routes to School Programs in the United States

March 26, 2001

A project of Transportation Alternatives
115 West 30th Street, Room 1207
New York City, 10001

Saferoutes@transalt.org

Produced in Conjunction with the Surface Transportation Policy Project (STPP)

and Funded by

Bikes Belong
League of American Bicyclists
The National Center for Bicycling and Walking
Thunderhead Alliance of State and Local Bicycle Advocates

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION:.....5

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL CALIFORNIA CHILD HEALTH AND SAFETY EDUCATION INITIATIVE..... 11

CALIFORNIA SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL LEGISLATION: CAMPAIGN..... 13

CALIFORNIA SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL LEGISLATION: IMPLEMENTATION 15

MARIN COUNTY SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS 17

SAFE WAYS TO SCHOOL/FLORIDA TRAFFIC AND BIKE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM (FTBSEP)..... 19

"SAFE PATHS TO SCHOOLS" LEGISLATION 21

PED'S KIDSWALK TO SCHOOL 23

CHICAGO'S WALKING SCHOOL BUS PROGRAM 25

ARLINGTON MA, SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PILOT PROGRAM 27

KIDSWALK TO SCHOOL..... 29

THE BRONX SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAM..... 31

PORTLAND KIDS ON THE MOVE 33

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL LEGISLATION..... 35

PENNSYLVANIA WALK TO SCHOOL TRAILS PROGRAM. 37

ARLINGTON COUNTY SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL..... 39

Introduction

Children's lives have altered dramatically over the last few decades. One of the most startling changes is how little independence and mobility they now have compared to the generations who grew up before them. Not so long ago, a vast majority of kids routinely roamed their neighborhoods on foot or bicycle, taking the first steps toward independence. Today, a new generation of moms and dads chauffeur their kids to nearly all their activities, fearing for their children's safety on streets due to perceived dangers from both crime and traffic. Researchers estimate while more than two-thirds of all children walked or biked to school as little as thirty years ago, that number has now plummeted to less than ten percent.

Yet a new movement is emerging that is focusing on getting kids back on their feet and back on their bikes. Neighborhood groups, traffic engineers and local officials are working together to make streets safer for pedestrians and bicyclists along school routes, while encouraging both parents and their kids to take advantage of the many benefits of getting around on foot or by bike. With new interest from transportation professionals, public health advocates, neighborhood improvement groups and local elected officials, communities all across the United States are discovering the many benefits of providing "Safe Routes to School."

In order to encourage more children to walk or bike, parents need to trust that it is both safe and convenient from a variety of perspectives. A concern among some parents is the threat of violence as well as child abduction. While statistics tell us that abductions are an extremely infrequent occurrence, many parents indeed have legitimate concerns about crime, and violence prevention is an important component of Safe Routes to School programs in many areas.

But the greatest danger for many children walking or biking to school comes from traffic on neighborhood roads and streets. Parents often cite the fear of traffic as one of their top concerns in allowing their kids to walk or bike to school. They note the importance of stronger education programs for both motorists and children, better enforcement of traffic laws, and projects and programs to help slow down the speed of residential traffic. Indeed, it is exactly this type of comprehensive approach to traffic safety problems that has been shown to be most effective in creating safer streets and promoting increased walking and bicycling among Americans of all ages.

The Types of Safe Routes Programs

The desire to reduce pedestrian injuries, restore childhood mobility, improve basic health, and reduce automobile traffic near schools have inspired a wide variety of "Safe Routes to School" programs across the United States. Some Safe Routes to School projects have existed under other names for decades, and been recently recast as Safe Routes to School. Others are new to this country. This paper includes details and contact information for many of these programs.

There are many different components involved in the creation of a safe routes to school program, but generally they can be grouped under these four broad approaches:

- **The Traffic Calming Model**
- **The Funding Model**
- **The Encouragement Model**
- **The Enforcement Model**

Many programs mix aspects of these models, and the different models can also co-exist in a single state or community. This discussion highlights the differences between the models in order to help proponents of Safe Routes think methodically about what they are doing, and why they are doing it. This means distinguishing

between **Ends** and **Means** — or **Goals** and **Methods**. For instance, traffic calming is a means to an end — reducing child crashes around schools, and encouraging cycling and walking. It is not an end in itself.

The Traffic Calming Model

In 1978, the town of Odense in Denmark launched “Safe Routes to School” to combat a child fatality rate that was the highest in Western Europe. The Odense project included an extensive, and carefully crafted community planning process. The process was based around surveying parents and children and consensus building sessions. The goal of the planning was to generate new ideas and solutions. More subtly, it was intended to win community agreement for the kind of major traffic calming engineering needed to significantly reduce crashes around schools. It worked. Within a year of the redesign of streets around schools using speed humps, traffic circles, and wider sidewalks, child pedestrian crashes in small town Odense plummeted from 10 to 2 a year.

Safe Routes to School in Britain, Germany, Holland, The Bronx, and Arlington, Virginia are examples of the Traffic Calming Model for Safe Routes. Many traffic calming based programs also employ education and enforcement strategies. The Traffic Calming Model is fundamentally based on changing the behavior of motorists through changes in street design. This model can also include increased enforcement — especially speeding — and increased safety education for motorists — for instance “Kill Your Speed Not a Child” marketing.

The Traffic Calming Model is characterized by these goals and methods.

Goals

1. Measurably reduce crashes, injuries and deaths involving child pedestrians or cyclists near schools.
2. Create congenial and safe walking and /or cycling routes on primary travel corridors to and from schools so as to measurably increase the share of children walking and cycling to school.

Methods

Summary: Use traffic engineering to change motorist behavior, to reduce speeding and reckless driving near schools, and improve the pedestrian environment.

1. Use changes in the physical environment near schools — primarily traffic calming engineering — to slow motor vehicle speeds, and reduce the exposure of child pedestrians to turning and backing vehicles.
2. *Can include community based planning and consensus building process.
3. *Can include Walking School Bus, group rides and other public events to increase political and community support for constructing traffic calming and pedestrian improvements.
4. *Can include increased police traffic enforcement.

Public and Governmental Participation and Funding

1. Must eventually include the active participation and funding of transportation agency.
2. *Can be initiated by civic group, advocates, school or government agency.
3. Government Funding: High \$100,000 minimum capital and planning cost per school.

Advocacy Requirements

1. Project Funding Level: High. Advocacy Funding Level to successfully Initiate: \$50,000.
2. Advocacy Experience Needed: High. Experienced advocacy and organizing experience

Scale

Most suitable for city or county level.

The Funding Model

The best example of the Funding Model is California's legislation dedicating one third of federal Surface Transportation Safety funds to local Safe Routes to School programs. The Funding Model is really a means to an end, not an end in itself. This said, it is probably the biggest bang per advocacy resources invested. A handful of advocates in California won \$20 million a year for local Safe Routes Program. This is an extraordinarily effective way of using limited time and resources. Funding a range of well thought out Safe Routes projects at the local level also encourages innovation. Several states are considering safe routes funding legislation, including Oregon, Montana, Florida, and Texas.

The Funding Model is characterized by these goals and methods.

Goals

1. Reduce child pedestrian and cycling crashes, and encourage cycling and walking to schools throughout California.

Methods

Summary: Win funding for localities to create engineering, education and enforcement campaigns to change motorist behavior — especially speeding and reckless driving near schools. Funding also supports programs to create congenial street designs, paths and encouragement to motivate children and parents to get kids out of cars and on foot and bike.

1. Pass legislation at federal, state or local level guaranteeing significant levels of funding at the state, city or county level for Safe Routes programs.
2. Win funding, without legislation, from existing safety and transportation funds. (Examples are federal 402 safety funds and federal Transportation Enhancement funds.)

Public and Governmental Participation and Funding

1. Must eventually include the active support of state or local elected officials or government agencies, including effective implementation plans.
2. Can be initiated by civic group, advocates, schools or government agency.
3. Likely to involve extensive coalition building among a broad list of proponents from health, education, safety, public interest and local government organizations.
4. Government Funding Level: Very High. Generates funding for other projects.

Advocacy Requirements

1. Advocacy Funding Level to successfully Initiate: High. \$75,000 for legislation. As low as \$5,000 for 402 safety grants.
2. Advocacy Experience Needed: Very High for legislation. Moderate for 402 and other readily identifiable safety funds. Extensive organizing experience.

Scale

Most suitable for state, city or county level. Could be implemented on regional, big, small city or local levels with large government commitment.

The Encouragement Model

Encouragement campaigns are the cheapest, quickest and easiest way for non-government organizations to direct public and political attention to walking and cycling to school. Encouragement typically takes the form of Walking School Buses and group rides. These can be accompanied by marketing and behavioral change methods

Draft 12/11/02

ranging from coloring books and prizes for kids, to street fairs, meetings and brochures targeting parents. Encouragement campaigns can be developed into a consensus building and marketing tool to win increased community, political and governmental support for traffic calming and increased police enforcement and engineering changes.

Programs using the Encouragement model typically include these goals and methods.

Goals

1. Encourage walking and cycling to school. Could be measurable increases.
2. * Could include winning safer walking and cycling corridors at some point in future.

Methods

Summary: Change child and parent behavior, to encourage walking or cycling to school.

1. Walking School Buses, group bicycling and a variety of encouragement literature targeted at children and their parents.
2. *Can include public awareness campaign and outreach to press, community and political leaders.

Public and Governmental Participation and Funding

1. *Can include the active participation of and funding from government agencies.
2. *Can be initiated and conducted by civic group, advocates, school or government agency.
3. *Government funding: Not required. Could be millions of dollars for comprehensive campaign.

Advocacy Requirements

1. Advocacy Funding Level to successfully Initiate: Low. \$5,000.
2. Advocacy Experience Needed: Low.

Scale

Most suitable for city or county level. Could be implemented on regional, big, small city or local levels with large government commitment.

The Enforcement Model

Numerous police departments across the country have child traffic safety campaigns. Some (like Chicago's) are called Safe Routes to School. Typically the police use crash maps to find schools with the highest number of children struck by cars. Police enforcement is assigned accordingly. Many enforcement campaigns also include police visits to schools where children are educated on safe cycling and walking and given safety literature and prizes. Enforcement campaigns are often a short term response to community anger after children are killed and injured. More effective campaigns are usually part of a broader, sustained traffic enforcement strategy.

Programs using the Enforcement model typically include these goals and methods.

Goals

1. Reduce child pedestrian and cycling crashes.

Methods

Summary: Change motorist behavior through increased traffic enforcement.

Modify child and parent behavior to improve cycling and walking safety. Ironically, this some times results in discouraging children cycling and walking due to the severe nature of police traffic safety information.

1. Increased police traffic enforcement; especially during school hours. Tends to be less than one month in duration.
2. Educate children and parents in safer cycling and walking practices.
3. *Can include media campaign with "Get Tough" message to motorists.

Public and Governmental Participation and Funding

1. Must include some commitment by police department or highest level of political support.

Advocacy Requirements

1. Advocacy Funding Level to successfully Initiate: Low. \$2,500.
2. Advocacy Experience Needed: Medium to low.

Funding Requirements

1. Employs existing police resources. Unknown opportunity cost.

Scale

Most suitable for city or county level.

Inventory of programs

Note: this is a working draft, and it is by no means exhaustive. It includes a range of school-related pedestrian and bicycle programs that represent the efforts from a number of fields, disciplines and philosophies, not exclusive to traffic calming projects. Many of these projects are just now getting started, or have not previously collected quantitative information on their initiatives. Thus, there are significant gaps in the availability of some types of information. The intention is to continue to fill in these gaps.

**Safe Routes to School
California Child Health and
Safety Education Initiative**

Lead Implementers:

California Department of Health Services
EPIC (Epidemiology for Injury Control) Branch
-State and Local Injury Control Program
-Walk Day Headquarters

Center for Health Training
Physical Activity & Health Initiative,
University of California, San Francisco

Partners:

Location:

Statewide, California

Contact Info:

Peggy DiSilva
Walk Day Headquarters
Center for Health Training
2229 Lombard Street
San Francisco, CA 94123
1-877-4-SAFERT
FAX: 415-929-9465

Web Address:

<http://www.dhs.ca.gov/EPIC/html/index.htm>

Project Focus:

Aims to encourage physical activity and safer child pedestrian behavior through events and safety education.

Summary:

- Convened a multi-disciplinary steering committee to conduct long-range planning.
- Conducted focus groups, learning perspectives from parents & community activists; traffic safety & law enforcement personnel; urban planners and traffic engineers; and school & public health personnel.
- Hosted a statewide conference and prepared a post-conference newsletter.
- Provided encouragement and assistance to local coordinators of a Walk a Child to School Day event. As many as 200 schools participated in 1999.
- Granted 10 Safe Routes to School demonstration projects using Federal 402 Safety funds.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Not a focus

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus

Educational Focus: Not a focus

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: All

Status: Ongoing since 2000.

Budget: Overall: N/A
10 demonstration projects granted \$25,000 each.

Funding Source: Overall: N/A
California Health Department granted 10 Safe Routes to School programs with Safe Communities model using Federal 402 Safety funds in 2000-2001

California Safe Routes to School Legislation: Campaign.
--

Lead Implementers:	Surface Transportation Policy Project
Partners:	California Bicycle Coalition
Location:	Statewide, California
Contact Info:	James Corless Surface Transportation Policy Project California Office (415) 956-7795
Web Address:	http://www.transact.org/Toolmonth/1999/may.htm http://www.bayped.org/saferoutes.html
Project Focus:	Makes money available to improve safety and design of street and sidewalk environment along routes to school.
Summary:	Legislation directs \$20 million annually in federal transportation safety funding from the Hazard Elimination/Safety program toward a program to fund local engineering improvements to school route safety. Traditional pedestrian safety countermeasures are eligible for funding, as are traffic calming programs around schools to slow speeds of cars and make the streets safer for children walking to school.
Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:	Make funding available for localities to construct traffic calming and traditional pedestrian safety measures.
Enforcement Strategy:	Not a focus
Educational Focus:	Not a focus
Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban:	All
Status:	Campaign launched in 1998, legislation passed in 1999, money allocated in 2000-2001. Renewal legislation campaign begins 2001.
Budget:	N/A

Funding Source:

N/A

California Safe Routes to School Legislation: Implementation

Lead Implementers: Caltrans, Local Programs

Partners: Local governments.

Location: Statewide, California

Contact Info: Local Programs at Caltrans
P.O. Box 942873
Sacramento, CA 94273-0001
916-654-5266

Web Address: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoute.htm>

Project Focus: Aims to improve pedestrian and bike safety through funding local planning and construction of street design and traffic calming.

Summary: Participants structure their proposed improvements to meet as many of the seven rating factors and criteria as possible. The statewide SR2S Project Recommendation Committee (comprised of representatives from federal, state, and local agencies along with bicycle and pedestrian stakeholder groups) guides the granting guidelines. Project applications will be rated in each of these categories as being excellent, good, fair, poor or ineligible. The following list identifies the seven factors:

- Identification and demonstration of needs
- Potential for proposed improvement to correct or improve the problem
- Potential for encouraging increased walking and bicycling among students
- Consultation and support for project by school-based associations, local traffic engineers, local elected officials, law enforcement agencies, school officials, and other community groups
- Potential for timely implementation of project
- Demonstrated relationship between the project and a Safe Routes to School plan

- Demonstrated coordination of SR2S funds with other activities, including education, enforcement and outreach activities

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:

Municipalities apply to State for grants, but must have input and involvement from the community. A wide range of traffic calming and traditional pedestrian safety approaches are eligible for funding.

Enforcement Strategy:

Not a focus

Educational Focus:

Not a focus

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban:

Statewide, all are eligible.

Status:

85 schools have been selected to receive first round Safe Routes to School funding for the year 1999-2000. Program will continue until 2002 unless legislation passes to make program permanent.

Budget:

Approximately \$60 million for 3 years.

Funding Source:

From state law passed in 2000 to mandate Federal Hazard Elimination Program funds be set aside to fund local Safe Routes to School programs. See "Surface Transportation Policy Project Safe Routes to School Legislation" in this document.

Marin County Safe Routes to Schools

Lead Implementers:	Marin County Bicycle Coalition
Partners:	Multi-Mobile, a Project of the Tides Center, The Marin Community Foundation, The National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, the Fred Gellert Foundation, The California Office of Traffic and Safety, The Miller Family Foundation, and the Kidsplate program provide funding.
Location:	Marin County, California
Contact Info:	Wendi Kallins Project Coordinator Marin County Bicycle Coalition P.O. Box 35 San Anselmo, CA 94979 (415)488-4101
Web Address:	www.saferoutestoschools.org
Project Focus:	Aims to encourage and educate children on walking and biking safety and benefits through classroom curriculum and walking school busses. Also looking to improve safety of streets along routes to school through traffic calming and traditional safety engineering changes.
Summary:	In their own words: “Safe Routes to Schools promotes Walking and Biking to School through <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Education in the Classroom• Events and Contests• Mapping for Safer Routes• Promoting Safety in the Community Marin County has four pilot programs in Mill Valley, Fairfax, San Geronimo Valley and Terra Linda.” from www.saferoutestoschools.org
Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:	Parents, police, schools, kids, map the road networks leading to the schools, recognizing the hazardous areas, and recommending solutions. Then recommendations are turned over to municipality.

Draft 12/11/02

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus

Educational Focus: Kids: Program will implement walking and biking safety curriculum in classroom.
Community: Program will sponsor Walk to School Day events to raise awareness.

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: Built: suburban

Status: Underway in 4 communities. Began Spring 2000.

Budget: \$50,000 from NHTSA
\$25,000 from Marin County Bicycle Coalition.

Funding Source: Marin Community Foundation, the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, the Fred Gellert Foundation, The California Office of Traffic and Safety, The Miller Family Foundation, and the Kidsplate program.

Safe Ways to School/

Florida: Tallahassee and Clearview

Lead Implementers:

Florida Traffic and Bike Safety Education Program (FTBSEP), Dept of Urban & Regional Planning , University of Florida .

Partners:

Location:

Tallahassee and Clearview, Florida

Contact Info:

Linda Crider, Director
Pete Davidson, Program Assistant Florida Traffic and Bike Safety Education Program
University of Florida -
Dept. of Urban & Regional Planning,
PO Box 115706, Gainesville, FL 32611.
352-392-8192
352-846-0404(FAX)
(352) 392-8192

Web Address:

<http://plaza.ufl.edu/lcrider>

Project Focus:

Aims to educate communities on how to advocate for pedestrian safety engineering measures and traffic calming along routes to school. Program also educates children in classroom for safer pedestrian and bike behavior.

Summary:

Distributes Safe Ways to School Toolkit with workbook and video showing how to put together Safe Routes to School program in communities. Uses the Australian/European Safe Routes to School traffic calming model. Has conducted workshops at 2 schools to show how it works. No direct community outreach component: word of mouth and web site only. Program does training only, does not keep track of schools progress. Safe Ways to School is a small slice of the larger Florida Traffic and Bike Safety Education Program (FTBSEP). The FTBSEP develops and trains students and teachers in elementary and middle school classroom based pedestrian and bike safety education programs.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:

Materials and training for communities to advocate for improved safety of street and pedestrian

environment on the routes to their schools.

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus

Educational Focus: Workshop and video show how to: - Form coalition with stakeholders - police, school, public works, Community Traffic Safety Team, etc. to assess, survey, brainstorm, recommend and implement.

Develops and trains for in school bike/ ped safety and encouragement curriculum for elementary and middle schools.

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: The 2 workshops were in urban schools: Clearwater fl. Tallahassee,

Status: Started in 1999. Ongoing.

Budget: N/A

Funding Source: Florida Department of Transportation
Florida Traffic & Bicycle Safety Education Program,
Department of Urban & Regional Planning,
University of Florida
Uses Federal 402 funds.

**"Safe Paths to Schools"
Legislation**

Lead Implementers:

Rails-to-Trails Conservancy's
Florida Field Office

Partners:

Location:

Statewide, Florida

Contact Info:

Ken Bryan
Florida Director
2545 Blairstone Pines Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Phone: (850) 942-2379
Fax: (850) 942-4431

Web Address:

E-mail: rtcken@transact.org
<http://www.RailTrails.org/FL/>

Project Focus:

Aims to improve safety of children walking and biking to school by creating pedestrian and bike only pathways to schools.

Summary:

The Florida Field Office of Rails-to-Trails Conservancy is working to pass a "Safe Paths to Schools" initiative during the 2001 session of the Florida Legislature. The Safe Paths to Schools Program would establish a grant program within the Department of Transportation to fund local, regional and state projects to provide safe transportation for children from neighborhoods to schools to parks to the state's greenway and trail systems. If passed, the measure would allocate no less than 1 percent of the state's transportation funding to this grant program annually, or approximately \$268 million.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:

Legislation would set up a State DOT granting fund to which municipalities would apply.

Enforcement Strategy:

Not a focus

Educational Focus:

Not a focus

Draft 12/11/02

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: Unbuilt: trails and greenway.

Status: Introduced bill in 2000 of last year, but did not make it through. Continuing legislative effort during the 2001 session.

Budget: N/A

Funding Source: Legislative campaign came out of general operating. Reaching for \$268 mil to be programmed through this legislation.

PED's KidsWalk to School

Georgia: Atlanta

Lead Implementers: PEDS : Pedestrians Educating Drivers on Safety.

Partners:

Location: Atlanta, Georgia

Contact Info: Sally Flocks
1447 Peachtree Street, Suite 801
Atlanta, GA 30309
404-873-5667

Web Address: http://www.peds.org/KidsWalk/Kidswalk_index.htm

Project Focus: Aims to educate for safer child pedestrian and motorist behavior and to educate for community traffic calming advocacy.

Summary: Program, just getting started at three schools, will include:
Organizing walking audits.
Providing workshops on traffic calming, and providing training aimed at empowering neighborhoods to successfully advocate for improvements.
Educating children on pedestrian safety.
Organizing walking school buses.
Organizing neighborhood "Slow Down" events, distributing bumper stickers and signs, and will be Developing a Neighborhood Pace Car Program.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Not a focus

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus

Educational Focus: Classroom safety education for behavior modification.
Walking school bus
Bumper stickers.
Roadway safety design improvement advocacy training.

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: Built: urban.

Draft 12/11/02

Status: Started in Fall 2000.

Budget: N/A

Funding Source: Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Funds

Chicago's Walking School Bus Program

Lead Implementers:	City of Chicago and Chicago Police Department CAPS -- Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy
Partners:	
Location:	Chicago, Illinois
Contact Info:	(312)744-CAPS.
Web Address:	http://w4.ci.chi.il.us./cp/AboutCAPS/HowCAPS%2520Works/WalkingSchoolbus.html
Project Focus:	Aims to protect children from traffic and street crime by creating walking school busses of parents and kids.
Summary:	<p>Police assist in establishing regular walking school busses. Maps are put up on local schools. Interested parents sign their names next to where they live to identify clusters of households that can walk to school together.</p> <p>Very high levels of walking -90% of the 422,000 public school students in Chicago walk to school.</p> <p>Numbers of active school busses and children involved were not available.</p>
Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:	Not a focus
Enforcement Strategy:	Police monitoring, crossing guards graffiti removal.
Educational Focus:	Child education in classroom and through walking bus.
Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban:	Built: urban.
Status:	Ongoing

Draft 12/11/02

Budget: N/A

Funding Source: N/A

Arlington MA, Safe Routes to School Pilot program

WalkBoston

Lead Implementers:

Partners:

National Parks Service, 5 local schools

Location:

Arlington, Massachusetts

Contact Info:

Steve Golden
National Parks Service
617 -223 -5123

Dorthea Haas
Project Coordinator WalkBoston
156 Milk Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617)451-1570

Web Address:

<http://www.walkboston.org/>
<http://www.massbike.org/events/events99.htm>

Project Focus:

Aims to encourage walking to school for physical activity, air quality improvement, and congestion mitigation.

Summary:

Piloted at one school in 1999 with help from Paul Osborne of the UK's Sustrans's Safe Routes to School program.

National Parks Service, received grant in 2000 from Federal Highway Administration to expand to 4 schools. Plan to conduct study at each school to find out why children are not walking, then establish walking school bus and other walking incentive programs.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:

N/A

Enforcement Strategy:

N/A

Educational Focus:

Walking encouragement through walking school bus program.

Draft 12/11/02

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: Built: urban.

Status: Started in 1999. Pilot completed at one school.
Continuing in 4 schools.

Budget: N/A

Funding Source: Federal Highway Administration/NHSTA grant.
National Parks Service

KidsWalk to School

National

Lead Implementers: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL), Division of Nutrition

Partners:

Location: National

Contact Info: Jessica Shisler,
MPH Coordinator,
Walk to School Programs
Active Community Environments Team
Division of Nutrition and Physical Activity
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
4770 Buford Highway, N.E. (MS-K46)
Atlanta, Georgia 30341
Phone: 770-488-5085
Fax: 770-488-5473

Web Address: <http://www.Centers for Disease Control.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/kidswalk/index.htm>

Project Focus: Aims to improve children's physical fitness and walking safety through encouragement and child education.

Summary: Program guide for community walk-to-school promotion campaign.

In their own words:

"To support the national goal of better health through physical activity, Center for Disease Control's Nutrition and Physical Activity Program has developed KidsWalk-to-School. This is a community-based program that aims to increase opportunities for daily physical activity by encouraging children to walk to and from school in groups accompanied by adults.

At the same time, the program advocates for communities to build partnerships with the school, PTA, local police department, department of public works, civic associations, local politicians, and businesses to create an environment that is supportive of walking and bicycling to school safely.

Goals:

Encourage children to walk and bicycle to and from

school.

Increase awareness of the importance of regular physical activity for children, improved pedestrian safety, and healthy and walkable community environments.

Mobilize communities to work together to create safe routes to school."

- <http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/kidswalk/>

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:

Not a focus

Enforcement Strategy:

Not a focus

Educational Focus:

Print and web published guide to promoting walking to school.

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban:

All

Status:

Ongoing since 2000

Budget:

N/A

Funding Source:

N/A

The Bronx Safe Routes to School Program

Lead Implementers: Transportation Alternatives

Partners: Office of The Bronx Borough President

Location: The Bronx, New York

Contact Info: Earlene Wilkerson,
Outreach Coordinator
Transportation Alternatives
115 W 30th St Ste. 1207
New York NY 10001
(212)629-8080

Web Address: www.saferoutestoschool.org

Project Focus: Aims to improve safety and maintain high level of walking by improving the pedestrian environment through traffic calming and traditional pedestrian safety engineering

Summary: Collaborative school community consensus-building process to develop and support traffic calming plans and implementation. Begins to develop support and input of stakeholders from very start of planning process. High level of school community buy in leverages funding and support for capital construction.

Community leaders nominate schools.
Select schools from nominated set using mapped crash data.
Initial contact with school
Parent and school community outreach
Survey parents and map walking routes and hazards.
Collate surveys/ Route maps matched with crashes
Stakeholder study tour to assess site and develop solutions. Proposal
Installation
Follow up

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus

Educational Focus: Not a focus. By-product of planning and consensus building process.

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: Build: urban

Status: Started in 1997, ongoing with 38 schools.

Budget: \$84,000/ year for planning. 12-13 schools per year.

Funding Source: Governor's Traffic Safety Committee using Federal TEA-21 402 funds.

Portland Kids on the Move

Oregon: Portland

Lead Implementers:	Portland Department of Transportation.
Partners:	Police Department.
Location:	Portland, Oregon
Contact Info:	Shannon Parker (503) 823-5391
Web Address:	http://www.trans.ci.portland.or.us/pdot%5Fservices/traffic%5Fsafety%5Faround%5Fschools.htm
Project Focus:	Aims to improve child pedestrian safety through traffic calming, enforcement and child education.
Summary:	City Department of Transportation coordinated education program and Neighborhood Traffic Calming program. City already has high level of comfort with traffic calming and an established, formal traffic calming program Schools are already subsumed and prioritized under the routine of neighborhood traffic calming. In their own words: "Portland Kids on the Move" is a comprehensive traffic safety program using education, engineering and enforcement to reduce traffic related injuries and fatalities."
Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:	Full neighborhood traffic calming program.
Enforcement Strategy:	Traditional enforcement. Unstaffed trailer that monitors and feeds back speeds to motorists
Educational Focus:	Photo radar. Traditional classroom, outside activity and workshops.

Draft 12/11/02

Some outreach to motorists: pamphlets, ads.

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: Built: urban

Status: Ongoing.

Budget: N/A

Funding Source: N/A

**Safe Routes to School
Legislation**

Lead Implementers: Bicycle Transportation Alliance

Partners: N/A

Location: Portland, Oregon

Contact Info: PO Box 9072
Portland, OR 97207-9072
503.226.0676
Fax: 503.226.0498

Web Address: <http://www.teleport.com/~bta4bike/index.html>

Project Focus: Aims to make money available to improve safety and design of street and sidewalk environment along routes to school.

Summary: N/A

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: N/A

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus

Educational Focus: Not a focus

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: N/A

Status: Spring 2001

Budget: N/A

Funding Source: N/A

Draft 12/11/02

Pennsylvania Walk to School Trails Program.

Pennsylvania: Statewide

Lead Implementers: Rails-to-Trails Conservancy's Pennsylvania Field Office

Partners: Pennsylvania Department of Health Bureau of Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention.

Location: Statewide, Pennsylvania

Contact Info: Tom Sexton
Director
105 Locust Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
phone: 717-238-1717
fax: 717-238-7566
E-mail: tsexton@transact.org

Web Address: http://www.RailTrails.org/PA/Active_Pages/Programs/main.asp

Project Focus: Aims to improve children's physical fitness and protect kids from traffic by encouraging walking and biking to school on off-street trails.

Summary: Rails-to-Trails Conservancy -PA (and NPS) are meeting with the PA. Dept. of Health to talk about developing a SRTS program. Rails-To-Trails Conservancy inventoried all elementary schools near trails (a few blocks away) as a first step. Assessed what's out there: 100 open trails in PA, about 20 id's that are within 2 blocks of school. They also solicited input and interest from a 100 piece mailing to health professionals that was co-signed with the Director of the Bureau of Chronic Diseases on Dept. letterhead. Looking to partner with 4-5 local health organizations to plan program to increase rail trail use in walking and biking to school. Will follow Centers for Disease Control's program guide on KidsWalk to School

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Not known, project in initial planning stages.

Enforcement Strategy: Not known, project in initial planning stages.

Draft 12/11/02

Educational Focus: Not known, project in initial planning stages.

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: N/A: Off street pathways.

Status: Started organizing in 2000, no timeline yet.

Budget: Only in initial stages, no budget yet.

Funding Source: Looking for funding.

Arlington County Safe Routes to School

Lead Implementers: Arlington County Public Schools and Arlington County government

Partners: Arlington County Public Schools
Arlington County, Department of Public Works
Police Department, Special Operations Section
County Managers Office
Department of Public Health.

Location: Arlington County, Virginia

Contact Info: Arlington County Public Affairs Division
2100 Clarendon Blvd., Suite 310
Arlington, VA 22201
(703) 228-3969

Web Address: <http://www.civfed.org/schosafe.htm>

http://www.arlington.k12.va.us/publicinfo/press_releases/0001/081000-saferoutes.html

<http://www.co.arlington.va.us/NewsReleases/Scripts/ViewDetail.asp?Index=355>

Project Focus: Aims to improve child pedestrian safety through engineering, education and enforcement.

Summary: Arlington County Safe Routes to School program gives equal weight to its Engineering, Education and Enforcement components. The stimuli for this came from the County Council of PTAs, which is the umbrella organization for all the school PTAs. All levels of county government seem to be familiar with traffic calming and interested in seeing more of it in Arlington. Program grew out of Arlington's pedestrian initiative and the Neighborhood Traffic Calming program for residential streets.

Engineering, Planning and

Design Strategy:	Department of Public Works is in charge of on-street changes. Community involvement will be solicited for site selection and assessment, and in choosing appropriate countermeasures. Treatments will range from the relatively simple and easy to implement measures, such as replacing or installing signs and crosswalks to measures which require a significant amount of engineering and expense such as the construction of new sidewalks, curb and median extensions and flashing school zone signals.
Enforcement Strategy:	Police will monitor traffic at identified schools to see if patterns exist and recommend action. Zero Tolerance -all motorists observed violating traffic laws in school zones will be ticketed. Also looking into photo enforcement around schools. Distribute brochures to motorists. School Resource Officers to conduct child education in schools. Additional crossing guards to be posted at select schools.
Educational Focus:	For kids: Route maps for elementary school walkers and bus riders, and middle school walkers to assist parents in charting "safe routes." A "safe routes" resource guide for teachers Videotaped puppet show about pedestrian safety for classroom use. For motorists and community: Utility bills reminder of speed laws, etc. Strategic local media outreach and press events.
Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban:	Built: semi urban and suburban.
Status:	Initiated in winter 2000/2001. Currently in planning and outreach phase.
Budget:	The County's FY2001-2006 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes \$1,090,000 for the Safe Routes to Schools program in the FY 2001 Transportation Bond. However, the full cost will rise as more capital projects are identified and money is programmed toward Safe Routes to School.
Funding Source:	Present County operating budgets, and the adopted capital budget in appropriated FY 2001 funding.

Bond funding if approved by the voters.
Capital funding proposed for FY 2002 and beyond, if approved.
Funding to implement the long-term actions is being planned for in the County's Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Since the FY2001 Safe Routes to Schools appropriation will not be able to fund all of the identified projects, program will tap into additional sources of funding such as the Neighborhood Conservation and the Pedestrian Systems programs where necessary.