Safe Routes to School Plans and Project Prioritization





Why develop a SRTS Plan?

- Clarify and communicate program goals
- Assemble baseline information for program evaluation
- Identify key issues and opportunities
- Organize and prioritize customized strategies based on information gathered
- Secure stakeholder and community buy-in for proposed strategies AND to assist with implementation
- Support funding applications (TXDOT and NCTCOG's SRTS and Active Transportation calls for projects)



SRTS Plans - Geographic scope

Single school

 Local SRTS team, comprehensive (all E's)

Multi-school (2+)

District-wide / City-wide

- Advisory committee plus school teams, maybe less detailed info gathering and recommendations
- Advisory committee, higher level information gathering and recommendations, less school-specific



Key Sections in a SRTS Plan

- School overview
- Summary of existing conditions/Key issues
- SRTS strategy recommendations (all E's)
- Other: SRTS Team acknowledgements, Summary of Planning Process, Implementation plan



Ohio School Travel Plan Template

- Section 1: Our School/s and SRTS team
- Section 2: Our SRTS Vision.
- Section 3: Existing Conditions.
- Section 4: Key Issues Impacting Safe Walking and Bicycling to School.
- Section 5: Recommended SRTS Countermeasures.
- Section 6: Public Input.
- Section 7: Final Plan Pledge of Support





DESIGN

STP Template Sections

SECTION 1: OUR SCHOOL/S AND SRTS TEAM

See Step 1 of the STP Guide for instructions on how to complete this section.

1A. Identify Target Schools: What schools will be included as a part of this School Travel Plan? Include the school name and address, and the appropriate demographic information indicated by the table below. *Reminder: This information is readily available on the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) website at www.reportcard.ohio.gov.* Enter information as requested in the tables below, or copy and paste your entire "Your School's Students Graph over the replica table provided, and reference the ODE website link at which you located the information. For multiple schools, simply copy the tables in 1A as needed according to your number of schools.

School District	School Name	School Address	Grades served

	Your School's Students 2011-2012 (modify dates as needed)									
Average Daily Student Enrollment	Black, non- Hispanic	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Hispanic	Multi- Racial	White, non- Hispanic	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Migrant

SECTION 3: CURRENT STUDENT TRAVEL

3A. How many students live within walking and bicycling distance of school? Distances are cumulative; meaning that "within ½ mile of school" would include students within ¼ mile as well. This data is from the 2017/2018 school year, and does not match the data from Section 1 taken from 2016/2017 school year data (the most recent data available at the time of this draft).

Brookville Elementary School

Distance from School	Number of Students	% of Student Body
Within 1/4 mile of school	22	4.73%
Within 1/2 mile of school	89	23.87%
Within 1 mile of school	167	59.78%
Within 2 miles of school	62	73.12%

Brookville Intermediate School

Distance from School	Number of Students	% of Student Body
Within 1/4 mile of school	15	2.60%
Within 1/2 mile of school	81	16.64%
Within 1 mile of school	222	55.11%
Within 2 miles of school	100	72.44%

Mapping student addresses. A map showing the school site and dots indicating where students live is included in Appendix A.



Mapping student addresses





STP Template Sections

3B. How many students are currently walking and bicycling to school? What are the primary walking and bicycling routes? Fill out the table below using information from the student travel tally summary report and from discussions with the school principal or crossing guard (primary walking/bicycling routes).

	Walk	Bike	School bus	Family Vehicle	Carpool	Public Transit	Other
Number of							
students							
(morning trips)							
Number of							
students							
(afternoon trips)							
Primary							
walking/bicycling							
routes							

Information on travel modes must come from data collected using the National Center for Safe Routes to School Student Travel Tally forms.

3C. Are there any school or district policies that impact students walking or bicycling to school? List below any school or school district policies that may affect a students' ability or decision to walk to school.

District Bus Policies

Policy:_____

How it affects student travel modes (3-5 sentences):



Do school buses and parent vehicles use the same driveway for arrival and dismissal?

- □ Yes, all vehicles use the same driveway.
- □ No, there are separate driveways for family vehicles and school buses.

Do all students use the same entrance to the school building in the morning?

- □ Yes, all students enter the building at the same location.
- □ No, students can use different entrances.

If no, in three sentences or less, describe how students enter the building:

Are all students released at the same time during dismissal?

- □ Yes, all students are released at the same time.
- No, we use a staggered release process (walkers are released first, bus riders second, etc.).

If no, in two sentences or less, describe how dismissal is staggered at your school:

Is school staff involved in either arrival or dismissal?

- $\hfill\square$ Yes, we have school staff help students enter and exit the campus safely.
- □ No, school staff is not involved in either arrival or dismissal.

If yes, in two sentences or less, describe how school staff are involved in school arrival and dismissal:

Are there any adult crossing guards located along student walking routes?

- □ Yes, we have at least one adult crossing guard that helps students on their walking routes.
- □ No, we do not have any adult crossing guards serving our school.
- If yes, please list the locations for each adult crossing guard:

Are there police officers that help with arrival or dismissal procedures at this school?



STP Template Sections

SECTION 4: KEY ISSUES IMPACTING SAFE WALKING AND BICYCLING TO SCHOOL

The key issues listed below are not listed in order of priority. Because the schools are located on the same campus, the issues for the Elementary and the Intermediate school have been combined.

Brookville Elementary and Intermediate Schools

Issue/Description

- 1. Issue: The intersection of Western Ave and Westbrook Road is challenging to cross.
 - This is a major crossing point for students coming from north of the schools.
 - The skewed intersection has four-way stop signs and simple crosswalks, but lacks enhanced infrastructure to indicate the presence of school children crossing, such as high visibility crosswalks or school crossing signs.
 - Each leg of the intersection has three travel lanes including a left turn lane.
 - The extreme skewed angle of the intersection impedes the sight lines for drivers approaching the intersection, which places pedestrians at risk, and also creates a longer pedestrian crossing distance than a perpendicular intersection.
 - Issue: The intersection of Western Ave and Blue Pride Drive lacks enhanced crossing infrastructure.
 - The intersection has a wide geometry, and each approach has three lanes with a left turn lane and a four-way stop.
 - The crossing features simple marked crosswalks, but no enhanced infrastructure for pedestrian crossing such as high visibility crosswalks or school crossing signs.
 - The Brookville Branch of the Dayton Metro Library is located across Western Ave from the school campus.
- 3. Issue: There are gaps in the sidewalks on the streets surrounding the schools, causing disruptions in potential walking routes. Sidewalk gaps include:
 - Johnsonville Brookville Rd south of Westbrook Rd.
 - Westbrook Rd east of Wolf Creek St (both sides).
- 4. Issue: The Wolf Creek Recreational Trail does not connect to the school campus.
 - This trail could provide a path for students to ride bikes to school from the southeast.
 - The trail crosses Westbrook Road, which leads to the school campus but lacks

SHORT TERM ENFORCEMENT COUNTERMEASURES: The following strategies are

planned for the next 12 months.

L L	NFORCEMENT
Issue	Countermeasure
There are no crossing guards to help students cross at crucial intersections.	Establish a school crossing guard program. Brookville does not currently have a formal districtwide school crossing guard program; crossing guards would help alleviate parent concerns about the safety of intersections and crossings near the schools. Crossing guards should be supplied with MUTCD-compliant stop paddles and safety vests and complete a training program. If possible, have someone observe each crossing guard at least once per year to make sure they are doing their job safely.
of the major roads surrounding the school	develop an integrated approach to speed enforcement. An integrated approach might include driver education, speed feedback signs, progressive ticketing, and other elements
	 Driver education may take many forms. Examples include materials sent to parents at the beginning of the school year, school newsletter articles, yard signs urging drivers to "slow down," and safe driver pledges. Speed feedback signs can be used to increase driver awareness about their speed and collect motor speed and volume data. The latter may be helpful for prioritizing locations for police enforcement. Each Highway Patrol District in Ohio (http://statepatrol.ohio.gov/counties.stm) has a speed feedback trailer that local jurisdictions can request. Progressive ticketing is a method of introducing police enforcement in stages. First an announcement is made that police enforcement will take place. Officers initially give only warnings and proceed to ticketing only after a coefficient.
	Enforcement should take place at irregular

Non-infrastructure Recommendations

5B. The 12-Month SRTS Non-Infrastructure Activity Calendar

EXAMPLE COUNTERMEAS	SURE	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May
Participate in International Walk to School Day	PLAN												
Lead: Natalie Downs, P.E. Teacher	IMPLEMENT												
Conduct student travel tallies and parent surveys	PLAN												
Lead: Charlie Smith, Parent	IMPLEMENT												



Infrastructure Recommendations Table

5C. Infrastructure Countermeasure Recommendations

See Figure 2 for locations of recommendations.

Map ID	Location	Issue	Countermeasure	Timeframe	Priority	Jurisdiction Responsible	Estimated Cost ¹	Possible Funding Source	Status
1	Intersections of Westbrook Rd. and Johnsville Brookville Rd/Arlington Rd.	Two staggered t- intersections are along potential school crossing routes, but there are no marked crossings for students to cross Westbrook Rd. Staggered nature of intersection adds additional conflict points.	Install a marked crosswalk across Westbrook Rd east of Johnsville Brookville Rd, including high visibility markings ² and curb extensions. Install a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) at crosswalk. Extend sidewalks on east side of Johnsville Brookville Rd to connect to crossing location (See #8).	Short	High	City of Brookville	\$50,000	 ODOT SRTS Funds Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission 	
2	Intersection of Johnsville Brookville Rd. and Blue Pride Dr.	Intersection lacks enhanced visibility for pedestrians crossing Blue Pride Dr.	Upgrade standard crosswalk markings across Blue Pride Drive to high visibility markings ² .	Short	High	City of Brookville	\$2,000	 ODOT SRTS Funds Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission 	
3	Intersection of Western Ave and Blue Pride Dr.	Intersection provides access to the Brookville Branch of the Dayton Metro Library from the school campus, but lacks enhanced crossing features.	Upgrade standard crosswalk markings to high-visibility markings ² . Install school crossing signage ³ .	Short	High	City of Brookville	\$2,500	ODOT SRTS Funds Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission	
4	Intersection of Westbrook Rd. and Western Ave.	Intersection is a major crossing point for students but lacks enhanced pedestrian infrastructure to assist students in crossing the	Relocate crosswalks on Westbrook Rd back from the intersection so they cross the road perpendicularly (See figure 3). Upgrade standard	Medium	High	City of Brookville	\$40,000	 ODOT SRTS Funds Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission 	

Engineering Recommendations Map



Engineering Recommendations Table - District

Map ID	Countermeasure	Location	Schools Affected	Weighted Score from Matrix	Priority	Timeframe	Estimated Cost
P34	Improve crosswalks and signage	Tallmadge/Main	Findley	780	High	1-3 years	Low
P53	Perform Pedestrian Saftey Study	Tallmadge & 8/59 ramps	Forest Hill	780	High	1-3 years	Low
P104	Repaint crosswalks; add countdown displays	Thornton/Wolf Ledges	Leggett	756	High	1-3 years	Low
P105	Add crosswalks; Must YIELD peds signs	Thornton/ramps	Leggett	756	High	1-3 years	Low
L12	4-lane to 3-lane conversion with crosswalks and Must YIELD peds signs at intersections	Tallmadge - from Carpenter to Columbia - 0.8 miles	Findley	710	High	1-3 years	Low
P70	Add crosswalks	261/Vernon Odom / Moon	Helen Arnold	708	High	1-3 years	Low
L33	Perform traffic study	Canton - from Shelburn to Triplett - 0.5 miles	Ritzman	688	High	1-3 years	Low
L14	Road diet	Tallmadge - from Columbia to 8/59 - 0.2 miles	Forest Hill	686	High	1-3 years	Low
P71	Add crosswalks and curb ramps; perform signal timing analysis	261/Vernon Odom / East	Helen Arnold	680	High	1-3 years	Low
P138	Add crosswalks	Market/Emmons/Schrop	Windemere	680	High	1-3 years	Low



Engineering Recommendations Map - District



CABIN JOHN MIDDLE SCHOOL SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL ACTION PLAN EXISTING CONDITIONS, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

DRAFT



Montgomery County Department of Transportation

June 2018

OVERVIEW OF CABIN JOHN MIDDLE SCHOOL

- •Location: Bells Mill Rd & Gainsborough Rd
- •4 discontinuous attendance zones
- •Major roads feature sidewalks while lowervolume roads lack sidewalks
- •1,005 students
- •120 staff
- •School Day: 8:15 AM 3:00 PM
- •26 buses



TRAVEL PATTERNS

The attendance boundary for Cabin John MS contains four discontinuous attendance zones providing a major barrier to walking and biking for many students.

The neighborhood surrounding the school is largely walkable with sidewalks and landscaped buffers, but is bisected by a few major roads including Democracy Blvd, Seven Locks Rd, and Tuckerman Ln.



PEDESTRIAN NETWORK ANALYSIS

Sidewalks – There are sidewalks on both sides of Gainsborough Rd and on one side of Bells Mill Rd on the perimeter of the school site. On the adjacent blocks of Gainsborough Rd and Bells Mill Rd to the east, there is sidewalk on at least one side. While there is traffic along Gainsborough Rd and Bells Mill Rd, a landscaped buffer contributes to a comfortable walking environment. The majority of roads missing sidewalk are low-volume residential streets.

Crosswalks – Marked crosswalks on three legs at Gainsborough Rd & Bells Mill Rd and on two legs at Bells Mill Rd & Democracy Ln. There are no additional marked crossings of Gainsborough Rd within a $\frac{1}{2}$ mile to the north or south. Some "crosswalks to nowhere."

Curb ramps – Most marked crossings have ADA-compliant curb ramps. Intersection of Bells Mill Rd & Democracy Ln needs curb ramp at SE corner.



ARRIVAL OBSERVATIONS

- •Drivers typically yield to students in the crosswalk at Bells Mill Rd & Gainsborough Rd.
- No significant queuing was observed in the dropoff loop or on Gainsborough Rd. School staff attributed this to good weather and a higherthan-average percentage of students walking to school.
- The school has asked parents to refrain from taking left turns out of the drop-off loop onto Gainsborough Rd during arrival, since these left turns can cause queuing in the drop-off loop and cause it to spill onto Gainsborough Rd. During arrival, they place safety cones at the parking lot driveway to enforce this. Most parents comply.



Left turns from the student drop-off and pick-up loop can lead to large queues and have been discouraged by school administration.

DISMISSAL OBSERVATIONS

- •Special Education students are escorted to buses by staff.
- •Some parents park along Bells Mill Rd to pick up students.
- •Some students observed waiting for pick-up in landscaped ditch on Bells Mill Rd.
- •Students tend to walk in groups, and generally cross at crosswalks. One or two students were observed making midblock crossings.
- •Some students use path around athletic fields to access Larkmeade Ln.
- •Lack of lighting could prevent use during winter months



Path on athletic fields leading to Larkmeade Ln.

ARRIVAL & DISMISSAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Educate parents on proper location for pick-up and drop-off and discourage the use of Bells Mill Rd and Gainsborough Rd for these purposes.
- Continue education campaign to prevent left-turns out of student drop-off and pick-up lane.
- If a mid-block crossing is added at the pick-up and drop-off driveway:
 - Add crossing guard or staff member to help control flow.
 - Formalize drop-off site on Gainsborough Rd for southbound vehicles.

INTERSECTION RECOMMENDATIONS

Map ID	Issue	Recommendation	Timeframe*
2	Long crossing distance; Improper parent drop-off and pick-ups. Students accessing cars parked along Bells Mill Rd mix with traffic and create back-ups.	Extend existing curb extension on NE corner eastwards to the driveway to prevent drop-offs and pick-ups (flexposts in short-term); add curb extension on SE corner to shorten crossing distance	Short
6	No marked crossing, Long crossing distance. Bells Mill ES entrance and Democracy Ln do not align creating irregular intersection geometry.	Add curb extensions, Install crosswalk, and square up intersection	Medium
10	No marked crossing between Bells Mill Rd and Tuckerman Ln. Students cross Gainsborough Rd before reaching Bells Mill Rd to access stairs.	Add new curb ramp, Install high visibility mid-block crosswalk, add crosswalk signage, add RRFP's or flashing beacons	Medium
14 * Short = within	No pedestrian signals, Long crossing distance. 1 year, Medium = within 3 years, Long = 3 or more years	Add curb extensions to SW corner to provide safe waiting area, Add median refuge island on south side of Democracy Blvd, Add pedestrian signals	Medium

SIDEWALK RECOMMENDATIONS*

* All sidewalks recommendations must be requested by community members for MCDOT to evaluate feasibility.

Map ID	Issue	Recommendation	Timeframe*
1	Missing sidewalk connection to homes along Bells Mill Rd	Construct new sidewalk along bells Mill Rd from Gainsborough Rd to 8613 Bells Mill Rd	Medium
4	Missing sidewalk connection to homes on south side of Bells Mill Rd	Construct new sidewalk	Medium
13	Missing sidewalk connection between athletic fields and neighborhood sidewalk network	Construct new sidewalk	Short
15	Narrow sidewalk connecting to neighborhood limits use	Widen existing sidewalk	Medium

* Short = within 1 year, Medium = within 3 years, Long = 3 or more years





INTERSECTION RECOMMENDATIONS



2. Extending the existing curb would prevent parent drop-offs at Bells Mill Rd and Gainsborough Rd.



6. Missing crosswalk and awkward intersection design at Bells Mill Rd and Democracy Ln



10. Students frequently cross Gainsborough Rd prior to Bells Mill Rd in order to reach the main entrance stairs

SIDEWALK RECOMMENDATIONS*

* All sidewalks recommendations must be requested by community members for MCDOT to evaluate feasibility.



1. Students walk west on Bells Mill Rd to residences with no sidewalk.



5. Overgrown vegetation narrows the sidewalk along Bells Mill Rd.



13.The sidewalk on Larkmeade Ln terminates just prior to the athletic field path. Tree is within County ROW.



SRTS Project Prioritization



Data-Driven Prioritization

- Represents community values
- Helps reduce political/individual influence and bias in project development process
- Provides transparency in how decisions are made



Prioritization Process





Step 1: Define Purpose

Example:

Identify infrastructure projects that improve safety and accessibility for children walking and biking to XYZ school.



Step 2: Select Factors

- Stakeholder Input
- Feasibility (constraints, opportunities)
- Safety
- Demand
- Connectivity
- Equity
- Compliance



Step 3: Establish Weights

Can assess – what is relative impact of factors if weighted differently?





Step 4: Select Variables

How will priority factors be measured? For example:

- Feasibility level of difficulty/cost, resources available
- Safety crashes, functional classification of roadway, engineering judgement
- Demand students served
- Equity free and reduced lunch rate, poverty rate



	Equity	Demand	Cost	Safety	TOTAL
1. Major Intersection Improvements	5	5	1	10	21
2. Raised Crosswalk	5	5	5	5	20
3. Curb Ramps	5	5	10	1	21

WEIGHTED	Equity	Demand	Cost	Safety x 2	TOTAL	
1. Major Intersection Improvements	5	5	1	20	31	
2. Raised Crosswalk	5	5	5	10	25	La contra da la co
3. Curb Ramps	5	5	10	1	21	



Project Prioritization

Two-stage prioritization

- Stage 1: Rank projects in order of importance
- Stage 2: Overlay cost and complexity to determine what gets built

Single-stage prioritization

Single-stage includes cost/feasibility



Two-stage Prioritization

Pros:

- Results in a list that clearly outlines critical projects, independent of cost/complexity
- Does not allow low-cost improvements to beat out those with important safety benefits
- Does not result in modest-benefit projects rising to the top
- Cons:
 - Requires an extra step, and perhaps more subjectivity
 - Harder to explain
 - May result in fewer total projects being built



Single-stage Prioritization

Pros:

- Simpler
- Easier to explain
- May result in more projects being built
- Cons:
 - May inhibit most important projects from being built
 - Can allow modest-benefit projects to rise to the top



Resource: ActiveTrans Priority Tool



Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center

Facts & Figures

Community Support

Planning & Design

Behavior Change

Webinars & Courses

PLANNING & DESIGN

Planning & Data Collection Tools

Counts

Audits

Secondary Data Sources

ActiveTrans Priority Tool

Performance & Analysis

Level & Quality of Service Intersection Safety Indices

PBCAT

Sample Policies &

ActiveTrans Priority Tool

The "ActiveTrans Priority Tool (APT)" is a step-by-step methodology for prioritizing improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities, either separately or together as part of a "complete streets" evaluation approach. The methodology is flexible, allowing the user to assign goals and values that reflect those of the agency and the community. It is also transparent, breaking down the process into a series of discrete steps that can be easily documented and communicated to the public.

While users are encouraged to read through the entire <u>Guidebook</u> before implementing the methodology, individual sections are provided below to allow information to be accessed more easily:

ActiveTrans Priority Tool Overview

this provide a second second second by Anti-Anti-Terms Delayity Terms have a distance of the second second second

Customized Prioritization -Springfield, OH

Three step approach:

- Priority score (weighted factors) – walk/bike potential, deficiencies, feasibility, demographics
- 2. Feedback from school teams AND Feedback from consultant field team
- 3. Feedback from lead plan contact

Category	Criterion	Weighting
Pedestrian/bicycle potential	K-8 schools within 1/4 mile of project (2+ schools = 20 points, 1 school = 10 points).	11
Deficiency	Project is along or facilitates crossing a road where traffic speed or traffic volume may be a concern (road classification is US Highway = 20 points; road classification is State Highway = 15 points; road classification is collector = 10 points).	4
Deficiency	Project is within 500 feet of a pedestrian or bicycle crash location that has occurred within the last 5 years (5 or more crashes = 20 points; 4 crashes = 16 points; 3 crashes = 12 points; 2 crashes = 8 points; 1 crash = 4 points).	7
Feasibility	Estimated project cost is categorized as low or medium (estimated project cost is under \$20,000 = 20 points; estimated project cost is \$20,000 to \$149,999 = 10 points; estimated project cost is \$150,000 or more = 0 points).	9
Feasibility	Project requires ROW acquisition (yes = - 20)	3
School demographics	Percentage of students with disabilities at school closest to project is above 15% (state average) (yes = 20 points)	2
School demographics	Poverty rate for Census Tract where primary school associated with project is located.	3



Springfield, OH School Travel Plan

Map ID	Schools Impacted	Location	lssue		Countermeasure	Summary of Prioritization Feedback
49, 50	Fulton Elementary	Intersection of West Pleasant Street and South Light Street, and Intersection of West Pleasant Street and Shaffer Street	No crossing provisions at this location.	•	Install high visibility crosswalks on all four legs of each intersection and install school zone crossing signs per MUTCD guidelines. Upgrade curb ramps to be ADA compliant. Consider curb extensions at both intersections to minimize crossing distances.	Priority Score: 409 School Team Feedback: None Consultant Field Team Feedback: Top safety priority for school
32	Fulton Elementary	South Light Street at school property line	Parents disobey DO NOT ENTER SIGNS onto South Light Street which increases the risk of conflicts with students crossing at this location.	•	Move the DO NOT ENTER SIGNS up to the edge of the visitor parking. Reduce the width of the South Light Street spur to 10ft by removing pavement and/or installing curb from the visitor parking lot to the edge school property.	Priority Score: 369 School Team Feedback: None Consultant Field Team Feedback: Top safety priority for school

Safety-based prioritization of schools

Crash history

- Safety concerns
- Current or potential pedestrian use

 Step 1
 Prioritize schools

 Step 2
 Conduct field reviews of highest priority schools

 Result
 Information on pedestrian infrastructure

needs for highest priority schools

Safety-based prioritization of schools for Safe Routes to School infrastructure projects: A process for transportation professionals

Determining the most effective use of limited infrastructure funds is a challenging task. It is especially difficult for local transportation professionals to prioritize infrastructure needs among multiple schools that may be eligible for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) funds to improve conditions for children to walk to school. This document explains a process to help transportation professionals identify schools within a city, school district or other local jurisdiction that merit additional review for specific pedestrian infrastructure improvements based on safety considerations (see Figure 1). Use of this process will result in a prioritized list of schools without carrying out a comprehensive field review and extensive data collection for every school site. Once the highest priority schools are identified, a field review of these schools should be performed to identify specific safety issues and infrastructure improvements. Parts of the Federal Highway Administration Pedestrian Road Safety Audit* have been adapted and included in this document to assist in this field review.

Focus on pedestrians

It is important to note that the primary emphasis of this resource is on infrastructure improvements that improve the safety of walking conditions. While bicycle travel shares some of the same needs as walking, other factors such as bicycle parking, on-road facilities and surface conditions need to be considered and are not discussed in this document.

Transferable to different funding sources

While the aim of this document is to assist transportation professionals who are preparing SRTS funding application for infrastructure improvements, it could also be useful when applying for funds from other sources, including Transportation Enhancements, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality or local government capital improvements.





Figure 1: Safety-based prioritization process for SRTS projects



National Center for Safe Routes to School | www.saferoutesinfo.org | (toll-free) 1-866-610-SRTS

NCTCOG selection criteria – 2017 TA Set-Aside Call for Projects

R	0	0	0	S	S	2	2	0	5	2	2	0	5	5	2	0	S	S	2	2		S	2	2	0	S	S	2	2	2	2		S	5	2	7	0	N	S	2	2	2	0		N	S	2	2	2	0		S	2	1		
Δ	7	7	7	7	2	7	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	7	7	2	7	7	2	2	2	7	7	7	2	7	7	7	7	7	2	2	7	7	7	2	2	2	2	7	7	7	2	2	7	2	7	7	7	7	J		

Category	Scoring (pts)	Description
Implements a Local Plan	20	Implements a project identified as a priority in a local Safe Routes to School plan or other local plan
Safety	20	Improves the safety of students walking and bicycling to school
Congestion Reduction	20	Strong potential for the project to increase walking and bicycling by students to and from school
Equity	20	Improves school access for disadvantaged populations and underserved communities
Community Support and Stakeholder Involvement	15	Builds upon demonstrated community support for walking and bicycling to school
Air Quality Benefits	5	Improves air quality by supporting non-motorized travel



NCTCOG selection criteria – 2017 TA Set-Aside Call for Projects

Additional Considerations:

Category	Scoring (pts)	Description
Project Readiness and Other Factors	20	Project readiness/ability to obligate funds and initiate construction quickly. Other factors related to project impact upon the community.
Project Innovation	5	Project implements innovative or new treatments and technology that can serve as a model for the region.



TxDOT selection criteria - 2019 SRTS Call for Projects

Description Category Demonstrates need for safety improvement and Safety appropriate safety countermeasures **Connectivity &** Improves non-motorized routes to destinations; supports multi-modal connections; eliminates barriers Accessibility Enhances livability by improving non-motorized access **Quality of Life** and reducing emissions; and improves mode choice in underserved communities Project includes programs to encourage biking and **Encouragement** walking among students **Community Support** Public outreach demonstrates positive community support **Project Readiness** Ability to advance the project to construction immediately Demonstrates a link to formal transportation planning **Planning** effort



Local Examples: Blue Zones – SRTS Pilot Schools Criteria

School ्रा	District Board Member	City Council Member	Interest in Blue Zones	Walking School Bus	% Free/ Reduced Lunch	Ped/bike Counts (Cross Guards) -	Total Ped/Bike Crash Count 	Sidewalk Density
CC MossES	Tobi Jackson	Gyna Bivens	Yes	Yes	63.83	L, M,L	14	0.75
D McRae ES	Tobi Jackson	Gyna Bivens	Yes		93.98	M, M, L	13	1.06
WJ Turner ES	Cinto Ramos	Sal Espino	Yes		94.31	Μ	10	0.19
Diamond Hill ES	Cinto Ramos	Sal Espino	Yes		95.41	Н	5	0.5
Daggett ES	Ashley Paz	Ann Zadeh	Yes		56.21	Н, Н	4	1.33
ML Phillips ES	Judy Needham	Zim Zimmerma	Yes	Yes (skj)	80.92	М	1	0.24
Harlean Beal ES	T.A. Sims	Gina Bivens	Yes		89.78		4	0.15
Burton Hill ES	Judy Needham	Dennis Shinglet	Yes		62.87		0	0.73
Alice Carlson ALC	Ann Sutherland	Ann Zadeh	Yes		19.08		11	1.05
Carroll Peak ES	T.A. Sims	Gina Bivens			67.55	L, L, M	8	1.48
George C Clarke ES	Matthew Avila	Ann Zadeh	Yes		92.86	L, L	8	1.12





How to make SRTS Happen



How to make SRTS Happen

- Bring together the right people
- Gather information and identify Issues (all E's)
- Find solutions: Identify and prioritize SRTS strategies (all E's)
- Make a plan
- Find funding Evaluate resources
- Secure community buy-in
- Act and evaluate



Bring together the right people

School/s – Principal, Vice Principal, School Nurse, PTA President

- School District Transportation Director, Safety/Security Director, Superintendent, School Board, Other
- Local municipality Transportation Planners & Engineers, Elected Officials
- Law enforcement Traffic, Community, School Resource Officer, Crossing Guards
- Parents PTA, health committee, volunteers, walkers/bicyclists
- School community neighborhood organization, citizen advisory group, advocacy group
- Public Health Professionals (Heath Department), advocates
- Students Student Council, walkers/bicyclists, class project
- Others Businesses, Recreation Centers, Senior Centers



Interest in SRTS

- Schools/School District safety, academic performance, health
- Municipality/law enforcement improved traffic and community safety, reduced traffic congestion, community health, strong economy, community partnership
- Parents safety, convenience, community
- School community improved traffic and community safety, reduced traffic congestion, community health
- Public Health increased opportunities for activity, improved safety, improved air quality
- Students fun, independence
- Others accessibility, safety



Steps to Sustainability

Share SRTS Plan

- Get adoption/endorsement
- Institutionalize the team (SRTS Committee)
- Be visible publicize and promote



Encouragement programs







Include everyone and invite support









National Walk and Bike to School Days



PLAN an event

SEE who's signed up

BEYOND the event





Register Now for Bike to School Day 2019

It's almost time to strap on that helmet and pedal with passion! National Bike to School Day is **May 8, 2019**, and registration is now open!

Bike to School Day connects communities with many issues such as creating safer and more friendly routes for biking and walking to school, building a sense of community or school spirit, and inspiring families to walk and bike to school more often.



This year, we particularly invite you to take advantage of your event to talk about walking and biking safety for everyone.

A record setting 3,205 communities participated in BTSD 2018. Organizers are aiming for even more momentum this year.

Follow Walk and Bike to School Day on Facebook and Twitter!

7 Ideas to Promote Safety

See Who Registered



Walking Wednesdays





Walking school buses and bicycle trains





Contests

Golden Sneaker Award

& Il Mm Nn Oo Pp 2 g Rads 5



w XxYyZ

SRTS Evaluation

Before - baseline

- During adjustments
- After impacts



NCTCOG SRTS

- Planning assistance can be requested through UPWP updates (every 2 years)
- Calls for projects every 2-3 years (pending federal transportation bill)
- Region-wide Walk to School Day promotion coming Fall 2019
- Education resources on website

www.nctcog.org/SafeRoutesToSchool



Safe Routes -- to --School

Helping kids walk, bike and roll to school safely



