



# State Network Project

## Selected Policy Successes: 2007 through 2010

January 2011  
Contact Robert Ping, State Network Director:  
[Robert@saferoutespartnership.org](mailto:Robert@saferoutespartnership.org)

### *Table of Contents*

<b>Background.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Complete Streets.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Curriculum.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Fine-Based Mechanisms.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Legislation Implementation.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Personal Safety.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>School Bus Funding and Cuts.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>School Siting and Joint Use.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>State SRTS Program.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Strategic Highway Safety Plans.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Supporting Low-Income Communities.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Wellness.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Regional Networks.....</b>	<b>27</b>

### **Background**

The State Network Project began with 10 states in 2007 through 2009 with funding from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF), Kaiser Permanente (KP) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CD). In January 2010, twenty states were funded to participate in 2010 and 2011, including eight of the original 2007-2009 states, with RWJF funding 15 states, and KP funding five states. Below are selected accomplishments from the 20 state networks during 2010, and from the 10 networks during the first three years of the program.

In each state, the State Network Project conducted initial research and set its policy priorities based upon the following policy categories: State SRTS Program, Complete

Streets, School Siting, Personal Safety, Low-Income Communities, Statewide Curriculum and Education, Strategic Highway Safety Plan, Implementation of SRTS-Related Legislation, School Bus Funding, School Wellness Policies, and Fine-Based Funding Mechanisms.

Collectively, the 20 state networks are engaging more than 600 partner organizations and agencies as active participants. The networks set different priorities in their Action Plans based on the unique policy opportunities and challenges in each state, and choose approaches suitable to the state's situation. Networks build productive relationships with state Safe Routes to School (SRTS) coordinators and assisted state Departments of Transportation (DOTs) in creating and running efficient Safe Routes to School programs through building partnerships with other state agencies including the Departments of Health and Education, and through outreach to stakeholders, technical assistance, advice and the creation and distribution of supportive resources. In the policy realm, networks were in many cases the first statewide group to research, advocate and create a vision for how to address particular policy issues within the states that will support increases in physical and safety through walking and bicycling to schools and in daily life. Networks advanced policy issues and opportunities influencing transportation policies and funding, safety, land use, the environment and public health.

## **Complete Streets**

*Complete streets policies require or encourage local and/or state jurisdictions to consider and address the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users in the planning, design, construction and maintenance of all roadway and transit facilities. These policies ensure that bicycle and pedestrian safety is considered from the inception of a transportation project, rather than something to be added later through more expensive retrofitting projects. The end result is more facilities for safe and healthy physical activity in neighborhoods and on routes to school. Networks work to get complete streets policies into state and regional transportation agency policies and procedures, and to ensure implementation.*

### **2010**

#### ***California***

The 2008 CA law AB1358 (Complete Streets Act) takes effect January 1, 2011, requiring all General Plan updates to include a policy on Complete Streets as part of the circulation element of the General Plan. The California Network convened an Action Team to ensure that the state would issue guidance to cities and counties, and worked for two years with the State Office of Planning and Research on developing the guidance. Several Network partners including our Network Organizer were invited to serve on a state advisory committee to make final recommendations on the Complete Streets guidance which became public as of December 2010.

#### ***Hawaii***

Hawaii Governor Linda Lingle signed [S.B. 718](#) on May 6, 2009, a landmark bill that requires the Hawaii DOT and the counties to establish policies to accommodate all users of the road, no matter what age, ability, or mode of transportation. The bill thus became Act 054, the Complete Streets law, which calls for the creation of a statewide task force to review existing state and county highway design standards and guidelines and propose changes to procedures and design manuals. Two Hawaii Network partners were appointed to the 20- member task force, and three other Hawaii Network partners are "Friends" of the task force. In 2010 the task force began working on specific design standards and guidelines as part of the task force's work plan. This will improve roadway design to support walking and bicycling to schools, and in daily life.

#### ***Tennessee***

The Tennessee Network Complete Streets Action Team developed a presentation on the important connection between Safe Routes to School and Complete Streets. In the summer of 2010 the Tennessee Network launched a number of these "Lunch and Learn" one-hour workshop sessions to educate decision makers and other leaders throughout the state on the benefits of a complete streets policy at the local, regional, and state levels, and is looking into using this model for educating decision makers on other SRTS-related topic areas.

#### ***Wisconsin***

The State of Wisconsin adopted statewide complete streets legislation in 2009, and the Wisconsin Network acted immediately in 2010 to ensure that this legislation was effectively implemented by WisDOT. In early 2010, the Wisconsin Network was added to the Wisconsin DOT's stakeholder list for the Complete Streets rule-making process. An

Action Team formed and soon drafted comments on the proposed Complete Streets administrative rules that proposed changes to strengthen the impact of the legislation. These comments eventually were part of a letter to WisDOT that included sign-ons from seven advocacy organizations in addition to prominent Wisconsin-based bicycle and bicycle parts manufacturing corporations. The Wisconsin Network and other partners in Wisconsin continue to work to ensure that the legislation is successfully implemented, and that options for exemption are kept limited in the final rules.

## **2007-2009**

### ***California***

The state of California has had a complete streets policy (Deputy Directive 64) since 2001, but the policy needed strengthening. The network worked with the California Bicycle Coalition, other partners and Caltrans to provide input on the update to Caltrans' complete streets policy. The revised policy was released in the fall of 2008, and now includes accountability procedures for how complete streets should be handled at each project decision level within Caltrans.

### ***Louisiana***

Because of the devastation caused by Hurricane Katrina, the federal government provided nearly \$200 million to rebuild roads in the New Orleans area. The Louisiana Network prioritized work on this funding stream due to its size; \$200 million is 20 times greater than what is available for Safe Routes to School for the entire state over five years. The network approached the New Orleans Planning Commission to discuss how the funds could be used to improve safety around schools and to provide safe infrastructure for bicyclists and pedestrians. The commission ultimately assessed schools in New Orleans for necessary physical improvements, such as crosswalks, sidewalk repairs, signage and improvements to bicycle, pedestrian and transit infrastructure. They also established a complete streets policy for the hurricane relief funds to ensure that road repairs included facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians.

This policy ran into some roadblocks due to FHWA regulations that only allowed federal funds to be used to bring the road back to its previous condition, without the ability to make improvements that would include bicycle and pedestrian treatments. However, the Louisiana Network was able to negotiate with FHWA and the New Orleans Planning Commission to develop a novel solution: roads were rebuilt and repaired to their previous standard, but were repainted in such a way that the city can easily come back afterwards to paint bicycle lanes and crosswalks on nearly 40 miles of roadways, using non-relief funds.

The relationship that the Louisiana Network developed with the city of New Orleans also paid off in 2009. The Louisiana Network was able to secure \$11 million in federal stimulus funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to paint bicycle lanes, install sidewalks and improve street crossings throughout the city. This funding source alone will nearly double the number of miles of bicycle lanes in New Orleans from 22 to over 40 miles. This was a huge win in southern Louisiana, especially for typically underserved New Orleans neighborhoods, which were hard hit by Hurricane Katrina.

Building on the success of New Orleans' usage of hurricane relief funds for complete streets improvements, the Louisiana Senate passed Concurrent Resolution 110 in 2009. The resolution established a complete streets work group in DOTD charged with

developing a statewide policy on the design and construction of thoroughfares that maximize the ability of all Louisianans to walk, bicycle, take public transportation or drive. Nine Louisiana Network partners were selected to serve on the work group for implementation, which first convened in fall 2009. While their effort is just beginning, the work group has the potential to influence hundreds of millions of transportation dollars in Louisiana to provide safe transportation options that will improve physical activity and safety of routes to schools.

### ***New York***

In January 2008, New York Network partners met with the NYSDOT commissioner to encourage the state agency to adopt a statewide complete streets policy that would ensure that the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users are routinely accommodated as part of all roadway projects. Because it was a new concept to the NYSDOT and many in the state, and because New York allows *local control* on land use issues, the network strategically chose to start at the local level and then move statewide. New York Network members educated members of the Buffalo Common Council about how building roads with facilities for bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users increases safety and mobility options for residents. In May 2008, the council unanimously amended the city charter to create a complete streets policy for Buffalo. Surrounding Erie County followed suit in late 2008 with its own complete streets policy.

Seizing on the success in Buffalo, the New York Network developed a policy brief on complete streets that highlighted the new policy in Buffalo and distributed it to local transportation planning committees throughout the state. Network partners also made a presentation on complete streets at the New York State Metropolitan Planning Organization Association conference in July 2008.

The New York Network's education campaign and outreach inspired several pieces of state legislation. Two different complete streets bills have been introduced in the state legislature to strong support, but have not yet passed. However, assembly member Sam Hoyt sponsored A2343-B, which would allow bicycle and pedestrian projects—including those in the vicinity of schools—to be eligible for funding from an existing \$39 million pot of state highway funding that has historically been used exclusively for road projects. Governor Paterson signed the legislation into law in July 2009.

## **Curriculum**

*Statewide bicycle and pedestrian safety curricula and skills training programs can facilitate the integration of Safe Routes to School into school physical education classes and other local activities, inspiring daily physical activity and improving safety. Networks research bicycle and pedestrian curricula and funding opportunities, and advise state Departments of Transportation and Education on opportunities for quality statewide implementation.*

### **2010**

#### ***Montana***

The Montana Network identified bicycle and pedestrian safety education as a “key” to the success of Safe Routes to School in Montana. The Montana Network worked with Network partner Journeys From Home to bring forward a revision of the Montana/Florida *Elementary Traffic Education Program* that was established in late 70s by nationally-recognized curriculum development experts in both states. The curriculum is research based and was approved by the Montana State Office of Public Instruction as appropriate traffic safety education for classroom instruction for kindergarten through 5th grades. Journeys From Home is now expanding this research-based curriculum to reach through 8th grade. To promote use of the *Elementary Traffic Education Program*, the Montana Network is sponsoring teacher development trainings in both urban and rural cities throughout the state in 2010. The Montana Network is connecting these educational efforts through a Curriculum Action Team in partnership with the Montana Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, the Montana Traffic Educators Association, the Montana Office of Public Instruction and the Montana State University system. The Montana Network continues to work with health educators, traffic educators, and educational organizations to promote bicycle and pedestrian safety education throughout Montana.

#### ***Hawai'i***

The Hawaii network identified the need for pedestrian safety education in the state, in order to give elementary school students enough skill and knowledge to safely negotiate street crossings and intersections on the way to and from schools. In August 2010, the Hawaii Network launched a pedestrian safety education program, *Ped Ed*, that reached more than 400 students in the first month. *Ped Ed* is a 1 hour, standards-based pedestrian safety education curriculum for 1st, 2nd and 3rd grade students. Following the conclusion of these programs, the Hawaii Network's host organization PATH - Peoples Advocacy for Trails Hawaii--launched their train-the-trainer program statewide, training an additional 22 adult instructors. The program is now on track to reach more than 2,000 Hawaii students by the end of October 2010.

#### ***Oklahoma***

The Oklahoma Network convened an action team to research established curricula around the country and found the right one right next door: the *SafeCyclist* curriculum (formerly *Texas SuperCyclist*), developed fifteen years ago by the Texas Bicycle Coalition and used extensively throughout Texas, is a comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian safety education curriculum designed for fourth and fifth grade elementary students. The

Oklahoma Network adapted this curriculum as a key resource by removing Texas-specific language and making it more applicable to the needs and goals of Oklahoma students and schools. Beginning in the fall of 2010, the Oklahoma Network secured funding from the Centers for Disease Control through the Oklahoma State Department of Health to make the Oklahoma version of the curriculum for grades 3-5 available to Oklahoma schools.

In addition, the Oklahoma Network worked to get the nationally-recognized *WalkSmart/BikeSmart Vermont!* curriculum for grades K-2 adapted by the state; it is currently available for free download on the Oklahoma State Department of Health, Education and Transportation websites.

In addition, a field trainer program aimed at providing teacher certification training sessions around the state is underway and will enable up to 200 teachers to take the *SafeCyclist* bicycle safety instruction program back to their schools for the 2010-2011 school year. This six-hour session was approved for professional development credits by the State of Oklahoma Department of Education.

## **2007-2009**

### ***Oklahoma***

The Oklahoma state Safe Routes to School program is funding improvements to the built environment around the state, but in order to give children the skills and knowledge they need to safely and responsibly walk or bicycle to school, the Oklahoma Network adopted a bicycle safety education curriculum for Oklahoma modeled after the nationally-recognized Texas *SuperCyclist* curriculum, and with additional language from the League of American Cyclists, a national leader in bicycle safety education. In addition to bicycle safety, the Oklahoma Network researched pedestrian curricula for younger students, and selected the nationally-recognized *WalkSmart/BikeSmart Vermont!* curriculum for grades K-2. In partnership with the Oklahoma Bicycling Coalition, the Oklahoma Department of Education, Oklahoma State University's Seretean Wellness Center, and the Texas Bicycle Coalition, the Oklahoma Network worked to have the curricula adopted as part of physical education programs in the state's elementary schools. The Oklahoma Network worked with the Department of Transportation and the Department of Education to ensure that physical education teachers received training to competently implement the curricula. The Department of Transportation agreed to incorporate the curricula into the non-infrastructure portion of the state Safe Routes to School program, including a mini-grant to help low-income schools, and promoted the curricula to encourage schools and parents to embrace Safe Routes to School and generate a higher activity level among students. This effort was bolstered by the May, 2008, passing of State Senate Bill 1186 that doubles the required PE time in grades K-5, in order to provide more physical activity and lower the obesity rate in Oklahoma. [*See above for 2010 activities*]

### ***New York***

Teaching cycling skills and safe practices is a critical element of promoting cycling, especially to children, yet in 2007 few states had statewide education programs to prepare young cyclists for traffic conditions, including New York. The New York Network created a comprehensive white paper entitled *Best Practices for Bicycle Education* in July, 2009, and distributed it throughout New York. The paper describes the need for bicycle safety education, what content should be included in a curriculum, teaching

methods and process, and the training and certification opportunities in New York. There are a variety of model curricula available to bike educators, depending on the resources available. Regardless of which model educators utilize, the New York Network believed that educators throughout the state should receive training to ensure that they are teaching reliable content and practicing safe 'on-the-bike' procedures with students. Training resources available from New York Network partners include Bike New York's *Bike Driver's Ed* curriculum, League of American Bicyclist training programs offered by the New York Bicycle Coalition and Bike New York, and curricular resources offered by the Cornell Cooperative Extension service.



### ***Fine-Based Mechanisms***

*Some states and cities have produced additional revenue for state and local Safe Routes to School programs through fine-based mechanisms that increase fines for driver infractions in school zones and direct additional revenue to Safe Routes to School projects. Networks influence decision-makers to create new funding sources for traffic safety projects and programs near schools.*

### **2007-2009**

#### ***DC***

After there was a sharp increase in pedestrian fatalities in 2007, the network prioritized pedestrian safety. Network partners reached out to legislators, pedestrian advocacy groups and the city government to brainstorm solutions and discuss ways to fund pedestrian safety efforts. After learning more about the problem and potential solutions, the DC Council created a safety fund of \$1.5 million per year dedicated to pedestrian and bicycle safety measures, including making infrastructure improvements around schools. The funds can be used for traffic calming, sidewalk construction, intersection improvement, encouraging safe routes to schools, upgrading lighting, and purchasing equipment used to enforce traffic laws.

## ***Legislation Implementation***

*State SRTS networks do not lobby for new state laws, due to restrictions on network funds. However, implementation of an existing law is a policy target among the networks. This can be a critical approach, since in many cases the state public agencies affected by a new law are reluctant to implement it, or may need assistance with the implementation process.*

## **2010**

### ***California***

As the first state to enact climate change legislation (AB32 and SB375), California has been a learning ground for how to ensure that regulations on greenhouse gas emissions will provide opportunities to promote smart growth and build more bicycle and pedestrian facilities and access within communities, and to decrease car trips and promote physical activity. The California Network worked with ClimatePlan, a diverse network of organizations committed to improving land use planning in California with a focus on SB 375, to encourage the California Air Resources Board and the large metropolitan transportation organizations in California to develop high targets for greenhouse gas reduction. The California Network is also advocating for data collection techniques that will be sensitive enough to measure bicycle and pedestrian trips in the state, and how these trips reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This work could ultimately impact future climate change policy for the nation and in other states.

### ***Colorado***

The Colorado State Network has been invited by State Representative John Kefalas to work on implementing new legislation, HB1147, which he authored, requiring bicycle and pedestrian education to be taught in schools across the state. The Colorado Network has begun collaborating with the Colorado Departments of Transportation and Education to ensure that a strong curriculum is created, provided to and used by schools. According to Bicycle Colorado, the goal of the bill is “to reduce injuries to children and reduce costs to families, the state, and our health care system...the state will also benefit by increasing physical activity which reduces obesity related diseases. In today's economic climate, more Colorado adults and their children are turning to walking and bicycling as low-cost, healthy ways to get around.”

## ***Personal Safety***

*The Safe Routes to School movement is increasing the number of children walking and bicycling in neighborhoods while improving personal safety, but many parents are still too worried about the personal safety of their children to allow them to walk or bicycle to school. Fears of street crime, gangs, dogs, pedophiles, busy, speeding traffic, and bullying can all contribute to the reduction of walking and bicycling on neighborhoods sidewalks, streets and in parks. In low-income communities, personal safety issues can be a real and severe problem. The SRTS State Network project has been working to address personal safety issues in states to improve safety and the perception of safety.*

### **2010**

#### ***DC***

The District of Columbia, in order to increase safety while walking or bicycling on city streets, instituted a *Safe Passages* program at area high schools. Currently the program consists of assigning additional police officers stationed on selected corners in patrol cars during high school dismissal time in order to deter crime and bullying and foster confidence among students walking and bicycling to and from school. The DC Network is working with the DC Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Police Department to expand the program by adopting a model developed by Illinois SRTS state network partners, and identified a DC pilot school in October 2010. In the new model, DC schools will be selected in neighborhoods with high crime rates, and police officers will reach out to residents within an eight-block radius around the school. Residents will volunteer to be either eyes on the street, corner captains at arrival and dismissal times, or school volunteers/tutors/mentors. Police trainees, community volunteers and beat patrol officers will conduct door-to-door canvassing, and the DC Network will provide door hangers to reach residents who are not home during the canvassing.

#### ***Kentucky***

In summer 2010 the Kentucky Network hosted a statewide webinar on the status of various issues of personal safety impacting children in Kentucky. The webinar was focused on exploring three main topics: public awareness of personal safety issues for children such as “stranger danger”; policies and programs that can increase personal safety such as SRTS and “walking school buses”; and other community responses to improving personal safety such as reducing traffic speeds near schools. On the morning of the personal safety webinar the Kentucky state network organizer appeared on ABC36’s *Good Morning Kentucky* to discuss personal safety issues for children walking and biking to school and solutions such as SRTS programs.

#### ***Oklahoma***

The Oklahoma Network partnered with the state department of transportation, state department of health, and AAA of Oklahoma to obtain CDC funding to expand the AAA School Safety Patrol Program in Oklahoma. This funding will allow AAA to establish a program in approximately 50 additional schools (it is already in 220 Oklahoma schools) and to maintain those programs for at least two additional years after initiation. The School Safety Patrol program trains student leaders to help younger students safely negotiate intersections and street crossings near schools.

## **2007-2009**

### ***Virginia***

Crossing guards can play an important role in increasing safety and encouraging children to walk to school, but many crossing guards are volunteers and receive minimal training. As crossing guards are a significant element of many local Safe Routes to School programs, the Virginia Network worked to improve the skills and knowledge of crossing guards throughout the state. Virginia Network partners reached out to communities that had crossing guard training in place to assess existing programs. The Virginia Network adopted a standardized training curriculum, which was submitted to the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services for certification. Once certified in 2011 crossing guards across Virginia will be able to access high-quality training and to be certified as having the appropriate skills to protect children.

### ***DC***

In 2008, after the launch of the DC Safe Routes to School pilot program, there was increasing public demand for crossing guards, which play an important role in improving safety and encouraging walking and bicycling to school. The leaders of DC's crossing guard program asked the network to assist them in determining the best placement of crossing guards throughout the city. The network worked closely with the department of transportation to overhaul DC's crossing guard location placement policy to ensure that crossing guards were placed at busy intersections where larger numbers of children needed assistance safely crossing the street. By revamping the existing city policy, the DC Network contributed to the safety of DC students and addressed parent concerns about traffic safety, setting the DC Safe Routes to School program up for greater success.

## ***School Bus Funding and Cuts***

*States and school districts spend hundreds of millions of federal, state and local dollars every year to transport students to and from schools, often just very short distances. It is common practice to not bus students less than a minimum distance - such as one mile or less - in most school districts unless there is a “safety hazard”, such as a busy arterial roadway, that allows for an exception. School districts may then provide busing for those students. Safe Routes to School programs and funding can improve the safety problem, thereby reducing the need for hazard busing. Networks work to change funding formulas and to promote installing SRTS safety treatments, thereby potentially saving school districts a lot of money, reducing congestion and air pollution around schools and improving safety and increasing physical activity.*

### **2010**

#### ***Missouri***

The Missouri Network convened an Action Team to research the issue of school transportation funding in the state. The Action Team requested and received a detailed analysis of Missouri Transportation Funding Formulas from the National Policy and Legal Analysis Network. The analysis gives four specific policy changes the Missouri Network can work to implement, which would fundamentally change the culture of school transportation to encourage more bicycling and walking, rather than discouraging bicycling and walking, as current policies do. The Missouri Network is creating a position paper in order to introduce these ideas into the state's public policy discussion about school transportation funding in Missouri. The Missouri Network is also working with a few key school districts to create pilot projects to showcase how the policy changes can reduce school bus expense and increase physical activity.

#### ***Illinois***

House Joint Resolution 6 required the creation of a School Transportation Task Force to examine multi-modal school transportation plans and to study potential legislative changes. In January 2010, Illinois Governor Patrick Quinn appointed the Illinois State Network Organizer to the School Transportation Task Force. The Task Force held its first meeting in May 2010. The Task Force is looking at ways to use hazardous route busing funds to mitigate hazards, increase the rate of walking and bicycling to school in Illinois and to save the state money on school transportation costs. The Task Force submitted recommendations on June 30, 2010 and is waiting for next steps from the Governor's Office. *[See below for 2007-2009 activities]*

### **2007-2009**

#### ***Illinois***

In many communities across Illinois, children are bused short distances to school—even just across the street—because of traffic safety hazards. Starting in the winter of 2008, the Illinois Network began educating state-level decision-makers about the prevalence of “hazard busing” and the financial costs to the state and to local school districts. In May, 2009, state legislators passed House Joint Resolution 6 to require the creation of a

School Transportation Task Force to examine multi-modal school transportation plans and to study potential legislative changes. Governor Pat Quinn, who as Lt. Governor was the chair of the network, has the authority to appoint five of the 13 appointments to the task force. The Illinois Network submitted a list of recommended task force members to the Governor. *[See above for 2010 activities]*

## ***School Siting and Joint Use***

*Only about 33 percent of elementary and middle school students in the United States live within two miles of their school. Statewide policies on where schools are located, minimum campus acreage requirements, joint-use of facilities, and funding formulas on renovation versus new construction, can profoundly impact the percentage of students who live within walking or bicycling distance of their school. Networks educate decision-makers and state agencies about the benefits of community-centered schools, facilitate cross-agency collaboration, and work to change policies to protect and encourage community-centered schools.*

### **2010**

#### ***Kentucky***

In order to increase opportunities for physical activity, the Kentucky Network is working to promote joint use policies and agreements that allow schools and communities to partner together to share recreational facilities, with a special focus on how joint-use agreements benefit urban and rural areas, especially for lower-income communities that may not have adequate recreational facilities. In 2009, the Kentucky Network jump-started the issue by developing a fact sheet on Joint Use Policies in Kentucky, which it distributed statewide through various list serves and other channels. In March 2010, the Kentucky Network continued to conduct outreach and educate policymakers by hosting a statewide webinar on joint-use agreements. In addition, the Kentucky Network spoke on joint-use agreements to nearly a hundred participants at the Kentucky Coordinated School Health Institute in July, 2010.

Kentucky Network partners, including Kentucky Youth Advocates, the Kentucky Cancer Consortium and the American Heart Association-Kentucky Chapter collaborated in September 2010 to successfully write a five-year, \$175,000 grant to build upon the joint-use policy efforts of the Kentucky Network. A significant portion of this grant will fund a statewide baseline assessment of joint-use agreements across the state of Kentucky. The partners will then gather input on joint-use policy barriers and opportunities in Kentucky, and provide technical assistance to support schools in developing their own agreements. Finally, the Kentucky Network will develop a set of recommendations on how policymakers can encourage and fully exploit joint-use of schools and community facilities across the state of Kentucky.

#### ***Louisiana***

In order to create a statewide conversation about school siting in Louisiana, and to identify challenges and policy targets on the subject, the Louisiana Network organized a School Siting Summit on July 22, 2010. The Summit was sponsored by the College of Urban and Public Affairs at the University of New Orleans and Tulane University's Cowen Institute. The Summit brought together dozens of professionals and individuals from a variety of fields including planning, public health, historic preservation, education, and more. The Summit was part of a Helping Johnny Walk to School grant the Louisiana Network won from the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Environmental Protection Agency. Participants developed a number of recommendations on steps that school officials should take to promote community-based schools and good school siting decisions. The Louisiana Network used those recommendations to create a fact sheet to influence local school siting policy, targeted to local and state school officials, which was distributed in fall 2010 to every district superintendent and school board president in Louisiana. The Louisiana Network also

created and distributed a similar document to state school board members that shows how the Department of Education can promote community-centered schools.

**Maryland:** The Maryland Network is working closely with Maryland’s Interagency Committee on Public School Construction, the Department of Planning, and the Department of Education to identify ways to improve school siting and site plans. The Maryland Network is providing input on metrics for new construction and building renovation projects that are used to evaluate local school sites submitted for capital funds from the state, and is encouraging the state to have local jurisdictions submit information about the transportation network surrounding schools, including how students are expected to arrive at school and school busing costs. In September 2010 the Maryland Network also gave a presentation to state and county facility planners about key issues in school planning and the importance of ensuring that school district transportation offices coordinate plans for school facilities with their local planning and transportation agencies.

### **Virginia**

In 2010 the Virginia Network recommended that the Virginia Department of Education include the promotion of walking and bicycling to school in its revised *Public School Facility Guidelines*. The department’s staff responded favorably, and subsequently inserted school siting language, although the final draft of the *Public School Facility Guidelines* was missing the new school siting language. The Virginia Network quickly responded, requesting that the language be reinserted, which prompted the administration to move to approve and post the revised guidelines for public consumption. For example, the *Public School Facility Guidelines* school siting language now includes this passage:

*Where possible, locate new schools in attendance areas that will promote students to walk or ride bicycles safely to school. When developing a new school site or altering an existing site the design should include features that encourage pedestrian or bicycle access to and from the school site.*

## **2007-2009**

### **Georgia**

In September 2009 the Georgia Network invited the state Department of Education to discuss school siting guidelines in the state. Georgia Department of Education policy allows for local control on school location decisions, and the state department reviews for compliance with state guidelines. The department met with the Georgia Network and subsequently invited the Network to propose new school siting language to be inserted into the state’s guidelines document. Once new language is approved by the department, the Georgia Network will conduct an outreach campaign to notify local decision makers of the new school siting policy language.

### **Illinois**

The Illinois Network prioritized school siting as a key issue for Safe Routes to School, as distance to school is one of the most difficult barriers to overcome in promoting walking and bicycling. In partnership with the Healthy Schools Campaign and the Office of then-Lt. Governor Pat Quinn (currently Governor), the Illinois Network secured a \$6,000



grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation to support the *Sustainable Schools in Illinois* project. The goal of the grant is to help the Illinois Network promote community-centered schools as anchors for sustainable development, smart growth and reduced school transportation costs. As Lt. Governor, Quinn convened several groups as part of the project, including a sustainable schools policy working group (fall 2008), a Sustainable Schools Symposium (February 2009) and a public listening and networking session (spring 2009). The Illinois Network wrote a school siting white paper based on the information gained from these working groups and events. The paper was completed in fall 2009, and the Illinois Network has made it available to school districts and school boards throughout the state.

## **State SRTS Program**

*The federal funds for Safe Routes to School flow from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to the state DOTs. How the state departments administer the millions of dollars of federal funding has a profound impact on the quality of local programs and whether the funding reaches underserved communities. This is critical because of its potential to increase physical activity among children, especially those most affected by or at the greatest risk for childhood obesity. Networks provide guidance on application guidelines, outreach and implementation processes and raise awareness of the program among potential applicants.*

### **2010**

**Maryland:** In order to better support the processing of infrastructure project applications through the Department of Transportation's state SRTS program, the Maryland Network successfully pushed for and has supported ongoing collaboration between the Highway Safety Office & the Office of Highway Development. The Maryland Network also created a listserv to allow for communication between SRTS grant recipients about the challenges they encounter, best practices, and upcoming trainings and promotional events. In September 2010, a pre-application training workshop was hosted by the state SRTS program; the Maryland Network was instrumental in outreach and promotion throughout the state, and subsequently nearly every county in Maryland had a representative at the workshop.

**Minnesota:** The Minnesota Network is working closely with the newly hired Active Transportation Coordinator at the Minnesota Department of Health to review current state policy impacting Safe Routes to School. The Coordinator is funded through CDC funds and their scope of work specifically focuses on a long-term policy strategy to make Safe Routes to School funding and programming more sustainable and less reliant upon federal funds. By researching the current status of SRTS-related policies and funding in Minnesota, and by exploring best practices from other states, the Minnesota Network will identify a strategy to improve state policies directly related to promoting and funding local Safe Routes to School programs.

**Wisconsin:** The Wisconsin Network has developed a strong working relationship with the state SRTS program and was invited to participate in the state SRTS Advisory Committee starting in early 2010. Recognizing that a Call for Applications was likely in late 2010, the Wisconsin Network convened an action team in mid-2010 to analyze the WisDOT SRTS application process and its accessibility to low-income communities. It was determined that due to strong outreach efforts, extra points in grant scoring for low-income communities, and the availability of planning grants, the Wisconsin SRTS program is indeed serving a diverse range of communities.

The Wisconsin Network also worked with the State SRTS program to plan and deliver a series of four training sessions focused on two Wisconsin Department of Transportation funding programs for walking and biking, Transportation Enhancements and Safe Routes to School, that have since awarded over 36 million dollars in funds to Wisconsin communities in 2010. Over 100 people attended the sessions, located in key regions across the state. The Wisconsin Network wanted to ensure that at least one of these sessions was assisting a low-income community and convinced WisDOT to select

Milwaukee as one of the sites. The goal of these sessions was to create demand for both programs, encourage high quality projects, and to ensure that communities across the state apply for state SRTS funds, especially low-income communities. From these sessions, it became clear that there is high demand and interest in SRTS; the state SRTS program received over 15 million dollars of requests for just six million dollars in funding for this cycle.

## **2007-2009**

### ***California***

The California Network assisted the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in revising its Safe Routes to School program application guidelines to create better geographic equity and a stronger local decision-making process. The California Network successfully recommended that health, education and law enforcement be represented on each of the 12 Caltrans District Selection Committees, so that the decision-making for grant awards was not done solely by internal engineering staff.

Once the first set of federal grants (2005-2009 cycle) had been awarded, the California Network fielded critical feedback from recipients of non-infrastructure funds (Education, Encouragement, Enforcement and Evaluation) about how to finalize the contract and meet regulatory requirements. The California Network helped Caltrans develop a 14-step checklist to demystify the implementation process, and got the contract deadline extended so that recipients were able to take advantage of state funding. To track the effectiveness of the new checklist in expediting the implementation process, the California Network receives regular reports and presentations from Caltrans showing how each grant recipient is progressing on implementation.

### ***District of Columbia***

Even though FHWA had been authorizing Safe Routes to School funds to the District of Columbia (DC) since 2005, the DC Department of Transportation (DDOT) was slow to launch the program. As of February 2008, DDOT was still sitting on more than \$3 million in federal Safe Routes to School funds. The DC Network conducted a letter writing and phone campaign to encourage DDOT to expedite development and implementation of the program. In May 2008, DDOT announced that they would test implementation of Safe Routes to School through a pilot program that would serve at least one school in each of the city's eight wards.

The DC Network served as a critical resource for DDOT during the establishment of the program. The DC Network was selected to serve as the DC Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee to advise DDOT on program development, implementation and selection of applicants. In the initial application process, 13 mostly lower-income schools applied for participation in the pilot. The DC Network was able to persuade DDOT to select all 13 schools for participation, rather than the intended 10 schools, by leveraging additional financial support from the DC City Council. The selected schools were announced in August 2008, after the DC Network convinced Mayor Fenty that expediting the program launch before the start of the school year would allow for more effective Safe Routes to School implementation.

The DC Network has continued to sustain support among city officials for Safe Routes to School through a variety of methods, including by spearheading a DC Safe Routes to School resolution and a Walk to School Day resolution in 2008.

DC Network inspired SRTS support from city officials has literally paid off. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) provided states and DC with millions in transportation funds meant to stimulate the economy. Even though it was not a requirement of the law, DDOT chose to dedicate 3 percent of their highway stimulus funds—a total of \$4 million—to Safe Routes to School infrastructure improvements throughout the city. As the federal Safe Routes to School funding to DC is \$5 million over five years, the stimulus funds provided a significant boost to Safe Routes to School in the city.

### **Georgia**

The Georgia Network's primary challenge was getting the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) to launch the Safe Routes to School program. Three years after the 2005 inception of the federal Safe Routes to School program, in summer 2008, GDOT had still not awarded a single grant or even released a call for applications for funding. The Georgia Network embarked upon an intensive series of activities to bring attention to this issue. Georgia Network partners wrote letters to the state Commissioner of Transportation and met with a GDOT board member. Georgia Network partners also spoke with their U.S. Congressional delegation about the delay. As a result, 10 of Georgia's 13 representatives wrote a joint letter to GDOT requesting an immediate launch of the Safe Routes to School program to help address the high rates of obesity among Georgia children.

When the congressional letter still did not result in any movement by GDOT, the Georgia Network opted to go public and engage the media. In September 2008, the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* published a prominent editorial discussing how at a time when many school districts were cutting back on busing due to rising fuel prices, GDOT was holding onto \$17 million in federal funds meant to make it safer for children walking and bicycling to school. The GDOT commissioner wrote a same-day response editorial laying out a timeline for the launch of the Safe Routes to School program. Just one month later, in October 2008, GDOT announced a call for applications and Georgia's first Safe Routes to School grants were announced in May 2009. Now that the Safe Routes to School program has made its first awards, the Georgia Network has shifted its focus to implementation to ensure that the remainder of the \$17 million is spent well.

## **Strategic Highway Safety Plans**

*In 2005, the federal government established a new Highway Safety Improvement Program requirement to significantly reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries on public roads. Some of this funding can be spent on bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements near schools, but most state departments of transportation prioritize highway and auto safety spending instead of projects that facilitate safe bicycling or walking. Strategic Highway Safety Plans (SHSP), are statewide, comprehensive, data-driven plans that provide a coordinated framework for reducing fatalities and serious injuries on each state's public roads. SHSP's establish statewide goals, objectives, and strategies to address safety needs, and influence the spending of tens of millions of dollars of each state's federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds. Networks get bicycling and walking language inserted into Strategic Highway Safety Plans, and secure dedicated funding for these types of safety improvements.*

### **2010**

#### **Hawaii**

Hawaii had the fifth highest pedestrian fatality rate and second highest bicyclist fatality rate in the nation between 2001-2005. These rates make the Hawaii Strategic Highway Safety Plan of major importance for increasing safety in the state. The Hawaii Network Chair, working for the Hawaii Department of Health, is the Chair for *Emphasis Area #4: Pedestrian and Bicycling Safety* for the *Hawaii Strategic Highway Safety Plan*.

Through this leadership role, the Hawaii Network successfully attracted \$5,000 in federal safety funds in 2010 to co-host a Bicycle Facility Design Seminar with the Federal Highway Administration's Hawaii Division, the Hawaii Local Technical Assistance Program and the Department of Health. The seminar was taught by two notable experts in pedestrian and bicycle facility design: the lead author of Part 7, *Schools*, of the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) and the lead author of a prominent national Pedestrian Facilities guide. The seminar attracted state and local transportation leaders, was sold out, and received excellent evaluative feedback. Participants noted that the training helped them to better understand how to incorporate bicycle facilities into their local roadways designs.

In September 2010, the Hawaii Network also hosted a three-day first-in-state Pedestrian Safety Action Plan Workshop with the same instructors in Hilo, Hawaii, which produced a draft Pedestrian Safety Action Plan for Hawaii County, including a strong emphasis on the importance of funding and fostering Safe Routes to School programs. The workshop included a walk audit of Kapiolani Elementary school in Hilo, Hawaii with critique and analysis among attendees for how to better support Safe Routes to School solutions.

#### **California**

The California Network is working to ensure that a greater percentage of Highway Safety Improvement Program funds are allocated to bicycle and pedestrian needs through the *Strategic Highway Safety Plan*, as these modes represent 20% of traffic fatalities in California. [See below for 2007-2009 activities] Caltrans, the state department of transportation, revealed that 27% of Local Assistance Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) projects have bicycle and pedestrian features in them, a tangible step towards a Fair Share for Safety. The California Network also reviewed and provided

feedback on the Strategic Highway Safety Plan Index Model in April, 2010, and is working to ensure that pedestrian and bicycle projects are competitive with other road projects submitted for HSIP funding. In July 2010, California Network partners participated in a 3 day “train the trainer” session on developing a *Pedestrian Safety Action Plan*, in Delano, California. The California Network also participated in the planning committee for the Statewide Pedestrian Data and Modeling conference in August and September 2010.

## **2007-2009**

### ***California***

In California, bicycle and pedestrian deaths on average represent 20 percent of the total traffic fatalities in the state. To ensure that bicycle and pedestrian projects received a fair share of the millions of dollars in federal traffic safety funding, California Network partners participated in the *CA 8: Making Walking and Street Crossing Safer*, *CA 13: Improve Bicycling Safety*, and *CA 7: Improve Intersection and Interchange Safety for Roadway Users*, Challenge Area working groups during the creation of the state’s *Strategic Highway Safety Plan*, and succeeded in getting Safe Routes to School listed as the number one priority for the walking challenge area.

### ***Kentucky***

The Kentucky Network selected the state’s *Strategic Highway Safety Plan* as an important priority because the plan—which drives the allocation of tens of millions of federal safety dollars each year—did not include any provisions for safety of pedestrians or cyclists when it was first adopted in 2006. As the Plan was scheduled for an update in 2008, it was an opportune time. The Kentucky Network approached the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) and made the case that leaving bicycle and pedestrian safety out of the Plan was a critical oversight. But after several months of delay, KYTC dropped the effort to update the Plan altogether, without further explanation.

In fall 2010, the Kentucky Network attended a meeting with the Governor’s Executive Committee on Highway Safety where the focus of discussion was updating the *Strategic Highway Safety Plan* for the next 5 years. There is still no mention of bicycle and pedestrian issues in the draft update Plan. The Kentucky Network is preparing comments to submit to the Kentucky Transportation Secretary concerning the lack of bicycle and pedestrian components. The Kentucky Network is working with a Network partner organization that is on the Committee to submit comments.

## ***Supporting Low-Income Communities***

*Children from low-income families are twice as likely to walk to school as children from higher-income families. And they face greater risks – children from low-income households have a higher risk of being injured or killed as pedestrians. It's critical that SRTS funds reach low income schools and communities to help improve safety, however, these communities may not know that funding is available, or they may lack access to city or county engineering staff with the expertise necessary to implement the project and comply with federal and state regulatory processes. The SRTS State Network project is working to ensure that the communities most vulnerable to childhood obesity and safety issues are served through SRTS funding.*

### **2010**

#### ***California***

In February 2010, California Governor Schwarzenegger announced that as part of his childhood obesity initiative, he would focus on SRTS and serving low-income communities. He directed Caltrans to do an analysis of past SRTS grants, to see how the funds are being distributed throughout the state. The final report released in December 2010 shows that 44% of SRTS infrastructure grants and 35% of total grants have been awarded to low income communities, which represent 33.6% of the statewide population. The Network has also been working with the CA Department of Public Health Active Communities department, which received a \$4M grant from Caltrans to provide technical assistance to communities throughout the state working on SRTS, with a highlight on serving low income communities.

#### ***District of Columbia***

In conjunction with the DDOT SRTS program, the DC Network prepared a SRTS FAQ sheet for distribution in 2010 to school principals in low-income communities, which make up a majority of DC's total population. The DC Network met with the Education Chancellor's office to garner their support for the SRTS program and to encourage school officials and parent volunteers to apply for SRTS funds from the DDOT program. Due in part to this outreach, 13 low-income schools applied for SRTS funds through DDOT.

#### ***Missouri***

Recognizing the need to ensure that the state Safe Routes to School program is reaching low-income communities in Missouri, the Missouri Network convened an Action Team earlier this year. Key partners on this action team include: the state SRTS coordinator, The Whole Person, a Kansas-City based disability rights organization, a retired teacher from the Kansas City School District, and the Metro St. Louis Coalition for Equality. The Low-Income Communities Action Team has been meeting with local leaders to determine some of the barriers to funding in Missouri's low-income communities, and is currently working on tactics for improving outreach and funding to low-income communities in Missouri.

In summer 2010 the Missouri Network began an intensive research project to identify how SRTS is or is not currently serving low-income and minority populations. Members of the Low-Income Communities Action Team have assimilated low-income and minority data related to each of the MoDOT SRTS award recipients and International

Walk to School Day participants. Data from this project was analyzed and written into a report, coupled with a one-page summary, and released in November 2010. The Action Team will present the data and a list of policy recommendations to MoDOT SRTS program and other Network partners. Initial findings indicate that low-income schools are not applying for and receiving Safe Routes to School funding in Missouri at the same levels as moderate- to high-income schools. The data shows that of the 135 SRTS grants awarded to date, totaling \$12 million, 81 grants went to schools with a free-or-reduced lunch population below 50%, whereas just 50 grants went to schools with a free-or-reduced lunch population of greater than 50%.

### ***Virginia***

In 2010 the Virginia Network successfully leveraged \$150,000 of funding from the Centers for Disease Control & Prevention through the Virginia Department of Health, for mini-grants for up to 75 Title 1, or low-income, schools throughout the state. The mini-grants are designed to provide seed money for schools to coordinate a walk or bike to school event as an initial step toward developing a comprehensive Safe Routes to School program.

### **2007-2009**

*No data, this issue is new for 2010.*



## **Wellness**

*The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 required school districts participating in the National School Lunch Program or other child nutrition programs to adopt and implement a wellness policy. One requirement is that the wellness policies include goals for increasing physical activity levels of students. Some states have developed model wellness policies, which provide an important avenue for linking Safe Routes to School to increasing student physical activity levels. Local school wellness policies can also be a means of institutionalizing Safe Routes to School within schools. Networks work to insert Safe Routes to School language into state model policies and promote Safe Routes to School to school district wellness committees.*

### **2010**

#### **Virginia**

The Virginia Network was instrumental in encouraging the state Department of Education to include SRTS language into its wellness programs, and in 2009, the department began to capture survey information from schools around the state that encourage walking and biking within their wellness policies. The Virginia Network is now embarking upon a project with the Department of Education to develop a presentation or webinar to give to school wellness committees, focusing on best practices for implementing SRTS in schools.

### **2007-2009**

#### **Georgia**

The Georgia Network quickly realized the opportunity presented by federally-mandated school district wellness policies. Georgia Network partners worked together to spread the word to school district personnel throughout the state about the role Safe Routes to School can play in student wellness efforts. After receiving information from the Georgia Network, the Georgia Department of Education added information about Safe Routes to School to their presentations and materials on wellness policies that were used at three education conferences in the summer of 2008. The Georgia Network continues to monitor the implementation of wellness policies and provide advice to schools about how to include Safe Routes to School into the physical activity component of local school wellness policies.

#### **Kentucky**

According to the latest *F as in Fat: 2009* report from the Trust for America's Health, Kentucky ranks fourth for the percentage of children who are obese and overweight. These alarming statistics have drawn attention across the state. In response, the Kentucky Network prioritized working with school districts to show them how Safe Routes to School programs can increase physical activity, help students achieve daily physical activity goals and help address the obesity epidemic. The Chair of the Kentucky Network, Lt. Governor Daniel Mongiardo, approached some non-network organizations with broad reach into school systems and ultimately engaged the help of the Kentucky Department of Public Health's Wellness & Health Promotions Branch, the Built Environment Committee of the Partnership for a Fit Kentucky, the Department of Education's Coordinated School Health program and Action for Healthy Kids. Together, the Kentucky Network and these additional partners are advocating that schools

throughout Kentucky add SRTS-specific language into their wellness policies. The Kentucky Network continues the push on this policy, and presented at three statewide conferences in 2009 targeted to health and education personnel: the Health Coordinators conference, the Action for Healthy Kids conference and the Growing Healthy Kids conference.

## **Regional Networks**

*The Regional Network Project launched in Southern California and the Washington DC region in January 2010 (Atlanta, Georgia will launch in January 2011), thanks to funding from Kaiser Permanente. These three regional networks operate within jurisdictions that also have a SRTS State Network (CA, DC, GA), and leadership is provided by the same contracted organization or a SRTS National Partnership staffer, for both policy change efforts. The regional networks work to improve their regional government's Regional Transportation Plan, create champions among the county commissioners who lead their regional government, and also work to ensure that the regional jurisdictions –counties and cities – implement and augment these plans, to create support and funding for SRTS and related programs and projects.*

### **2010**

#### **Atlanta, Georgia**

In June 2010 the SRTS National Partnership embarked upon strategic state and regional network positioning in Georgia, working with Georgia Network leaders to assess the structure of the Georgia Network and to prepare to launch the Atlanta Regional Network, focusing on the Atlanta Regional Commission's *Regional Transportation Plan*. As part of the State Network Project since 2007, the Georgia Network has realized some notable policy successes, including the successful push to get the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) SRTS program launched in 2008, after three years of delay. The Georgia Network also recognizes the significant need in Georgia and the Atlanta region to promote SRTS as a health initiative; in November 2010 the SRTS National Partnership worked out an agreement with the National Association of Chronic Disease Directors (NACDD) to facilitate the Georgia state and regional project beginning in January 2011. NACDD also hosts the Florida SRTS Network and has proven its effectiveness there. This national health organization is headquartered in Atlanta and has significant connections to the Georgia health community, a feature that will undoubtedly strengthen the Georgia Network's efforts to grow as a policy change leader in Georgia and to promote SRTS as a health initiative. Georgia Bikes! will chair the Georgia Network and Atlanta Regional Network in 2011, continuing the network's strong connections to the transportation sector.

#### **Southern California**

##### **Building a Coalition of Stakeholders**

The Southern California Regional Network began in January 2010 by recruiting partners and developing champions through key meetings, conferences and events, and has since grown into a coalition of more than 250 partners. The SoCal Regional Network presented at the *LA StreetSummit 2010* in March 2010, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Agency's *Metro 2010 Pedestrian Symposium* May 2010, Los Angeles Mayor's Bike Summit August 2010, a Riverside County Health Coalition meeting in October 2010, and *Mobility 21*, an annual regional transportation summit, in October, 2010, marking the first time *Mobility 21* has had a bicycle and pedestrian perspective included in their conference agenda. The SoCal Regional Network was also featured in the following news outlets in 2010: LA Daily News, KPCC, Streetsblog and CityFix.

### **Setting the Stage**

The Southern California Regional Network developed a Policy Platform and an Action Plan to carry out its Platform goals, with a specific focus on the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) *Regional Transportation Plan*, which in prior years only dedicated 0.5% of funding to walking and bicycling while these modes represent more than 12% of trips in the region. The SoCal Regional Network solicited input on the draft platform from all six County Transportation Commission CEO's and their key staff. The SoCal Regional Network will begin soliciting formal endorsements of the platform by stakeholder organizations in early 2011, and conducting more outreach to SCAG's staff and Regional Commissioners.

### **Building County Support: Los Angeles Metro**

An early policy success began in fall 2010 when the SoCal Regional Network was asked by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Agency's sustainability team to present on the importance of Complete Streets and ideas and strategies for developing a citywide strategic Safe Routes to School plan. The SoCal Regional Network Organizer also testified before the Los Angeles Transportation Committee on the benefits of funds to develop a data-driven citywide SRTS Plan. This SoCal Regional Network outreach has made a difference; while still in draft form, the *2010 City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan* includes significant input from the SoCal Regional Network on language pertaining to SRTS and complete streets, including development of a strategic citywide SRTS plan. The 2010 Plan designates an ambitious 1680-mile bikeway system and introduces a commitment to increase, improve and enhance bicycling in the city as a safe, healthy, and enjoyable means of transportation and recreation. In support of this commitment are three goals: to increase the number and types of bicyclists who bicycle in the City, make every street a safe place to ride a bicycle, and make the City of Los Angeles a bicycle friendly community.

### **Greater Washington D.C. Metropolitan Area**

#### **Setting the Stage**

The Greater Washington DC Area Regional Network, founded in January 2010, finalized a Policy Platform and an Action Plan in June 2010 to carry out its platform goals, with a specific focus on the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments' (MWCOC) *Regional Transportation Plan*. The DC Regional Network has already achieved an early policy success by convincing the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) to recognize and support Safe Routes to School in the region. DC Regional Network outreach to the TPB staff and comments submitted by the regional network resulted in the TPB directing their staff to keep member jurisdictions informed and aware of the availability of SRTS funding and to work to add SRTS projects as separate line items in the MWCOC's Transportation Improvement Program.

#### **Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan**

In early 2010, public input was being solicited by the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board's (TPB) Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee for the update of the *Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region*. The Plan identifies the capital improvements, studies, actions, and strategies that the region proposes to carry out by 2030 for major bicycle and pedestrian facilities. This is the first all-new regional plan specifically for bicycle facilities since 1995, and represents the first-ever regional pedestrian facilities plan. In February of 2010, the DC Regional Network worked with the Washington Area Bicyclists Association to draft language that

highlighted SRTS as a significant new program within the Plan. The language as written was adopted *in full* by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee and was subsequently adopted by the Transportation Planning Board. The Plan was published in late-October 2010 and now includes goals to implement SRTS and complete streets, both within the context of regional transportation planning and as best practices to prioritize into the future.

### **Building County Support: Fairfax, Prince Georges and Montgomery**

In 2011, with the recently adopted Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region as a guidance tool, the DC Regional Network will work with staff in the individual counties on implementing policies that will further support SRTS. The DC Regional Network has identified Fairfax County, Virginia, and Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland as key targets for 2011, and has scheduled meetings and presentations with decision makers from these three large counties to build support for policies that will advance SRTS and bicyclist and pedestrian programs and projects.

### **Fairfax County, Virginia**

In October 2010 the DC Regional Network met with Fairfax supervisor Catherine Hudgins to discuss specific actions to take to advance SRTS projects in the county. Subsequently, supervisors Hudgins and McKay have begun championing SRTS and want “The Board of Supervisors and the School Board...to address these issues more comprehensively looking specifically at the areas of transportation, safety and the environment”. In March the DC Regional Network will present to the Board of Supervisors on developing SRTS projects and programs and applying for state SRTS funding.