

Photo courtesy of Smart Growth America



The 2002 Summary of Safe Routes to School Programs in the United States

March 5, 2002

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAMS.....	2
OVERVIEW OF CURRENT SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAMS.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	7
THE TYPES OF SAFE ROUTES PROGRAMS.....	7
THE DEDICATED RESOURCE MODEL.....	8
THE ENGINEERING MODEL.....	9
THE ENFORCEMENT MODEL.....	10
THE ENCOURAGEMENT/EDUCATION MODEL.....	11
INVENTORY OF PROGRAMS BY LOCATION.....	13
ARIZONA: PRESCOTT.....	14
CALIFORNIA: STATEWIDE.....	15
CALIFORNIA: STATEWIDE.....	16
CALIFORNIA: STATEWIDE.....	18
CALIFORNIA: STATEWIDE.....	19
CALIFORNIA: MARIN COUNTY.....	21
FLORIDA: TALLAHASSEE AND CLEARVIEW.....	23
FLORIDA: STATEWIDE.....	25
GEORGIA: ATLANTA.....	27
GEORGIA: METRO ATLANTA.....	29
ILLINOIS: CHICAGO.....	30
ILLINOIS: CHICAGO.....	32
MARYLAND: STATEWIDE.....	33
MASSACHUSETTS: ARLINGTON.....	34
NATIONAL.....	35
NEW YORK: THE BRONX.....	37
NEW YORK: CITYWIDE.....	39
OREGON: PORTLAND.....	40
OREGON: STATEWIDE.....	41
PENNSYLVANIA: STATEWIDE.....	42
RHODE ISLAND: STATEWIDE.....	43
TEXAS: STATEWIDE.....	44
VIRGINIA: ARLINGTON COUNTY.....	45
WASHINGTON: STATEWIDE.....	47
WASHINGTON: STATEWIDE.....	48

Executive Summary: Safe Routes to School Programs

A new movement is emerging that is focused on getting kids back on their feet and on bikes. Neighborhood groups, traffic engineers, local officials, and in some cases state DOTs 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.”

The common goal of all Safe Routes to School programs is to make walking or biking to school a safe and valued activity for children. However, the name ‘Safe Routes to School’ covers a wide variety of programmatic approaches. This report is designed to inventory and clarify the different approaches used in Safe Routes to School programs. We have identified four primary models:

Engineering model

The Engineering model focuses on changes to the pedestrian and bicycle environment to promote safety, such as crosswalks, expanded sidewalks, traffic calming, and bicycle lanes and paths. For example, the Phoenix, Arizona Department of Transportation alleviated unsafe pedestrian hot spots with sidewalk expansions at traffic lights, crosswalks, and speed-reduction measures near schools.

Enforcement

The Enforcement model uses police enforcement of traffic laws around schools to change driver behavior that may endanger schoolchildren, such as speeding and reckless driving. Enforcement programs are often implemented as short-term fixes after a child pedestrian fatality.

Encouragement/Education

The Encouragement/Education models work with schoolchildren and their parents directly to foster interest and enthusiasm about walking to school, as well as promoting safe bicycling and walking behavior. Some Encouragement/Education programs also use the community outreach process to identify facilities needs.

Dedicated Resource model

The Dedicated Resource model is based on legislation that directs significant funding to Safe Routes to School programs at the local level. The California legislature passed a bill in 1999 that required \$20 million of a \$160 billion state transportation budget to go to pedestrian and bicycle safety projects. Funding requests from local governments exceeded \$130 million, demonstrating the need for greater resources for safe routes.

Combined approaches are most effective

Creating a truly safe route to school requires a combination of engineering, encouragement and education, and dedicated resources. For example, in California, the dedicated resource provided by the state for infrastructure helps support and energize local programs based on the encouragement/education model. Conversely, both encouragement and engineering programs can help improve implementation of the dedicated resources model, by boosting community participation in selection of areas that need funding.

Overview of Current Safe Routes to School Programs

The following overview is organized by the model type being used for the program. Programs which use elements of more than one model are listed under each model they are using.

DEDICATED RESOURCE MODEL			
STATE	CITY	PROJECT NAME	FUNDING SOURCE
CA	Statewide	Safe Routes to School Implementation	Federal Safety Set-Aside
OR	Statewide	Safe Routes to School legislation	Unfunded
TX	Statewide	Safe Routes to School Matthew Brown Act	Unfunded
WA	Statewide	Traffic Safety Near Schools	Unfunded
WA	Statewide	Safe Routes to School legislation	N/A
NY	Bronx	The Bronx Safe Routes to School Program	Federal 402 Funds

Note: **Bold** = primary focus of program; Non-bold = secondary or supported program outcome
 Programs are listed under each model they use.

DEDICATED MODEL LEGISLATION PLANNED	
STATE	STATUS
Alaska	In preparation
Florida	In preparation
Illinois	In preparation
Montana	Bill did not clear committee
New Mexico	In preparation
Ohio	In preparation
Rhode Island	Bill before State House
Virginia	Bill did not clear committee
Washington	In preparation

ENGINEERING MODEL

STATE	CITY	PROJECT NAME	FUNDING SOURCE
CA	Statewide	Safe Routes to School Implementation	Federal Safety Set-Aside
FL	Tallahassee & Clearview	Safe Ways to School	Federal 402 funds
GA	Metro Atlanta	Safe Routes to School	In planning stage
IL	Chicago	Safe Routes to School	Fed traffic safety funds; City match
MD	Statewide	Safe Routes to School Pilot Program (HB 717)	Maryland DOT Office of Planning, general fund
NY	Bron(x)	The Bron(x) Safe Routes to School Program	Federal 402 funds
NY	Citywide	Safe Routes to School	N/A
OR	Portland	Portland Kids on the Move	N/A
TX	Statewide	Safe Routes to School Matthew Brown Act	Unfunded
VA	Arlington County	Arlington County Safe Routes to School	General County funds
CA	Statewide	Safe Routes to School Clearinghouse	California Endowment, NHTSA
CA	Marin County	Marin County Safe Routes to Schools	Transportation Enhancement grants, foundation grants
GA	Atlanta	PEDS' KidsWalk to School	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds
PA	Statewide (pilot)	Walk to School Trails Program	Pennsylvania Dept. of Health
WA	Statewide	Safe and Active Routes to School	In-kind contributions of Coalition members
WA	Statewide	Traffic Safety Near Schools	Unfunded

Note: **Bold** = primary focus of program; Non-bold = secondary or supported program outcome
 Programs are listed under each model they use.

ENFORCEMENT MODEL

STATE	CITY	PROJECT NAME	FUNDING SOURCE
IL	Chicago	Safe Routes to School	Fed traffic safety funds; City match
IL	Chicago	Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS)	N/A
OR	Portland	Portland Kids on the Move	N/A
VA	Arlington County	Arlington County Safe Routes to School	General County funds
CA	Statewide	Safe Routes to School Clearinghouse	California Endowment, NHTSA
CA	Marin County	Marin County Safe Routes to Schools	Transportation Enhancement grants, foundation grants

Note: **Bold** = primary focus of program; Non-bold = secondary or supported program outcome
 Programs are listed under each model they use.

EDUCATION/ENCOURAGEMENT MODEL			
STATE	CITY	PROJECT NAME	FUNDING SOURCE
(US)	--	KidsWalk to School	N/A
CA	Marin County	Marin County Safe Routes to Schools	Transportation Enhancement grants, foundation grants
CA	Statewide	Safe Routes to School California Safe Routes to School Initiative (Department of Health)	Federal health and human services prevention block grant, Federal 402 safety funds
FL	Tallahassee & Clearview	Safe Ways to School	Federal 402 funds
GA	Metro Atlanta	Safe Routes to School	N/A
GA	Atlanta	PEDS' KidsWalk to School	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds
IL	Chicago	Safe Routes to School	Fed traffic safety funds; City match
IL	Chicago	Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS)	N/A
MA	Arlington	Arlington, MA Safe Routes to School Pilot	Federal Highway Administration/National Highway Traffic Safety Agency (NHTSA) grant; National Parks Service
OR	Portland	Portland Kids on the Move	N/A
PA	Statewide (pilot)	Walk to School Trails Program	Pennsylvania Dept. of Health
VA	Arlington County	Arlington County Safe Routes to School	General County funds
CA	Statewide	Safe Routes to School Clearinghouse	California Endowment, NHTSA
WA	Statewide	Safe and Active Routes to School	In-kind contributions of Coalition members

Note: **Bold** = primary focus of program; Non-bold = secondary or supported program outcome
 Programs are listed under each model they use.

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 both the real and perceived dangers of crime and traffic. Forty years ago, half of all U.S. school children walked to school. Now, the Centers for Disease Control estimate that only 10% do. The Surface Transportation Policy Project's "High Mileage Moms" report found that the number of kids walking to school dropped 23% between 1990 and 1995 alone.

Yet a new movement is emerging that is focused on getting kids back on their feet and 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. Some parents are concerned about the threat of violence and abduction. While statistics continue to bear out the infrequency of random abductions, many parents have legitimate concerns about crime, and violence prevention is an integral component of Safe Routes to School programs in many areas.

But the greatest danger for many children who choose to walk or bike 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 programs that share the name "Safe Routes to School". Safe Routes to School projects have emerged from concerned communities around the country, sometimes under different names. They have often been inspired by the experiences of similar programs in other countries. This paper includes details and contact information for a sampling of programs in the U.S.

Several components must come together to create a Safe Routes to School program. Program activities can generally be grouped under these four broad approaches:

- **The Dedicated Resource Model**
- **The Engineering Model**
- **The Enforcement Model**
- **The Encouragement/Education Model**

Most programs focus on one model, but use elements of other models for a holistic approach. 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 method; the goal is reducing child crashes around schools, and encouraging cycling and walking.

The Dedicated Resource Model

The Dedicated Resource Model centers on a policy mandate to fund local Safe Routes to School programs. The best example of the Dedicated Resource Model is California's legislation dedicating one third of the federal Surface Transportation Safety set-aside to local Safe Routes to School programs. Funding a range of well thought out Safe Routes projects at the local level encourages innovation in engineering, education and enforcement campaigns to change reckless motorist behavior. Funding is the basis of Engineering, Enforcement, and Education/Encouragement programs.

For advocates, creating dedicated resources for Safe Routes to School programs is probably the biggest bang per advocacy resources invested. A handful of advocates in California won \$20 million a year for local Safe Routes programs. This is an extraordinarily effective way of using limited time and resources.

Program Goals

1. Create a guaranteed level of federal or state funding for local engineering, education and enforcement programs to provide a safer pedestrian environment around schools.
2. Change motorist behavior, especially speeding and reckless driving near schools.
3. Reduce child pedestrian and cycling crashes, and encourage cycling and walking to schools throughout the state.

Program Methods

1. Create legislation at federal, state or local level guaranteeing significant levels of funding for Safe Routes programs, generally focused on facilities.
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 groups, 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 for legislation: (Very High) Extensive organizing experience.
3. Advocacy Experience Needed for 402 and other readily identifiable safety funds: (Moderate).

Scale

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

The Engineering Model

Overview and Background

The Engineering Model is fundamentally based on providing safe facilities for cyclists and pedestrians, and changing the behavior of motorists through changes in street design. This model can be coupled with increased enforcement, especially of speed limits, and increased safety education for motorists — for instance “Kill Your Speed Not a Child” marketing. Many engineering based programs also employ education and enforcement strategies.

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 (NY), and Arlington (VA) are examples of the Engineering Model for Safe Routes.

Program 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.

Program Methods

PRIMARY

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.

SECONDARY/OPTIONAL

- a. Use community-based planning techniques to create consensus on facility improvements.
- b. Include Walking School Bus, group rides and other public events to increase political and community support for constructing traffic calming and pedestrian improvements.
- c. Include increased police traffic enforcement.

Public and Governmental Participation and Funding

- Can be initiated by civic groups, advocates, schools or government agencies.
- Must eventually include the active participation and funding of transportation agency.
- Government Funding: (High) \$100,000 minimum capital and planning cost per school.

Advocacy Requirements

- Project Funding Level: (High) \$50,000 advocacy funding level to successfully initiate.
- Advocacy Experience Needed: (High) experienced advocacy and organizing experience

Scale

Most suitable for city or county level.

The Enforcement Model

Overview and Background

Numerous police departments across the country have child traffic safety campaigns. Some 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.

Program Goals

1. Reduce child pedestrian and cycling crashes.

Program Methods

PRIMARY

1. Change motorist behavior through increased traffic enforcement.
2. Increased police traffic enforcement; especially during school hours. Typically less than one month in duration.

SECONDARY/OPTIONAL

- a. Educate children and parents in safer cycling and walking practices. 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.
- b. 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.

The Encouragement/Education Model

Overview and Background

Encouragement and Education programs focus on altering the attitudes and behavior of children, often with outreach to parents and guardians as well.

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, group rides, contests and special events. These can be accompanied by marketing and behavioral change methods ranging from coloring books and prizes for kids, to street fairs, meetings and brochures targeting parents. It is often easier to get volunteers to help out for a special event or even once a month for a Walk to School day, than to get people to do it daily or even weekly. Encouragement campaigns can be developed into a consensus building and marketing tools to win increased community, political and governmental support for traffic calming and increased police enforcement and engineering changes.

Education programs are similar to Encouragement programs, but have a stronger focus on changing the individual behavior of children. These tend to be public safety campaigns that focus on harm reduction techniques, such as helmet usage. Although the programs could include information on pedestrian safety, typically the programs focus on bicycling.

Program Goals

PRIMARY

1. Encourage walking and cycling to school. Could be measurable increases.
2. Educate children about safe walking and bicycling practices.

SECONDARY

- a. Win safer walking and cycling corridors at some point in future.

Program Methods

PRIMARY

1. Walking School Buses, group bicycling and a variety of encouragement literature targeted at children and their parents.
2. Certified instructors or volunteers give classroom sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety, health and environment.

SECONDARY/OPTIONAL

- a. 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. Governmental participation can include police officers as part of the training process.
4. Government funding: Not required. Could be millions of dollars for comprehensive campaign.

Advocacy Requirements

1. Encouragement. Advocacy Funding Level to successfully initiate: (Low) \$5,000.
2. Encouragement. Advocacy Experience needed: (Low)

3. Education. Funding for training and volunteers: (Medium) around \$100,000.
4. Education. Funding for instructors and organized activities: (Medium-Low) \$50,000.
5. Education. Advocacy experience needed: (High) Knowledge of safety and curriculum requirements.

Scale

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

Inventory of programs by location

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.

Arizona: Prescott**Safe Routes to School**

Lead Implementers: Prescott Alternative Transportation

Partners: Margaret T. Morris Foundation

Location: Prescott, Arizona

Contact Info: Sue Knaup
Prescott Alternative Transportation
P.O. Box 2122
Prescott, Arizona 86302
sue@prescottbikeped.org

Web Address: <http://www.prescottbikeped.org>

Project Focus: Increase the number of children who walk or bike to school for the benefit of the entire community.

Summary: This program is a comprehensive Safe Routes to Schools program. Four schools are targeted in 2002. The program is scheduled to expand from Prescott, to central Yavapai County, to statewide, in the coming years.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Program participants identify the safest routes between neighborhoods and schools and pinpoint bicycle and pedestrian facility deficiencies. Roadway improvements in the next fiscal year that affect schools are also targeted. Some funding is currently available for these capital improvements through federal and local government sources; other funding is being actively sought.

Enforcement Strategy: Program participants and schools work closely with law enforcement officers and crossing guards.

Educational Focus: The program creates teams of parents, teachers and kids at each of the schools. These teams develop customized educational programs that fit their school. All include safe walking and riding habits, helmet use, rules of the road, and the health and environmental benefits of non-motorized travel. Contests, games and events encourage more kids to take part. Students are directly involved in conducting surveys, mapping their routes to school and keeping track of their own family's means of transportation. An annual Bike Week in May will showcase participating students.

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: Built, urban

Status: Launched January 2002

Budget: \$8,500 (Morris), plus PAT program budget

Funding Source: Margaret T. Morris Foundation, Prescott Alternative Transportation (PAT)

California: Statewide**California Safe Routes to School Clearinghouse**

Lead Implementers: Center for Health Training

Partners:

Location: Statewide, California

Contact Info: Peggy Da Silva, Director
614 Grand Avenue Suite 400
Oakland, CA 94610-3523
1-877-4-SAFERT
Fax: (510) 625-9307
Email: SafeRt@jba-cht.com

Web Address: <http://www.4saferoutes.org/index.html>

Project Focus: The Clearinghouse offers support to local activists and public agency staff in their quest to develop Safe Routes to School in their California communities.

Summary:

- * Provide technical assistance to Safe Routes to School programs.
- * Support local organizations with information, data on biking and walking to school safely, and materials, fliers, handouts timelines, and other materials for Safe Routes to School programs.
- * Conducted focus groups, learning perspectives from parents & community activists; traffic safety & law enforcement personnel; urban planners and traffic engineers; and school & public health personnel.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Support other organizations

Enforcement Strategy: Support other organizations

Educational Focus: Support other organizations

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: All

Status: Ongoing since 2000.

Budget: Overall: N/A

Funding Source: California Endowment (private foundation), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) grant for publication supporting Safe Routes to School programs

California: Statewide**Safe Routes to School California Safe Routes to Schools Initiative**

Lead Implementers: California Department of Health Services
-State and Local Injury Control Program
-Cancer Prevention and Nutrition Section
Institute for Health and Aging, UC San Francisco
- Physical Activity and Health Initiative

Partners: California Bicycle Coalition, California Parent-Teacher Association, California Dept. of Education, California Dept. of Transportation, California Highway Patrol, Local Government Commission, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, Surface Transportation Policy Project

Location: Statewide, California

Contact Info: Anne Seeley, Active Communities Coordinator
Physical Activity & Health Initiative
UC San Francisco / CA Department of Health Services
PO Box 942732 - Mail stop 675
Sacramento, CA 94234-7320
916 445-0472 916 324-7763 fax

Web Address: <http://www.dhs.ca.gov/routes2school>
www.cawalktoschool.com

Project Focus: Encourages communities to pursue Safe Routes to School projects comprehensively, for sustained cultural and environmental improvements that enable children to be more physically active and safe.

Summary:

- 1999: Conducted focus groups, hosted a statewide conference, created Walk to School Day Headquarters, began research projects with data from schools participating in Walk to School Day
- 2000: Began 2-year SR2S project with 10 community-based planning projects using federal 402 Safety funds. Distributed 30,000 copies of a fact sheet about all aspects of SR2S in California.
- 2001: Projects with planning grants continue to implement “Safe Communities” activities. Reprinted the fact sheet; developed new “10 Good Reasons to Walk to School” brochure. Walk to School Day Headquarters initiates on-line registration.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Planning activities are for community assessment and prioritization of projects using NHTSA’s “Safe Communities” model for mobilizing communities.

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus

Educational Focus: Annual Walk to School Day

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban:	All
Status:	Ongoing since 1998.
Budget:	Walk to School Day Headquarters: ~ \$15,000/year 1 ½ SR2S staff: ~ \$100,000/year (through June 2002). 9 community planning projects granted \$25,000 each for 18 months in October 2000.
Funding Source:	California Department of Health Services and UCSF staff, including Walk to School Day Headquarters, are funded by the federal health and human services prevention block grant. In 2000-2002, community-based Safe Routes to School projects receive Federal 402 Safety funds.

California: Statewide**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.baypeders.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 \$25 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, \$40 million allocated in FY 2000 and FY 2001. Renewal legislation was passed in 2001, with an increased allocation of \$25 million per year for three years.

Budget: N/A

Funding Source: N/A

California: Statewide**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: The program was oversubscribed in the first year by a factor of 6.5 (\$130 million in proposals for \$20 million available).

Budget: Approximately \$75 million for 3 years, in addition to \$40 million originally allocated.

Funding Source: From state law passed in 2000 to mandate one-third of 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.

California: Marin County**Marin County Safe Routes to Schools**

Lead Implementers: City of San Rafael, representing the members of the Marin Congestion Management Agency

Partners: Marin County Bicycle Coalition (project implementation), Nelson Nygaard (project management) and David Parisi & Assoc. (engineering consultant)

Location: Marin County, California

Contact Info: Wendi Kallins
Project Coordinator
Safe Routes to School
P.O. Box 201
Forest Knolls, CA 94933
(415)488-4101
wkallins@igc.org

Web Address: www.saferoutestoschools.org

Project Focus: Safe Routes to Schools is a grassroots program that is getting more children walking and bicycling to school by combining education, community organizing, and engineering improvements. The program results in decreased traffic congestion, a cleaner environment, and improved health for individuals. Safe Routes to School is creating a new culture of walking and biking.

Summary: Marin Safe Routes to Schools organizes School Safe Routes Teams and Community-wide Task Forces to comprehensively create a safer environment that encourages walking and biking to school and makes it safer. The Safe Routes Teams are made up of school parents along with principals, teachers, neighbors and children who develop events such as monthly or weekly Walk and Bike to School days, contests like our Frequent Rider Mile Contest, and promotes the program in school newsletters using materials provided by the program.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Parents and neighbors map the routes to schools, identify problem areas and, with the help of our engineering consultant, develop recommendations. Safe Routes Task Forces work together with the local public works and law enforcement staff to develop a Safe Routes improvement plan and to implement the plan by applying for funding and making easy improvements like crosswalks and signage.

Enforcement Strategy: Work together with local law enforcement to provide additional support on special event days and to develop and implement a long-term strategy for improving enforcement around schools.

Educational Focus: Children are taught bicycle and pedestrian safety in the classroom as well as information on health and the environment. They play games such as the Bicycle Safety Quiz Show and participate in Bicycle Safety Rodeos. Driver's

	education and Share the Road campaigns are designed and launched by the Community Task Forces.
Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban:	Built: suburban
Status:	The program is currently offered county-wide, with 14 schools currently participating, 5 more who have applied for the program, and another school district including 10-15 schools pending.
Budget:	For the 2000-2001 school year, the budget was \$100,000. For the 2001-2002 school year, the budget is \$140,000; for the 2002-2003 school year, the budget will be \$330,000.
Funding Source:	Federal Transportation Enhancements funds provided through the Marin Congestion Management Agency, Marin Community Foundation, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (seed money, 200-2001), the Fred Gellert Foundation, The California Office of Traffic and Safety, The Miller Family Foundation, the Marin Independent Journal, the Schow Foundation, and the California Department of Health Services.

**Florida: Tallahassee
and Clearview****Safe Ways to School**

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 and 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.

Florida: Statewide**"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
E-mail: rtcken@transact.org

Web Address: <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" bill or amendment during the 2002 session of the Florida Legislature. The Safe Paths to Schools Program would give the Secretary of the Department of Transportation the discretion to establish a grant program to fund local, regional and state projects to provide safe transportation for children from neighborhoods to schools, to parks, and to the state's greenway and trail systems. The current Secretary has pledged to devote \$30 to \$40 million to such a program should the bill pass the legislature.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Legislation would enable a State DOT granting fund to which municipalities would apply.

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus

Educational Focus: Not a focus

**Built/Unbuilt-
Urban/Suburban:** All

Status: Introduced measure as amendment to related bills in 2000 and 2001, but bills did not make it through legislature. In the 2002 session, the legislation will be attempted both as an amendment and as a stand-alone bill. The Florida Rails-to-Trails office is also working with legislators to encourage school districts to consider safe paths to schools when locating new schools.

Budget: N/A

Funding Source:

Legislative campaign came out of general operating. Reaching for \$30-40 million to be programmed through this legislation.

Georgia: Atlanta**PEDS' KidsWalk to School Program**

Lead Implementers: PEDS: Pedestrians Educating Drivers on Safety

Partners: Local elementary schools, PTAs, police, a community center, parent "champions."

Location: Atlanta, Georgia

Contact Info: Sally Flocks, President and CEO
1447 Peachtree Street, Suite 801
Atlanta, GA 30309
Tel: 404-873-5667, Email: info@peds.org

Michael Orta, Director of Community Education
Tel: 404-673-5513, Email: education@peds.org

Web Address: <http://www.peds.org>

Project Focus: Aims to mitigate traffic congestion, improve safety, and increase physical activity by promoting and organizing "walking school buses" at elementary schools. Also empowers participating communities to advocate successfully for safer routes to school.

Summary: Working with 18 elementary schools, seven of which are already active. The "walking school bus" model provides opportunities for kids, supervised by adults, to learn and practice pedestrian safety. Components include:

- Coordination of parents, school staff, and other community partners
- Train-the-trainer safety workshops for organizers
- School area maps for planning and establishing safe "walking school bus" routes
- Seasonal events and contests
- Signs, whistles, stickers, T-shirts, and other materials

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Provide resources and guidance on advocating for pedestrian facility improvements. Example: working on getting "in street" crosswalk signs for school areas.

Enforcement Strategy: Work with police officers to conduct "sting operations" targeting motorist who violate crosswalk laws or speed limits. Visible police presence during special events.

Educational Focus: Program relies mostly on kids' experiential learning through participation in "walking school bus." Train-the-trainer workshops used to educate "walking school bus" leaders on pedestrian safety and "bus" management. Important to keep the "bus" fun so kids will favor walking over riding with parents' car. PEDS provides some curriculum materials to teachers to support events or campaigns.

Built/Unbuilt- Urban/Suburban:	Built: urban.
Status:	Entering third year of the program. Expanding to other schools in metro Atlanta.
Budget:	2001-2003: \$205,000 2003-2005: \$216,000
Funding Source:	Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Funds

**Georgia: Metro
Atlanta****Safe Routes to School**

Lead Implementers: Atlanta Bicycle Campaign

Partners: Citizens for a Livable DeKalb, Safe Communities of DeKalb, Safe Communities of Gwinnett, Pedestrians Educating Drivers on Safety, (PEDS), Safe Kids of DeKalb, Safe Kids of Gwinnett, Bicycle Users of Gwinnett, and the North Georgia Bicycle Dealers Association.

Location: Metropolitan Atlanta

Contact Info: Fred Boykin, Jr.
Atlanta Bicycle Campaign
404-636-4444

Web Address:

Project Focus: Work with schools to create a holistic program for safer routes to school and to encourage walking and bicycling to school.

Summary: The project aims to improve the safety of children who walk and bicycle to and from school, and to increase the number of school community members who walk and/or bicycle safely to and from school. The counties involved (DeKalb and Gwinnett, as pilot projects) will use plans created by the school and other community representatives to guide infrastructure changes to the pedestrian environment.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Conduct a school transportation assessment and develop a School Travel Plan, which will include infrastructure improvements as well as educational and encouragement efforts.

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus.

Educational Focus: Conduct bicycle and pedestrian safety training; hold events to encourage walking to school.

**Built/Unbuilt-
Urban/Suburban:** All

Status: N/A

Budget: N/A

Funding Source: N/A

Illinois: Chicago**Safe Routes to School**

Lead Implementers: Chicagoland Bicycle Federation

Partners: Chicago Department of Transportation, Chicago Public Schools, Illinois Secretary of State, Chicago Police Department, Children's Memorial Hospital

Location: Chicago, Illinois

Contact Info: Heather Convey
Research Coordinator
Chicagoland Bicycle Federation
650 S. Clark Street, #300
Chicago, IL 60605
Heather@biketraffic.org
312.427.3325, ext. 25

Web Address: www.biketrafic.org

Project Focus: Increase the number of children who ride their bikes to school, thereby increasing the health and safety of all residents by reducing traffic and encouraging everyone to become more active.

Summary:

First Phase:

- Identify school parameters (demographics, number of students, location of students)
- Present bicycle safety information to classes.
- Conduct student surveys to find out why children currently do not ride their bicycles to school.
- Examine the building for potential bike parking installation.
- Examine the neighborhood.

Second phase:

- Input information received from the student surveys.
- Analyze responses and identify problems.
- Examine crash and injury data gathered for the surrounding community.
- Present survey results and analysis to school administration.

Third phase:

- Organize parent and community meetings to deliver Safe Routes to School program information and survey results.
- Identify safe routes and needed countermeasures.
- Implement new facilities and countermeasures.

Fourth and final phase:

- Conduct training of students and teachers.
- Evaluate program impact.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Through surveys, mapping, crash studies, and direct observation, we identify parts of the physical environment needing remediation (such as bike lanes, pavement repair, and crossing guards). We work with city agencies

	lanes, pavement repair, and crossing guards). We work with city agencies to implement these before doing in-school training and promotion.
Enforcement Strategy:	Police, parents, and school safety officials monitor designated safe routes around participating schools.
Educational Focus:	Children: Classroom education, distribution of bike safety materials, bike-handling training, and familiarization of established safe routes. Parents: Training in bicycle safety, and organizing and leading riding school buses. Teachers: Training in bicycle safety and implementation of bicycle education curriculum. Community: Alderman, local business owners and residents introduced to program and encouraged to participate to raise awareness.
Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban:	Built, urban
Status:	Program began in 2001. Target of four schools in 2001-2002 school year.
Budget:	\$135,000
Funding Source:	Federal traffic safety funds matched by city funding.

Illinois: Chicago**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:

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. Very high levels of walking – 90% of the 422,000 public school students in Chicago walk to school. Numbers of active school busses and children involved were not available.

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

Budget:

N/A

Funding Source:

N/A

Maryland: Statewide**Safe Routes to School Pilot Program (HB 717)**

Lead Implementers:

Maryland Department of Transportation
Sprinkle Consulting, Inc. (SCI)

Partners:

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees

Location:

2 Pilot Programs (one urban and one suburban community – Baltimore City and Montgomery County)

Contact Info:

Michael Jackson
Maryland Department of Transportation
Post Office Box 8755
BWI Airport, MD 21240
(888) 713-1414 (phone)
(410) 865-1334 (fax)

Jennifer Toole, SCI
301-362-1699 ext. 103

Web Address:

<http://www.mdt.state.md.us>

Project Focus:

To create a demonstration project to be modeled by other jurisdictions – one in a suburban area and one in an urban area.

Summary:

- Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees will initiate the pilot projects and produce an action plan based on pilot project results.
 - Identify safety impediments to child pedestrian routes to school
 - Consult with PTAs county officials, police officers, and school administrators
 - Conduct surveys of relevant areas for safety hazards
-

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:

Identify safety hazards around schools

Enforcement Strategy:

Not a focus

Educational Focus:

Not a focus

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban:

All

Status:

Consultant is surveying parents and children in the two pilot schools currently.

Budget:

Unfunded

Funding Source:

Overall: N/A

**Massachusetts:
Arlington****Arlington MA, Safe Routes to School Pilot
program**

Lead Implementers: WalkBoston**Partners:** National Parks Service, 5 local schools**Location:** Arlington, Massachusetts**Contact Info:** Steve Golden
National Parks Service
617-223-5123Dorothea 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. 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.**Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban:** Built: suburban.**Status:** Started in 1999. Pilot completed at one school. Continuing in 4 schools.**Budget:** N/A**Funding Source:** Federal Highway Administration/National Highway Traffic Safety Agency (NHTSA) grant; National Parks Service

National**KidsWalk to School**

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/ncccdphp/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/ncccdphp/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

New York: The Bronx 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

Program is currently targeting the 5 worst intersections for children in The Bronx.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Focus of project is on making infrastructure improvement recommendations.

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus

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

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: Built: urban

Status:	Program is currently being used by the City of New York to address Safe Routes to School in all five boroughs.
Budget:	N/A
Funding Source:	Governor's Traffic Safety Committee using Federal TEA-21 402 funds.

New York: Citywide**Safe Routes to School**

Lead Implementers: New York City Department of Transportation

Partners:

Location: New York City

Contact Info: Ben Eliya
(718) 433-3183

Web Address:

Project Focus: Working with schools and communities in all five boroughs to improve safety for children near schools.

Summary:

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Improvements to infrastructure to support a safe environment.

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus

Educational Focus: Not a focus

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: Built: urban

Status:

Budget: N/A

Funding Source: N/A

Oregon: Portland**Portland Kids on the Move**

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/schoolsafety/Trafficsafetyaroundschools.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
Photo radar.

Educational Focus: Traditional classroom, outside activity and workshops.
Some outreach to motorists: pamphlets, ads.

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: Built: urban

Status: Ongoing.

Budget: N/A

Funding Source: N/A

Oregon: Statewide**Safe Routes to School Legislation**

Lead Implementers: Bicycle Transportation Alliance

Partners: N/A

Location: Oregon, statewide

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: Focuses on planning for safer environments around schools.

Summary: Legislation requires cities and counties to work with school districts to identify barriers that keep kids from walking and bicycling to school safely. This program will hopefully lay the groundwork for funding to be dedicated to eliminating these barriers.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Removing barriers to walking and bicycling to school

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus

Educational Focus: Not a focus

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: All

Status: Bill in effect as of 2001

Budget: Unfunded

Funding Source: Unfunded

Pennsylvania: Statewide	Pennsylvania Walk to School Trails Program
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 is conducting a pilot project in Brockway, a rural town, together with the PA. Dept. of Health. and a local State Health Improvement Plan (SHIP) partner. A rail-trail is located close to the school, and the project is focused on making the trail more accessible to the school and encouraging its use.
Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:	The project group will formulate infrastructure recommendations and forward them to the local planning agency. The funding does not currently cover any changes.
Enforcement Strategy:	Not a focus
Educational Focus:	Encouragement of walking and biking to school with parents and grandparents as an intergenerational activity, to promote physical activity.
Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban:	Rural (pilot program); additional pilot school being sought in Philadelphia.
Status:	Project staff are currently meeting with school officials, teachers, and parents in Brockway to map out details of the program implementation.
Budget:	\$75,000 per year
Funding Source:	CDC Grant through the Pennsylvania Department of Health

**Rhode Island:
Statewide****Rhode Island Safe Routes to School
Legislation**

Lead Implementers: State Department of Transportation**Partners:** N/A**Location:** Statewide, Rhode Island**Contact Info:** Alicia Karpick
21 Meeting St., Garden Entrance
Providence, RI 02903
401-521-4734
fax: 401-521-4001
email: alicia.karpick@sierraclub.org**Web Address:** <http://www.sierraclubri.org>**Project Focus:** Providing a funding source for Safe Routes to School programs around the state of Rhode Island through legislation.**Summary:** The bill proposed on January 30, 2002 would allow the Director of the Rhode Island Department of Transportation to set aside \$6.5 million of federal transportation funding for programs enhancing pedestrian and bicycle safety for school routes.**Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:** Legislation would provide a funding source for locally proposed improvements to the pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.**Enforcement Strategy:** Not a focus.**Educational Focus:** Not a focus.**Built/Unbuilt-
Urban/Suburban:** All**Status:** Bill in committee**Budget:** N/A**Funding Source:** Federal transportation funds

Texas: Statewide	Safe Routes to School Matthew Brown Act: Comprehensive Traffic Safety (HB 2204)
Lead Implementers:	Texas Department of Transportation
Partners:	Texas Bicycle Coalition
Location:	Statewide, Texas
Contact Info:	Gayle Cummins Texas Bicycle Coalition O Box 1121 Austin, TX 78767-1121 512-476-7433 512-476-7458 (fax) mail@biketexas.org
Web Address:	http://www.biketexas.org
Project Focus:	Aims to coordinate community, local and state government inputs to review, plan and implement changes to create safe ways for children to get to school. Goal is to increase youth fitness and reduce congestion.
Summary:	Program was not allocated any funding in its final draft. This legislation only asks Texas DOT to create this program, it does not fund it. The following are suggested as projects: Installation of new crosswalks and bike lanes Construction and replacement of sidewalks Traffic-calming programs Identification of safety hazards Construction of wide outside lanes to be used as bike routes
Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy:	Not a focus
Enforcement Strategy:	Not a focus
Educational Focus:	Not a focus
Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban:	All
Status:	Signed into law May 2001. Should start by September 2001.
Budget:	Unfunded.
Funding Source:	Overall: N/A

Virginia: Arlington County**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 busriders, 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.

**Washington:
Statewide****Safe and Active Routes to School**

Lead Implementers: Coalition Promoting Physical Activity

Partners: Washington Dept. of Health, Washington State Traffic Safety Commission, Washington Department of Transportation, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Safe Kids Coalition (through the Dept. of Health)

Location: Washington, statewide

Contact Info: Barbara Culp
Bicycle Alliance of Washington
PO Box 2904
Seattle, WA 98111

Web Address:

Project Focus: Providing information to various groups on Safe Routes to School programs.

Summary: The Coalition gives presentations and provides resources to groups interested in creating a Safe Routes program at their school or in their community. Presentations have been given or are planned at the statewide Parent Teacher Association meeting, statewide teacher associations, the Association of Washington Cities, and the Planning Association of Washington.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Projects are encouraged but not funded directly through the Coalition.

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus.

Educational Focus: Projects are encouraged but not funded directly through the Coalition.

**Built/Unbuilt-
Urban/Suburban:** All

Status: Outreach is under way

Budget: In-kind contributions of Coalition members

Funding Source: Coalition members

**Washington:
Statewide****Traffic Safety Near Schools**

Lead Implementers: Washington State Department of Transportation, Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Program

Partners:

Location: Washington, statewide

Contact Info: Stephanie Tax
WSDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Program
PO Box 47390
Olympia, WA 98504
(360) 705-7389

Web Address: <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/TA/ProgMgt/Grants/traffic.html>

Project Focus: Funding capital improvements projects to increase bicycle and pedestrian safety near schools

Summary: Traffic and pedestrian safety improvements near schools are proposed by cities, counties, and state agencies and submitted to the program for approval. Proposals are evaluated based on proximity to school, type of school (elementary schools most preferred), posted speed at the proposed project site, record of traffic accidents at the proposed project site, and amount of local match and school match.

Engineering, Planning and Design Strategy: Capital improvements projects are eligible for funding through state grants

Enforcement Strategy: Not a focus

Educational Focus: Not a focus

Built/Unbuilt-Urban/Suburban: All

Status: Program is currently finishing its first year.

Budget: The program was set up in 2000 with \$5 million allocated by the legislature; 130 applications for \$12 million in identified needs were received, despite the fact that many localities did not apply because they were unsure the program would go forward.

Funding Source: Washington State transportation budget
