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Executive Summary

“Safe Routes to School” efforts create streets that safely accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, coupling infrastructure improvements with education, encouragement, and other programs designed to make walking and biking safer and more desirable.

With the overarching goals of improving safety and encouraging active transportation, Safe Routes to School efforts improve health, reduce transportation costs, and decrease school-related vehicle trips, thus improving air quality and reducing traffic congestion near schools. Safe Routes to School efforts also teach children healthy lifestyle skills and heighten public awareness about the benefits of active transportation.

To further realize these benefits, the Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan) proposes a blueprint for a regional strategy to make walking and bicycling to and from school safer and facilitate the development of more attractive travel choices for families throughout the region.

Safe Routes to School initiatives support the regional objectives of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP and SCS) by creating walkable and bicycle-friendly communities, encouraging active transportation to reduce vehicle trips and improve public health.
THE CHARGE FOR A REGIONAL STRATEGY

Safe Routes to School efforts support the regional objectives of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP and SCS) by creating walkable and bicycle-friendly communities, encouraging active transportation to reduce vehicle trips and improve public health.

To enhance the region’s existing efforts, the Strategic Plan identifies a strategy to support local communities in establishing new Safe Routes to School programs as well as sustaining and enhancing existing efforts. A regional strategy will ensure that the tools provided are germane and that resources are focused in areas across the region with the greatest need for assistance.

A REGIONAL SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL STRATEGY

SANDAG began developing the Strategic Plan in September 2010 with funding through the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) Healthy Works program, a multi-faceted initiative addressing rising obesity rates in the region by increasing access to healthy foods and promoting physical activity.

The planning process has engaged key stakeholders and the region’s residents in the development of the Strategic Plan through a variety of venues. The strategy proposed in the plan reflects input received as well as reviews of best practices and existing conditions.

The recommended strategy consists of the following elements:
**Regional Planning and Evaluation** – Integrating Safe Routes to School into regional planning efforts establishes a vision for Safe Routes to School throughout the region and advances the regional goals of monitoring, projecting, and promoting active transportation. Within this category, recommendations include establishing an ongoing Safe Routes to School data collection and evaluation program, and activities to underscore the importance of Safe Routes to School in promoting active transportation, complete streets, and smart growth.

**Collaboration and Coordination** – The ultimate success and reach of this strategy is largely contingent on engaging in partnerships and collaborating with agencies and organizations that are intimately connected to school communities and knowledgeable about school issues. Two actions are recommended to improve regional coordination and information sharing: establish a regional Safe Routes to School coordinator position; and sustain the San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Coalition assembled in conjunction with the development of the Strategic Plan. Beginning in April 2011, multiple agencies have partnered to establish the Regional Safe Routes to School Coalition that serves as a forum to connect agencies and organizations involved in implementing Safe Routes to School.

**Technical Assistance** – Providing trainings and other forms of technical assistance helps ensure that programs are comprehensive, effective, and sustainable. Recommended programs in the area of technical assistance include Safe Routes to School planning workshops, seminars and trainings, and professional Safe Routes to School planning services.

**Education and Encouragement** – Identifying and administering select education and encouragement programs, such as the iCommute SchoolPool program, provides communities beneficial tools that might otherwise be too costly or burdensome for local administration. Also, serving as an information clearinghouse to local jurisdictions, schools districts, and schools facilitates local Safe Routes to School program development and maintenance. Proposed education and encouragement actions involve enhancing Web-based tools and information to encourage walking and biking to school, conducting outreach and promotional campaigns, and providing education programs.

The Strategic Plan addresses several of the region’s significant and interrelated issues including escalating childhood obesity rates, safety concerns, transportation costs, traffic congestion, and clean air. By promoting effective and coordinated Safe Routes to School programs, this strategy responds to these challenges, thus improving the overall quality of life in the San Diego region.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“Safe Routes to School” refers to a spectrum of programs and built environment improvements used together to foster opportunities for students to walk and bike to school safely and routinely.

In addition to the overarching goals of improving safety and increasing physical activity, Safe Routes to School efforts improve health, reduce transportation costs, and decrease school-related vehicle trips thus improving air quality and reducing traffic congestion near our schools. Safe Routes to School efforts also teach children healthy lifestyle skills and heighten public awareness about the built environment, air quality, health, and quality of life benefits associated with these programs.
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Safe Routes to School efforts improve health, reduce transportation costs, and decrease school-related vehicle trips thus improving air quality and reducing traffic congestion near our schools.
This chapter of the Strategic Plan introduces the concept of Safe Routes to School, how the concept has evolved over time, and it describes how the plan was developed and highlights the specific goals of the strategy.

THE “FIVE E’S” OF SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

Safe Routes to School programs utilize five strategies: planning and evaluation, infrastructure improvements, enforcement of safe motorist, pedestrian, and bicyclist behaviors, education, and activities that encourage children to walk and bicycle to school. Comprehensive Safe Routes to School programs encompass all of these components commonly referred to as the 5 E’s (engineering, education, enforcement, encouragement, and evaluation).

Engineering

The engineering element of Safe Routes to School refers to the design, construction, and maintenance of traffic control devices, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, traffic calming measures, and other modifications to the built environment aimed at enhancing safety around school areas. Common improvements include installing school area signage, high visibility crosswalks, flashing yellow beacons, and traffic calming measures such as landscaped roundabouts, curb extensions, and chicanes. Use of school area infrastructure improvements is guided by engineering analysis and several design guidelines and manuals including Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, Model Guidelines for the San Diego Region and the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, particularly Part 7, Traffic Controls for School Areas.
Education

Education is a cornerstone of Safe Routes to School. It involves teaching students traffic safety skills and laws, personal security measures, as well as health and environmental lessons. Material is presented in a variety of formats including skills practice in a simulated streetscape setting, school assemblies, and ongoing classroom coursework. Integrating Safe Routes to School education into physical education, health, and science curriculums exposes students to the health and environmental benefits of active transportation. Public awareness campaigns can also educate the general public about the benefits associated with Safe Routes to School and the critical importance of operating motor vehicles more safely, especially in school zones. Providing the educational information in alternative languages for those with limited English skills can help ensure all members of the community have the opportunity to learn about Safe Routes to School. Educating neighbors and parents on the goals and benefits of Safe Routes to School is essential to program success.

Encouragement

Closely related to education, encouragement efforts are designed to increase walking and biking to school by generating enthusiasm, highlighting the benefits of active transportation, and increasing the convenience of using alternatives to driving students to school. Encouragement activities include special events, such as “Walk and Bike to School Day”, coordinated walking and biking groups, promotional campaigns, student competitions and incentives. Many of these initiatives incorporate an educational component. For example, “Walk Across America” can integrate geography, math, and science lessons into this classroom-based competition by calculating and
Tracking classes’ weekly walking miles across a map, studying destinations they travel through, and learning about the air quality benefits derived from their walk trips.

**Enforcement**

Enforcing compliance with traffic and parking laws is another aspect of Safe Routes to School. Enforcement activities target unsafe driving behavior, such as speeding, failing to yield to pedestrians and bicyclists, as well as illegal parking and turns in school areas. In addition to motorists’ behaviors, enforcement includes ensuring that pedestrians and bicyclists comply with traffic laws. While authority to enforce traffic laws resides with local police departments, crossing guards, school officials, parents, and volunteers can play a vital role in reinforcing safe behaviors surrounding schools.
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**Evaluation**

Evaluation is crucial to gauging the efficacy of a Safe Routes to School program and identifying needed improvements. Factors to measure include program participation levels and awareness of the program, school travel mode shift, changes in attitudes toward active transportation to school, infrastructure completed, and dollars leveraged to support the longevity of the program. Evaluation efforts begin with collecting baseline data and establishing performance measures and obtainable benchmarks.

Ideally, identifying each community’s respective infrastructure and programmatic strategies begins with a planning process that includes a
thorough assessment of the school area’s existing facilities, travel patterns, issues, and community input. Many jurisdictions fold assessment into comprehensive Safe Routes to School plans that include the following key components:

- Existing conditions and needs assessments;
- Needed infrastructure improvements to facilitate safe walking and biking to school routes;
- Education, encouragement, and enforcement strategies; and
- Monitoring and evaluation strategies.

Comprehensive planning helps ensure each communities’ infrastructure and programmatic priorities are germane and competitive for funding.

THE SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL MOVEMENT

In the United States, Safe Routes to School programs initially emerged during the mid-1990s to address child pedestrian safety issues in school areas, and then proliferated in response to escalating childhood obesity rates, of which physical inactivity is a key contributor.

Early Safe Routes to School efforts in New York, Florida, and Chicago were recognized as mechanisms for integrating physical activity into children’s and adolescents’ daily routines, which is critical in the United States where...
an estimated 32 percent of children and adolescents are considered overweight or obese and only one-third meet the Surgeon General’s daily physical activity recommendations (Center for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2005). Correspondingly, approximately 13 percent of students aged five to 14 years old walk or bike to school regularly compared to 48 percent in 1969 (National Center for Safe Routes to School [NCSRTS], 2010).

Recognition of the safety and health implications of this trend ultimately led to state and federal Safe Routes to School grant programs established through legislation in 1999 and 2005, respectively.

California’s Safe Routes to School Grant Program

California’s pioneering Safe Routes to School program was established in October 1999 with the passage of California Assembly Bill 1475 (AB 1475). AB 1475 allocated one-third of California’s federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) safety funds toward Safe Routes to School, thus creating the first statewide Safe Routes to School construction program in the United States. A coalition of urban planning, engineering, public health, education, law enforcement, active transportation advocacy groups, and other professional organizations were instrumental in advancing the bill.

The initial two-year program administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) restricted funding to infrastructure projects. However, succeeding program cycles have authorized funds to be used for education and encouragement programs at the schools that the infrastructure projects serve. Under the current grant program guidelines (Cycle 9), incorporated cities and counties are eligible to apply for up to $450,000 toward construction projects that target grades K–12 schools and
may apply ten percent of project funding toward education, enforcement, and encouragement activities and/or school grounds improvements. A ten percent match of funds is required for the California state program. The non-infrastructure program allowance is sometimes underutilized; however, in many communities this component of the program is a pivotal part of the strategy to support travel behavior change.

In September 2011 California Assembly Bill 516 was adopted, requiring state and federal Safe Routes to School grant program applicants to identify community priorities, a public participation process, and potential benefits of the project to low income communities.

**Federal Safe Routes to School Grant Program**

At the federal level, Safe Routes to School commenced in 2000 when the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) awarded $50,000 each to launch pilot programs in Marin County, California and Arlington, Massachusetts geared toward increasing rates of walking and biking to school. The successes of these and other programs, particularly in Marin County, ultimately led to federal Safe Routes to School legislation. In 2005, the federal surface transportation bill, Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), authorized $612 million in funding under Section 1404 to state departments of transportation for Safe Routes to School programs through September 2009. The funding is allotted to states based on their relative proportions of total enrollment in primary and middle schools. The federal surface transportation bill has been operating under a series of short-term extensions until a new transportation authorization is passed.

Under the federal Safe Routes to School grant program guidelines released on April 15, 2011, tribal governments and regional and local planning
Agencies are eligible to apply for funding toward infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects aimed at influencing behavior and improving safety for children in Kindergarten through 8th grade. Although local or regional planning agencies must serve as the lead agency, they may partner with a ‘Project Sponsor’ such as a public health agency, school district, or non-profit organization.

One million dollars is the maximum amount that may be requested for capital projects and $500,000 for programmatic projects. In addition to applying for projects that are exclusively programmatic, agencies seeking capital project funding may allocate up to 10 percent of their budget toward complementary education, encouragement, and enforcement activities. California’s approximate allocation of funds for the current (2011 – 2012) cycle is $42 million, with a target of 70 percent of those funds devoted to infrastructure projects and 30 percent toward education, encouragement and enforcement activities.

**Local and Regional Implementation**

While funding for Safe Routes to School programs primarily derives from the state and federal programs, the planning and implementation of Safe Routes to School programs is inherently local, relying on collaboration between local jurisdictions, school districts, schools, and community-based and nonprofit organizations. Although state and federal grants are vital funding sources, many Safe Routes to School activities occur outside of grant funded projects. Several of these effective local programs exist throughout the San Diego region and are described in greater detail in Chapter 3 of this plan.
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Within the regional planning context, Safe Routes to School is gaining prominence as an effective Transportation Demand Management (TDM), air quality, and greenhouse gas reduction strategy in addition to an essential component to regional active transportation planning. It also plays a developing role in addressing transportation equity by targeting public health impacts and serving low-income communities.

PURPOSE AND RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS AND POLICIES

The emerging role of Safe Routes to School in regional planning has significant implications for the San Diego region. Safe Routes to School efforts support the regional objectives of creating walkable and bicycle-friendly communities, encouraging complete streets and smart growth place-making, and helping to reduce vehicle trips during peak periods of demand. Chapter two of this plan summarizes these and several related benefits derived from implementing Safe Routes to School programs.

To achieve these benefits, this Strategic Plan identifies a strategy to support the region's local communities in establishing new programs as well as sustaining and expanding upon the many existing Safe Routes to School initiatives. Planning a regional strategy ensures that tools and resources are strategically distributed to realize the greatest benefit.

The specific goals of the regional strategy are to:

- Increase physical activity rates of children and adolescents by increasing the number who walk and bike to school.

- Improve safety conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists, thereby reducing child and adolescent injuries and fatalities.

- Continue to expand current Safe Routes to School programs by encouraging comprehensive planning, fostering collaboration and partnerships, boosting public support, and initiating institutional change.

- Reduce barriers to participation in Safe Routes to School, whether founded on race, ethnicity, national origin, disability, income level, or some other basis.

- Promote and document the health, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emission reduction, traffic management, and community benefits derived from Safe Routes to School through systematic monitoring, evaluation, and planning.
- Promote standardization of data collection where possible throughout the region.
- Promote land use planning and design decisions that support active transportation, complete streets, and smart growth place-making.

The regional strategy consists of methods for integrating Safe Routes to School into regional planning activities; strengthening collaboration; providing technical assistance; and education and encouragement programs offered region-wide.

Several of the region’s transportation plans underpin the development of the Strategic Plan to support active transportation to school. The 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2050 RTP) outlines the regional Safe Routes to School strategy and provides a framework to guide the development of this Strategic Plan. The 2050 RTP proposes completion of the Strategic Plan as one action toward expanding the region’s travel choices by helping to make walking and biking to school a viable transportation option.

The Safe Routes to School strategy also contributes to a new element of the RTP, the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The SCS proposes coordinating land use, housing, and transportation planning to foster more sustainable, compact, walkable, and transit-oriented communities. The SCS accounts for this strategy’s potential to increase school walk and bike trips and thus contribute to meeting the regional greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Consistent with Safe Routes to School objectives, the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), adopted in 2004, seeks to advance more walkable and bicycle-friendly communities based on sound urban design and planning principles. The RCP also acknowledges the significant role of school siting and
design in using land more efficiently and supporting smart growth development.

Safe Routes to School is also identified as a priority in Riding to 2050: San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Regional Bicycle Plan) adopted in April 2010. The Regional Bicycle Plan provides a blueprint for making bicycling more practical and desirable to a broad spectrum of people in the San Diego region. It includes Safe Routes to School as a priority program to encourage children and adolescents to bicycle safely and more frequently to school.

**STRATEGY PLANNING PROCESS**

SANDAG began developing the Strategic Plan in September 2010 with funding through the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) Healthy Works program, a multi-faceted initiative intended to address rising obesity rates in the region by increasing access to healthy foods and promoting physical activity.

The planning process has engaged key stakeholders and the general public in the development of the Strategic Plan through a variety of formats.

Beginning in October 2010, SANDAG has convened a Safe Routes to School Strategy Coordination Team comprised of school district officials, planners, engineers, and public health professionals. The specific purpose of the team was to provide guidance on the contents of the Strategic Plan including existing conditions, issues to address, and actions identified in the plan.

Early in the planning process, SANDAG staff also drafted a white paper entitled “Overview of Safe Routes to School and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan” that introduced the concept of a regional Safe Routes to School strategy and proposed preliminary strategic actions for potential inclusion in the 2050 RTP and as a possible framework for developing the Strategic Plan.

In November 2010 through January 2011, this 2050 RTP white paper was presented to the following eight SANDAG working groups and policy committees to solicit input on the strategy: Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, Public Health Stakeholder Group, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council, Regional Planning Committee, Transportation Committee, and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee. The same eight working groups and committees were presented the draft of this plan and provided valuable input to shape the final Strategic Plan.

Developing and administering a Healthy Works pass-through grant program was also instrumental in shaping this strategy. The Healthy Works Safe
Routes to School grant programs are funding twelve comprehensive Safe Routes to School planning projects and education, encouragement, and enforcement related projects.

SANDAG staff also garnered feedback on the strategy through public presentations and forums, such as to the Regional Safe Routes to School Coalition (discussed in Chapter 4 of this plan) and various school-based meetings. School stakeholders and the general public also had the opportunity to review and provide comment on the draft version of the Strategic Plan available online on the SANDAG website (www.sandag.org/healthyworks) and distributed via email to key stakeholders and agencies.

CONTENTS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

After this introduction, the Strategic Plan is organized into the following chapters:

Chapter 2: Existing Issues and Opportunities discusses the role of Safe Routes to School in addressing certain transportation, built environment, air quality, and public health issues currently impacting the region.

Chapter 3: Existing Safe Routes to School Efforts describes the region’s existing Safe Routes to School resources and programs implemented at the local as well as regional level.

Chapter 4: Moving Forward – a Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy presents the draft regional strategy to support the creation and maintenance of Safe Routes to School efforts. It also proposes a process for implementing the strategy and updating the strategy to address future needs.
This chapter of the Strategic Plan highlights opportunities for Safe Routes to School programs to impact several of the region’s significant and interrelated challenges including escalating childhood obesity rates, safety concerns, transportation costs, traffic congestion, and cleaner air. By promoting effective Safe Routes to School programs, this strategy can substantially affect all of these challenges, thus improving the overall quality of life in the San Diego region.

The chapter opens with walking and bicycling to school trends and an overview of the region’s school system.

SNAPSHOT OF THE REGION’S SCHOOL SYSTEM AND WALKING AND BIKING TRENDS

As of 2011, an estimated 21 percent of students walk to and/or from school, and 1 percent bike to and/or from school. In comparison, 2.7 percent of all daily trips are taken by walking, and 0.5 percent by bike. Single occupancy vehicle trips constitute 52.7 percent of all trips, 42.8 percent are high-occupancy vehicle trips, and the remaining 1.3 percent of trips are taken via transit. While the percentage of students taking active modes to school is
relatively significant, there is opportunity to grow these numbers through Safe Routes to School, particularly as the average distance between home and school in the region is 3.25 miles. Figure 2-1 shows the distribution of youths across the region.

The San Diego region’s public school system currently consists of 42 school districts and 761 schools serving 498,243 students. An additional 38,431 students attend the region’s 251 private elementary and secondary schools (California Department of Education, 2011). Figure 2-2 displays the schools and school district boundaries within the region. Of the 42 districts, 24 are elementary, six are high school, and 12 are unified districts, which consolidate primary and high school administration into a single district.
Figure 2-1: Youth Population Density
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Figure 2-2: San Diego Region Schools and School Districts
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Correspondingly, elementary school students comprise the greatest share of school enrollment. Figure 2-3 displays the portion of schools and student enrollment figures by school type within the region. As shown, elementary schools account for approximately 59 percent of the region’s schools and 47 percent of total student enrollment.

**Figure 2-3: Percentage of Schools and Enrollment by Type**

![Graph showing percentage of schools and enrollment by type]

Source: Education Data Partnership, May 2011

The proportions of middle and high school students are both greater than their relative share of schools in the region. Specifically, 14 percent of the region’s schools are middle schools constituting 18 percent of enrollment and 13 percent of schools are high schools contributing 30 percent of total student enrollment in the region (Education Data Partnership, 2011).

**PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AND HEALTH AMONG YOUTHS**

Childhood and adolescent obesity rates have risen exponentially over the last few decades and currently persist at critical levels, with approximately 32 percent of United States youths ages two to 19 classified as overweight and 17 percent considered obese (Ogden et al., 2010). This trend is equally severe in the San Diego region, where more than one in four children are categorized as obese (California Department of Education, 2010). As with adults, lack of physical activity is a principal contributor to the childhood obesity epidemic and the associated health risks, including diabetes, high blood pressure, and heart disease.

Safe Routes to School programs provide opportunities to incorporate physical activity into children and adolescents daily lives; thus counteracting
the prevalence of obesity and its associated health risks for all segments of the population.

Numerous studies have examined the impact of school travel mode choice on physical activity levels, finding that children who walk or bike to school tend to meet recommended physical activity levels and have a greater propensity to be active throughout the day. For example, a study of 332 children found that students who walked to school were significantly more active than those who were driven to school. Among male students, biking to school was also correlated with higher overall physical activity levels (Cooper et al., 2005). A similar study found that walking to school was associated with greater overall activity levels and that, among males, walking to school was also linked to greater activity levels after school and throughout the evening (Cooper et al., 2003).

By increasing physical activity, Safe Routes to School programs promote healthy weight and cardiovascular and respiratory functioning. Body Mass Index (BMI) and skin-fold measurements, two indicators of obesity, are lower among boys who walk or bike to school than those who do not, according to a two-year study of fourth-grade to fifth-grade students (Rosenberg et al., 2006). Bicycling to school has also been correlated with higher levels of cardiovascular and respiratory fitness among children and adolescents (Cooper et al., 2006).

Physical activity not only has a significant impact on physiological health, research indicates that physical activity contributes to cognitive functioning (Buck et al., 2008) and academic achievement among children (Stevens et al., 2008) and adolescents (Nelson & Gordon-Larsen, 2006) despite variance in personal backgrounds and demographic characteristics. Better grades, standardized test scores, and other measures of academic performance have been linked to physical activity in copious research studies (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 2011).
In addition to these immediate health benefits, walking and biking to school can engender lasting behavior change – children who are consistently physically active as youths are more likely to become physically active adults (Telama et al., 2005).

The role of Safe Routes to School in increasing physical activity makes it a key school-based public health strategy that, in conjunction with physical education, nutrition, and wellness programs, can have a monumental impact on child and adolescent health.

**TRAFFIC SAFETY AND PERSONAL SECURITY**

Concerns for child safety are among the strongest impediments to children walking or biking to school, but for some, walking or bicycling to school is a necessity due to financial or other circumstances. In fact, walking or biking to school is more than twice as common among students from low-income households than students from higher-income households. Studies also show that low-income communities tend to report more infrastructure deficiencies within their communities compared to higher-income communities (McDonald, 2008). For these reasons, creating safe routes is one key mechanism to achieve social equity goals by providing safe opportunities to walk and bike regardless of a community’s socio-economic composition.

Traffic safety conditions vary substantially across the region, based on characteristics such as traffic volumes and speeds, roadway widths, intersection density, and presence of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Figure 2-4 displays the percentage of roadways with sidewalks by census block group across the region. Figure 2-5 shows existing bicycle facilities in the region. Although facilities exist across the region, gaps are also present in some areas.

Frequent vehicle collisions involving pedestrians or bicyclists indicate that there are opportunities to improve safe walking or biking. Figures 2-6 and 2-7 show average pedestrian crash rates and bicycle crash rates by census block group over a ten-year period normalized by day time population.

Improving safety conditions is a central goal of Safe Routes to School programs, which can be accomplished through improvements to the built environment, educating students, engaging community members, enforcing traffic laws, and instituting programs designed to address personal security concerns.

...creating safe routes is one key mechanism to achieve social equity goals by providing safe opportunities to walk and bike regardless of a community’s socio-economic composition.
Figure 2-4: Percentage of Roads With Sidewalks
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Figure 2-6: Pedestrian Crash Rate
Census Block Group Level Data. Average yearly rate per 1,000 daytime population.
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Figure 2-7: Bike Crash Rate
Census Block Group Level Data. Average yearly rate per 1,000 daytime population.
Studies focused on assessing the impacts of the California-legislated program demonstrate that Safe Routes to School infrastructure improvements can be effective tools for improving safety and increasing the proportion of students walking and biking to school. Traffic signal enhancements and sidewalk gap closures, especially, have been shown to influence safety and mode choice. (Boarnet et al., 2005a; Boarnet et al., 2005b). In addition to addressing school travel issues, investing in safety improvements and traffic calming measures benefits the broader community particularly in urban areas where school and population density is higher (Watson & Dannenberg, 2008).
Schools in the San Diego region that have participated in the National Center for Safe Routes to School evaluation program show that, combined, traffic safety and infrastructure deficiencies are by far the most significant barriers to parents allowing their children to walk and bike to school. In addition to physical barriers, forty percent of parents surveyed also indicate that fear of violence or crime influences their decisions regarding active transportation to school. This was the strongest individual factor among the approximately forty schools from five jurisdictions that participated in the program by January 2011 (NCSRTS, December 2010). Although this only reflects parents’ attitudes from a small subset of the population, it illustrates that in many communities personal security is a significant determinant of school travel behavior.

Several Safe Routes to School strategies are designed to address personal security concerns by engaging parents, school officials, and community members in supervising students as they walk or bike to school and by training children how to respond to potentially dangerous encounters on the trip to school. Walking schools buses, for example, have proven effective in urban, socio-economically disadvantaged neighborhoods where concern with criminal activity can be paramount (Mendoza, et al., 2009).
TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Congestion in school zones degrades air quality and can be a significant community-level transportation issue that is further exacerbated by changes in San Diego school districts’ transportation policies. Over the last several years, the cost of busing, coupled with budgetary constraints, have caused several districts to reduce, eliminate, or institute a fee-based system for school-busing services.

By 2009, at least three of the region’s school districts had eliminated regular school-to-home transportation and 12 charged a fee for student busing although fee policies typically exclude students enrolled in special education programs or whose household income qualifies them as low-income or certified to receive free or reduced lunch. In June 2011 the San Diego Unified School District Board of Education, overseeing the largest district in the region, approved a plan to eliminate all non-mandatory bus services. This action will eliminate bus service for approximately 6,000 students and is projected to produce substantial overcapacity at 11 schools resulting in a need of $56 million in capital improvements to accommodate a surge of students returning to their neighborhood schools (San Diego Unified School District, June 7, 2011).
The cost to schools and individual families due to busing reductions can be mitigated, in part, by expanding transportation options including carpooling, walking, biking, and taking other active modes to school.

COMPLETE STREETS AND SMART GROWTH

Safe Routes to School programs support the vision established in the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan of more sustainable, compact, well-designed communities interconnected by a transportation system that expands travel choices and reduces greenhouse gas emissions. Safe Routes to School programs help achieve this vision by reducing peak period vehicle trips and making active transportation to school more viable and attractive options. Addressing school safety and accessibility improves the overall walkability of affected neighborhoods.

Some of the region’s most exemplary ‘complete streets’ are a result of Safe Routes to School infrastructure projects, exhibiting a mix of traffic calming measures, road diet, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and amenities. The County of San Diego and cities of National City, Chula Vista, Lemon Grove, San Diego, and Encinitas have all completed Safe Routes to School projects featuring traffic calming elements. For example, the City of Encinitas used a federal Safe Routes to School grant to fund first phase implementation of a neighborhood traffic calming project surrounding Cardiff Elementary School, and the City of National City received a state grant to improve access to Central Elementary School with a road diet, traffic calming, and amenities along East 8th Street. In San Diego, the City Heights neighborhood Urban Village is a mixed-use public space that provides recreational and educational opportunities to adults and youths including enhanced pedestrian access to Rosa Parks Elementary School.
Yet the efficacy of Safe Routes to School projects and programs is limited by school siting and design decisions. National studies cite distance to school as the single strongest deterrent to parents allowing their children to walk or bike to school (National Center for Safe Routes to School, 2010). Additionally, distance to school has increased over the last few decades which may be responsible for as much as half of the reduction in active transportation to school over the same period (McDonald, 2007). Therefore, school siting must be addressed to broaden the impact of Safe Routes to School programs.

Not only does school siting have an unparalleled influence over school travel patterns; the more expansive implications are that these land use decisions affect the region’s progress toward advancing smart growth objectives. Smart growth proponents advocate for investing in community-oriented schools that are interwoven into the social fabric of the neighborhoods they serve. This requires investment in existing urban and suburban schools. However, acreage and square-footage guidelines established by state policies have historically favored new school construction in suburban areas over reinvestment in existing schools.

State case law is beginning to help shift financing toward a more balanced approach to school construction and renovation. However, more collaboration is needed between policymakers, education, and planning experts to identify urban and suburban strategies to support community-oriented schools.

Over the last ten years, San Diego Unified School District has made significant progress in restoring urban schools based on community priorities. In 2002, the San Diego Chapter of the American Planning Association honored the district for applying collaborative site identification and community-based planning strategies to its school facility master plan process. Opportunities
exist to strengthen the relationship between Safe Routes to School, school siting, and the advancement of smart growth goals.

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT, AIR QUALITY, AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Safe Routes to School programs are mechanisms for reducing private vehicle trips and traffic congestion which improves traffic safety and air quality in school zones, and has a measurable impact on human-generated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. These programs can also help counteract the adverse effect on air quality experienced in communities that are already overburdened by pollution.

For this reason, planning and transportation agencies across the U.S. utilize Safe Routes to School as TDM measures. In 2009, the San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) invested $80 million over three years toward its Climate Initiatives Program, which includes $17 million allocated toward emission-reducing Safe Routes to School programs.

Marin County’s nationally-recognized Safe Routes to School initiative has proven effective at shifting school travel modes from single-student vehicle trips to alternative modes. During the 2007/2008 school year, 90 percent of students living within a half-mile of school walked or bicycled to school. The Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) attributes the program with more than 15 percent mode shift since its inception (TAM, 2009). This is significant in Marin County where school-related trips constitute 21 percent of morning peak period trips compared to 11 percent in most U.S. geographic areas (U.S. Department of Transportation, 2007).

In the San Diego region, 41 percent of the region’s GHG emissions derive from light-duty truck and passenger car trips. Much of these emissions occur during the morning and afternoon commute hours – approximately 50 percent of daily travel occurs during the morning and afternoon peak-periods. School trips contribute over eight percent of peak-period traffic congestion. These figures are likely underestimations because the data does not distinguish between work commute trips and combined work and school commute trips. Combination trips are generally captured as work commute whereas school-only trips are reflected as school commutes. Thus, there is also no measure of additional miles traveled resulting from these extended trips.

Shifting a greater percentage of these school-related trips to walking and biking trips would contribute to meeting our region’s GHG reduction goals. The SCS developed in conjunction with the 2050 RTP includes implementation of this Safe Routes to School Strategy as one measure to help reduce future GHG emissions from private vehicles and light trucks. Specifically, implementing this Safe Routes to School strategy is anticipated to increase school walk and bike trips by 10 percent in 2020 and 20 percent by 2035, resulting in tens-of-thousands fewer pounds of GHG.
CHAPTER 3: EXISTING SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL EFFORTS

The potential benefits described in Chapter 2 are already evident in many communities throughout the region who participate in Safe Routes to School activities. This chapter of the Strategic Plan provides an overview of the region’s existing Safe Routes to School efforts underway, including individual programs as well as regionally-available resources.

FEDERAL AND STATE GRANT FUNDED PROGRAMS

Through the collaborative efforts of city officials, schools, school districts, community-based organizations, parent organizations, and parents, at least a quarter of the region’s schools engage in Safe Routes to School activities or benefit from Safe Routes to School infrastructure improvements funded by the federal or state-legislated grant programs.
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Although not inclusive of all of the region’s existing Safe Routes to School efforts, as primary sources of funding for Safe Routes to School programs,
the state-legislated and federal Safe Routes to School grant awards provides an indication of the number, distribution, and diversity of these Safe Routes to School efforts.

Table 3.1 summarizes state-legislated Safe Routes to School grant awards by jurisdiction in the San Diego region over the nine funding cycles since the program commenced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Grant Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$745,505</td>
<td>$846,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$3,087,508</td>
<td>$3,430,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$105,750</td>
<td>$117,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,127,833</td>
<td>$1,253,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$337,500</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$225,720</td>
<td>$250,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$825,172</td>
<td>$916,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$735,930</td>
<td>$817,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,283,800</td>
<td>$3,207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$241,200</td>
<td>$268,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$427,500</td>
<td>$562,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$4,352,160</td>
<td>$4,869,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,634,830</td>
<td>$1,860,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$225,720</td>
<td>$250,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,585,260</td>
<td>$2,411,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>54</td>
<td><strong>$17,941,388</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,437,366</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown, the state-legislated program has provided nearly $18 million toward projects and programs impacting 80 schools throughout the region. Some schools have benefited from more than one grant. By design, the vast majority of these funds were devoted to infrastructure improvements. The state-legislated program enables jurisdictions to apportion up to 10 percent of grant funds toward education and encouragement activities. However, according to Caltrans’ approved projects lists, only three of the 54 funded projects incorporated non-infrastructure program elements, specifically, projects of the County of San Diego and cities of National City and San Diego.

Table 3.2 presents the number of grants, funds, and schools in the region impacted by the federal Safe Routes to School grant program.
Table 3.2  
Federal Safe Routes to School Program  
Funded Projects in the San Diego Region  
(Program Cycles 1 & 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Grant Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$621,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista Elementary School District</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$499,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$651,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$975,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$743,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$730,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$63,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rady Children’s Hospital Center for Healthier Communities</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$499,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$517,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,034,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$228,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>$6,563,366</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caltrans, [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/sr2s.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/sr2s.htm)  
(downloaded on December 4, 2010)

Over the first two federal program cycles, 13 grants with a combined total of about $6.6 million have been awarded to cities, school districts, and non-profit organizations. Ten of the 13 grants were infrastructure based and three were provided to support non-infrastructure programs conducted by the Chula Vista Elementary School District, Rady Children’s Hospital Center for Healthier Communities, and City of La Mesa.

Some of the non-infrastructure funded programs include coordinating Walk to School Day events, parent safety patrols, taskforces, incentive programs, outreach campaigns, and traffic safety courses.

To help reduce the disparity between the numbers of infrastructure and non-infrastructure funded projects (an imbalance that is not exclusive to the San Diego region), Caltrans sets funding distribution goals. The federal Call for Projects released on April 15, 2011 aimed to allocate 70 percent of available funds to infrastructure projects and 30 percent to support education, encouragement and enforcement activities.

The majority of federal and state Safe Routes to School infrastructure projects involve sidewalk and curb ramp installation. Traffic controls and crossing improvements such as enhanced crosswalks, in-pavement lighted crosswalks, flashing beacons, pavement markings, and signage, are also common construction types. Additionally, several jurisdictions have used
funds for traffic calming measures including curb extensions, bulb-outs, raised pedestrian refuges, and speed humps. Fewer projects involve bicycle facilities.

**Figure 3-1** displays the geographic distribution of schools impacted by the federal and state-legislated Safe Routes to School grant awards in the San Diego region. As shown, several jurisdictions have implemented Safe Routes to School projects. While the majority of funds have been used to support capital projects, the three non-infrastructure grants have benefited about 50 schools because programmatic activities are relatively inexpensive compared to infrastructure improvements. Federally-funded non-infrastructure programs are concentrated in the southwestern portion of the region, in southeastern San Diego, La Mesa, and Chula Vista.

In addition to those already impacting the region, eleven new Safe Routes to School grants are anticipated through the federal 2011/2012 program cycle. On October 17, 2011, Caltrans announced the list of projects approved for Cycle 3 grants, which will contribute an additional $5.4 million in federal Safe Routes to School funds to the San Diego region, including $1.9 million to support non-infrastructure projects. Cycle 3 grant recipients include the cities of San Diego, Santee, El Cajon, Encinitas, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, San Marcos, and County of San Diego.
Figure 3-1: Schools Impacted by Safe Routes to School Grants
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SUPPORTIVE LOCAL AND SCHOOL DISTRICT POLICIES

Most local jurisdictions in the region have a current bicycle master plan and several have a pedestrian master plan, or similar document, that includes a discussion of Safe Routes to School as a key element to improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility. Fewer school districts have adopted complementary policies. Of the region’s 42 school districts, the following eight have adopted Safe Routes to School-supportive policies:

- Alpine Union School District
- Encinitas Union School District
- Escondido Union School District
- Escondido Union High School District
- Grossmont Union High School District
- La Mesa – Spring Valley School District
- San Pasqual Union School District
- Solana Beach School District

School boards can play a vital role in encouraging active transportation to school by establishing policies that promote programs and encourage coordination with local city departments to implement Safe Routes to School projects.

PUBLIC HEALTH PARTNERSHIPS

The public health field plays an integral role in advancing Safe Routes to School programs both state-wide and within the region.

California Department of Public Health

To complement the support provided by the state grant program, the California Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance Resource Center (TARC) assists local communities in coordinating non-infrastructure Safe Routes to School programs. TARC is a project of California Active Communities, which is a joint program of the University of California, San Francisco, Institute for Health and Aging and the California Department of Public Health. TARC is funded by Caltrans to support non-infrastructure
Safe Routes to School projects and represents a successful partnership between the state departments of transportation and public health. Four TARC coordinators provide training and resources to communities throughout the state.

California Project LEAN (Leaders Encouraging Activity and Nutrition) works with school and community stakeholders to prevent obesity and its associated health risks by promoting physical activity and nutrition policy, particularly in high-need, low-income communities. The program is a collaborative effort of the California Department of Public Health and the Public Health Institute.

**County of San Diego Healthy Works**

As noted in the introductory chapter of this plan, in March 2010 SANDAG partnered with the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) to develop this Strategic Plan and provide implementation resources to encourage exemplary, comprehensive local Safe Routes to School programs throughout the region. This effort is one of six Healthy Works initiatives HHSA has contracted with SANDAG to implement as part of HHSA’s broader effort to reduce chronic disease by combating rising obesity rates in the San Diego region with improved access to physical activity, nutritious foods, and healthy school environments. Healthy Works is funded by Communities Putting Prevention to Work, a program of the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention established by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

A major component to SANDAG’s Healthy Works Safe Routes to School initiative involved developing and administering two pass-through grant programs: the Safe Routes to School Capacity Building and Planning
Grant Program, and Safe Routes to School Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Grant Program.

Twelve cities, non-profit organizations, and school districts were awarded grants totaling about $340,000. Approximately $280,000 was provided to develop comprehensive Safe Routes to School plans that include existing conditions analysis; identification of infrastructure needs and non-infrastructure program strategies; and define an ongoing monitoring and evaluation strategy. These plans are intended to serve as a blueprint for future Safe Routes to School investments and make jurisdictions more competitive for state and federal funding. In addition to planning grants, about $60,000 was awarded to advance education, encouragement, and enforcement activities, such as bicycle rodeos, a speed reduction campaign, pedestrian safety courses, and student encouragement competitions.

Figure 3-2 displays schools impacted by the Healthy Works grant programs. As demonstrated, the Healthy Works program was most commonly utilized in jurisdictions where Safe Routes to School initiatives already exist. In some cases, the Healthy Works funds are contributing to expanding Safe Routes to School into schools not currently participating, such as in Chula Vista. In other jurisdictions, funds are being used to incorporate other program components, such as the City of National City pursuing education and encouragement activities to support their existing capital investments.
Figure 3-2: Schools Impacted by Healthy Works Safe Routes to School Grants
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Table 3.3 lists the Healthy Works project titles, lead agency, and project partners.

**Table 3.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa Kids Walk &amp; Roll to School Safe Routes Program Planning Project</td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>La Mesa-Spring Valley School District, Boys and Girls Club of East County, WalkSanDiego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ysidro Walks and Wheels to School</td>
<td>WalkSanDiego</td>
<td>San Ysidro School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Diego: Let's Move Together</td>
<td>WalkSanDiego</td>
<td>South Bay Union School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Taking Active Routes to School (STARTS) Program</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Sweetwater Union High School District, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, Chula Vista Community Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan</td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Vista Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Avenue Elementary Safe Routes to School (GAE-SRTS)</td>
<td>Lemon Grove Elementary School District</td>
<td>San Diego County Sheriff’s Department, District Health and Wellness Council, WalkSanDiego, Parent Teacher Association of Golden Avenue Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa and Parkway Middle School Student Engagement Initiative</td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>WalkSanDiego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Gets Moving</td>
<td>WalkSanDiego</td>
<td>Lakeview Elementary School, Lakeside Union School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City Safe Routes to School Education and Encouragement Initiative</td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>National School District, Sweetwater Union High School District, South Bay Community Services, National City Collaborative Family Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Pace Car Program- Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>Chula Vista Elementary School District</td>
<td>Chula Vista Community Collaborative, WalkSanDiego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside Bicycle Rodeo Program</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Oceanside Unified School District, Oceanside Bicycle Committee, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk This Way: Pedestrian Training for Elementary School Students</td>
<td>WalkSanDiego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five Healthy Works grantees, who were awarded a combined $160,000, leveraged those dollars to secure nearly $2.5 million in federal Safe Routes to School grant funds through the program’s third application cycle (see Table 3.3).

Healthy Works helps fulfill HHSA’s broader goals which include promoting Safe Routes to School as a strategy to improve childhood health. In July 2010, the County of San Diego adopted Live Well, San Diego!, the County’s 10-year plan to build a healthy, safe and thriving community, which identifies encouraging Safe Routes to School programs as a goal to increase physical activity. The San Diego County Childhood Obesity Initiative’s 2010 Call to Action: Childhood Obesity Action Plan also identifies Safe Routes to School strategies including implementation of a countywide Safe Routes to School strategic plan. By funding the development of this Strategic Plan and complementary grant program, the Healthy Works program helps achieve the County’s Safe Routes to School related public health goals.

SANDAG’S ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

The Healthy Works program builds on SANDAG’s growing active transportation and the iCommute SchoolPool program.

To support local projects and planning, the regional Active Transportation Program funds bicycle, pedestrian, and neighborhood safety (traffic calming) projects and programs including projects that improve access and safety in school areas. Funding for the Active Transportation Program local competitive grant program derives from the TransNet ½-cent transportation sales tax program and the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3
Non-motorized funds. Since the TransNet program’s inception in FY 1988, SANDAG has provided approximately $28 million in TransNet revenues and $37 million TDA funds to active transportation projects throughout the region.

The competitive grant program’s current guidelines and criteria give preference to planning and infrastructure projects that comprehensively address active transportation and complete streets considerations, including bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access and Safe Routes to School. Approximately $8.8 million is available for the FY 2011 local call for projects.

Implementation of the Regional Bicycle Plan is also central to the development of a robust active transportation system and is now a key component to the regional Active Transportation Program. In April 2011 SANDAG assumed responsibility as the lead agency in implementing regional bicycle projects and programs identified in the Regional Bicycle Plan. These projects and programs are funded by TransNet and Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds. Initial implementation will begin in 2012 and is supported by $8.3 million in TransNet and TE funds.

As noted in Chapter 1, the Regional Bicycle Plan identifies Safe Routes to School as a priority regional program. This Strategic Plan strengthens the region’s Active Transportation Program by contributing a strategy to support Safe Routes to School planning and programming.

**SANDAG iCOMMUTE SCHOOLPOOL**

SANDAG’s SchoolPool program is managed by iCommute, the regional TDM program. SchoolPool is designed to reduce peak-period trips and traffic congestion in and around school zones. The program is a free, convenient, and secure online system used to help parents of children who attend the same school to find partners to walk, bike, or carpool for school commute trips. As of January 2012, 68 schools from 14 school districts participate in the SchoolPool program.

Carpooling is a vital element to many Safe Routes to School programs, particularly for schools where a significant portion of the student population live further from school than is a reasonable distance to walk or bike. Carpooling reduces vehicle congestion in school zones, which promotes cleaner air and safety around the school.

With Healthy Works funding, iCommute launched the “Walk, Ride and Roll to School” campaign in 2011 to expand school and parent participation in SchoolPool. The campaign introduced the “Walking School Bus” and “Bike Buddies” elements to the program. These program elements encourage students to walk or bike to school as a group, supported by adult-
supervision and safety education. Bike Buddies and Walking School Buses can also be used in combination with carpooling.

Walk, Ride, and Roll to School 2011 provided free marketing materials, student incentives, and safety equipment, such as bike helmets and reflective vests, for Walking School Bus and Bike Buddies formed through SchoolPool. These Bike Buddies and Walking School Bus starter kits were available while supplies lasted to all SchoolPool registrants, regardless of participation in Walk, Ride, and Roll. The campaign featured a competition where schools could win up to $1,000 toward school supplies for logging the most walking or biking trips throughout the month of October 2011. Registered schools also received pedestrian or bicycle safety training courses and safety trading cards.

Twenty-two schools, representing approximately 15,000 students, registered to participate in Walk, Ride, and Roll to School. As shown in Figure 3-3, schools across the region participate in SchoolPool as well as Walk, Ride, and Roll. Also beginning in 2011, iCommute is holding annual Walk and Bike to School Day events in conjunction with International Walk to School Day.
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Walk, Ride, and Roll to School 2011 provided free marketing materials, student incentives, and safety equipment, such as bike helmets and reflective vests, for Walking School Bus and Bike Buddies formed through SchoolPool… Twenty-two schools, representing approximately 15,000 students, registered to participate in Walk, Ride, and Roll to School.
Figure 3-3: Schools Participating in iCommute’s SchoolPool Program
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ADVOCACY AND COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

As illustrated in the previous sections, non-profit and community-based organizations in the San Diego region play a vital role in Safe Routes to School implementation within the region. The San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, for example, provides bicycle skills and safety training to children in communities throughout the region. This includes conducting bicycle and pedestrian safety trainings as a facet of the iCommute “Walk, Ride, and Roll” campaign.

WalkSanDiego is another non-profit organization in the region focused on education, outreach, and advocacy to promote walkable communities. Their work includes contracting with several communities within the region to assess school travel needs and deliver Safe Routes to School education and encouragement programs. Additionally, the City Heights Community Development Corporation, Oceanside Bicycle Committee, Bayside Community Center and Linda Vista Collaborative, and Chula Vista Community Collaborative are among the numerous community-based organizations that collaborate with schools, school districts, and city agencies to advance Safe Routes to School.

State and national organizations also serve as essential resources to Safe Routes to School programs. The National Center for Safe Routes to School, administered by the University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center with funding from the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, maintains a website containing the largest U.S. based collection of Safe Routes to School related information, including a guide to developing and sustaining programs, case studies, news,
publications, information on funding sources, and instructions on collecting and submitting data to the National Center’s database.

The National Center’s data collection program is a tool for local communities to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs and also contributes to national research and evaluation conducted by the institute. Currently, the National Center also provides mini-grants of $1,000 to communities throughout the country on a bi-annual basis to support mainly community-driven education and encouragement activities.

Other online resources include California Walk to School Day Headquarters and iWalk International Walk to School in the USA, which enables schools to register their Walk to School events and provides access to materials and tools for organizing successful events. Appendix A of this plan lists Web links to resources provided at the regional, state, and national level.

The programs summarized in this chapter reflect only a large subset of Safe Routes to School activities within the region. Many activities are maintained with volunteer support, such as bicycle rodeos conducted in Oceanside and Lakeside. School and parent involvement can be key to the success of these programs due to limited staff resources. Private businesses, organizations, and other governmental agencies also regularly fund Safe Routes to School related efforts. For example, in 2005, Imperial Beach launched a pedestrian and bicycle safety campaign involving bicycle and pedestrian rodeos and school assemblies with funding from the California Office of Traffic Safety. Imperial Beach is now expanding their Safe Routes to School program activities with a Caltrans Environmental Justice grant award.
CHAPTER 4: MOVING FORWARD A REGIONAL STRATEGY

Based on a review of best practices, existing efforts, and extensive input from stakeholders, the following strategy is proposed as a means to support local communities and schools in developing effective Safe Routes to School programs and to better integrate Safe Routes to School with regional objectives.

The strategy consists of the following major components: regional planning and evaluation; technical assistance; collaboration and coordination; and education and encouragement. Within each of these categories, actions are recommended as well as the agencies responsible for implementing the action.

REGIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

Integrating Safe Routes to School into regional planning efforts establishes a vision for Safe Routes to School throughout the region and advances the regional goals of monitoring, projecting, and promoting active transportation.

The following actions are recommended to strengthen the role of Safe Routes to School in local and regional transportation and land use planning.

Data Collection and Evaluation

- **Key Elements**
  - Data collection and analysis focused on school travel
  - SANDAG
  - School districts, schools, parent volunteers, and local governments

Data collection and analysis of school travel behavior is essential to measuring progress, identifying and prioritizing needs, and generating evidence to support future investment in Safe Routes to School efforts. Accordingly, the Strategic Plan recommends establishing a process to evaluate Safe Routes to School program participation levels, changes in

Integrating Safe Routes to School into regional planning efforts establishes a vision for Safe Routes to School throughout the region and advances the regional goals of monitoring, projecting, and promoting active transportation.
perceptions and attitudes toward active transportation to school, future needs, and Safe Routes to School impacts on mode share, health, and safety.

This Safe Routes to School monitoring program should complement the Active Transportation Program data collection, evaluation, and modeling effort planned for initial implementation in 2012. This broader Active Transportation Program effort will capture active transportation trip data to incorporate into future activity-based transportation models and to inform future regional planning efforts with more robust data on active transportation activity levels and behaviors.

To measure journey to school trends, the Safe Routes to School data collection effort may consist of three major components:

- Conducting biannual school traffic counts throughout the region that capture a diverse sample of school sites in terms of Safe Routes to School program elements and land use, transportation, and population characteristics, as well as encouraging schools to routinely collect in-classroom student arrival and departure tallies, consistent with the National Center for Safe Routes to School evaluation program.

- Surveying parents or guardians and students to identify behavioral and attitudinal trends as well as input on the effectiveness of Safe Routes to School infrastructure and non-infrastructure programs. Survey instruments should be based upon and compatible with the National Center for Safe Routes to School evaluation program but enhanced with input from local practitioners.
Surveying government agencies and school administrators to gain an accurate picture of the types and distribution of the Safe Routes to School activities in existence, programs they are interested in learning more about, and existing institutional barriers to participating in Safe Routes to School activities.

The data compiled through this effort should be incorporated into a Regional Safe Routes to School Evaluation and Action Plan that includes: 1) performance measures and benchmarks; 2) a mode shift and GHG reduction analysis; 3) an assessment of Safe Routes to School program participation levels, including utilization of SANDAG resources such as SchoolPool; 4) a health and safety benefits analysis; and 5) actions and programs recommended to implement the Strategic Plan over the subsequent years.

The Evaluation and Action Plan should be published bi-annually and incorporated into regional Active Transportation Program monitoring reports. It should help inform future regional transportation and comprehensive planning, and also serve as a strong public awareness tool to communicate the health and environmental benefits of active transportation.

**Smart Growth and Complete Streets Integration**

**Key Elements**
- Engaging planners, school district officials, and policymakers to improve synthesis between school facility and community planning goals.

**Lead Agency**
- SANDAG

**Partners**
- Local jurisdictions, school district officials, and school facility planners

Community-oriented schools located in close proximity to the neighborhoods they serve encourage walking and biking to school and provide social and recreational opportunities for students and community residents. If well-designed, they reflect community character, can hold historical significance, and enhance the aesthetic quality of a neighborhood. For these reasons, community schools support smart growth development, and in many communities, school access has become the focal point of complete streets initiatives.

However, a spectrum of factors discourages investment in community-oriented schools. These include regulatory barriers, such as historical funding biases that favor new construction over renovation and minimum acreage regulations for new facilities, as well as social factors that must be balanced, such as the need for large athletic fields and cultural diversity goals. Lack of coordination between comprehensive planning and school facility planning is also a challenge to designing schools that are interwoven into the community fabric.
Despite these challenges, communities are moving toward collaboration and innovative design solutions to retain community-centered schools.

To underscore the connection between school planning, smart growth, and complete streets, the Strategic Plan recommends the following actions:

- Discuss the role of schools in place-making in relevant, future regional plans such as the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Regional Transportation Plan.

- Address school design and access issues in any of the region’s future smart growth, complete streets, or healthy and active design guidelines.

- In SANDAG’s existing Smart Growth and Active Transportation grant programs, consider incorporating criteria that encourages jurisdictions to consider school access and collaborative school facility planning approaches.

- Provide workshops, presentations, or other forums on topics such as joint-use policies, green school building renovation, complete streets, and model inter-agency review agreements between school facility planning and city planning agencies.
COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION

The success and reach of this strategy is largely contingent on engaging with partners and collaborating with agencies and organizations that are intimately connected to school communities and knowledgeable about school issues.

There is growing interest among Safe Routes to School implementers in coordinating regionally and collaborating on Safe Routes to School efforts. The following actions are intended to strengthen relationships and the exchange of information amongst schools, organizations, SANDAG, and other agencies involved in advancing Safe Routes to School. Another key objective is to engage related, non-participating organizations in Safe Routes to School efforts through collaboration and disseminating information.

Safe Routes to School Coordination

Key Elements
- Regional coordination of Safe Routes to School efforts

Lead Agency
- Regional public health or planning organization

Partners
- Local jurisdictions, school districts, County of San Diego HHSA, and other regional organizations and agencies involved in Safe Routes to School

The Strategic Plan recommends creating a structure to manage on-going implementation of the regional strategy, coordinate local Safe Routes to School program activities, and ensure that local jurisdictions and school communities have access to technical assistance that supports effective program implementation. A key component to this process is bringing school districts and local jurisdictions together to promote collaboration and jointly address barriers to Safe Routes to School implementation.
Safe Routes to School funding apportioned for non-infrastructure projects is often underutilized because applicants lack the staff resources to implement these types of projects. Although city traffic engineers and planners may not have the time or expertise to devote toward programmatic activities, most recognize the high rate of return provided by these efforts. As shown in Chapter 2, non-infrastructure projects can reach a considerable number of schools at relatively low cost.

Coordinating access to resources and information could help address this gap and expand program activities in the San Diego region. Throughout the U.S., county- or region-wide Safe Routes to School coordination supports programmatic activities by providing individualized support to jurisdictions, schools, and community volunteers. This includes connecting schools with available resources and providing information on model programs and strategies for establishing programs tailored to their communities’ needs, sustaining activities, and overcoming program challenges. One way to accomplish this is by maintaining a clearinghouse of case studies to illustrate best practices.

Regional coordination could also result in tools to address common barriers to walking and biking to school, such as liability concerns, prohibitive school policies and other institutional barriers, as well as tools to support instituting curriculums, school transportation policies, and school wellness policies that facilitate walking and biking to school. Regional coordination could also help to ensure resources are available, in appropriate formats and languages, to underserved communities.

Participating in existing regional, state, and national Safe Routes to School networks, in addition to seeking new opportunities to collaborate among
agencies and institutions, is key to coordinating Safe Routes to School regionally.

**Safe Routes to School Coalition**

**Key Elements**
- On-going forum to exchange information and promote collaboration

**Lead Agencies**
- California Department of Public Health, Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance Resource Center
- County of San Diego HHSA
- Rady Children’s Hospital, Center for Healthier Communities
- SANDAG

**Partners**
- School district officials, parent organizations, non-profit organizations, local government staff including engineers and planners.

Beginning in April 2011, the County of San Diego HHSA, SANDAG, the California Department of Public Health’s Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance Resource Center (TARC), and Rady Children’s Hospital, Center for Healthier Communities, have partnered to establish a Regional Safe Routes to School Coalition that serves as a forum to connect agencies and organizations involved in implementing Safe Routes to School. The Coalition, currently chaired by TARC, meets on a bi-monthly basis to coordinate efforts and to share relevant information about local program activities as well as available resources and technical expertise.

The Strategic Plan recommends regional and local partners, including SANDAG, continue to participate and work to expand participation and the scope of the Coalition.
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Providing trainings and other forms of technical assistance helps ensure that programs are comprehensive, effective, and sustainable.

Seminars and Trainings

Key Elements
- Professional trainings on a variety of technical topics related to Safe Routes to School

Lead Agencies
- Regional public health or planning organization

Partners
- Local governments, school districts, County of San Diego HHSA, State of California agencies, and professional organizations.

The plan recommends providing periodic trainings and seminars for professionals to support Safe Routes to School program and project development and overcome obstacles to implementing Safe Routes to School. Training topics may include: addressing liability issues, local and school district policy development, prioritizing investments, crime prevention by design, school-siting and design issues, and obligating funds in a timely manner.

Additionally, the highly competitive nature of Safe Routes to School funding has produced significant demand for grant-writing assistance. In response, the plan recommends offering periodic grant-writing seminars geared toward writing successful state-legislated and federal grant applications, as well as identifying and applying for alternative sources for Safe Routes to School funding.
One to three trainings or seminars could be offered within the first five years of strategy implementation, contingent on local demand.

**Safe Routes to School Planning Workshops**

- **Key Elements**
  - Safe Routes to School planning workshops
- **Lead Agency**
  - SANDAG
- **Partners**
  - Local jurisdictions, school districts, schools, parent volunteers, and professional trainers

The San Diego region is home to 251 private and 747 public primary and secondary schools as distinct as the 19 jurisdictions they reside within. With schools located in varied rural, suburban, and urban settings and with diverse built environment and population characteristics, each school’s combination of transportation issues and solutions are unique.

The plan recommends offering Safe Routes to School planning workshops to engage school communities and jurisdictions in launching comprehensive Safe Routes to School programs that address each school’s distinctive mix of issues and opportunities.

The workshops should be modeled after the National Center for Safe Routes to School National Course, designed to engage local planners, engineers, policy-makers, law enforcement, school district and school administrators, teachers, parent organizations, and other community members in a highly interactive process to identify school travel issues and potential solutions.
The workshops should be approximately three-hour sessions, taught by a team of at least two instructors, and conducted at a school or nearby facility. The format includes an introduction to the five elements of Safe Routes to School, observation of school travel behaviors, and charrettes resulting in potential design solutions, as well as non-infrastructure programs to pursue, for the target schools.

Prior to the workshop, the instructors should conduct field work to observe travel behaviors and identify deficiencies and issues in the vicinity of each target school. They should also review traffic count and collision data and interview enforcement, engineering, and school officials prior to the workshop. All of this information should be integrated into the workshop content.

Workshops could either focus on an individual school or a small group of schools located within the same area or similar settings. Scheduling workshops would require collaborating with school districts and local jurisdictions to prioritize implementation and coordinate with schools.

The results of the workshop, along with the data collected prior to the workshop, should be summarized into a report for the host agencies. The results can be used to initiate broader planning efforts, such as those described in the subsequent section (Safe Routes to School Planning Services), and to help launch the development of a comprehensive Safe Routes to School program. The workshop facilitators should also offer post-workshop de-briefs to the lead implementing agencies to provide technical assistance in moving forward with the development of the program.
Once the program is established, approximately five workshops could be held per year in high need communities.

**Safe Routes to School Planning Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Elements</th>
<th>Comprehensive Safe Routes to School planning services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Local governments, partnering organizations, and professional planning agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to promote comprehensive citywide and school-district wide Safe Routes to School planning, the Strategic Plan recommends providing professional planning services to three to five high-need communities per year beginning with this program’s first year of implementation. Cities and districts will be selected on a competitive basis based on criteria such as safety, health, existing and latent demand, and community support. The selection process will be developed as part of early implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Similar to the plans funded through the Healthy Works Safe Routes to School grant program, the planning services will result in community-level, district-wide, or city-wide safe routes to school plans that include all of the following elements:

- Existing conditions analysis and needs assessment (including walk/bike audits);
- Community and stakeholder input;
Suggested routes and/or deficiency maps;

Infrastructure improvement plans and concepts;

Education, encouragement, and enforcement program strategies;

Summary of funding sources; and

Evaluation and monitoring plan.

In addition, planning services to provide guidance on school-siting, new school design, or renovations may be available through this program.

EDUCATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT STRATEGIES

Identifying and administering select education and encouragement programs provides communities beneficial tools, such as SchoolPool, that might otherwise be too costly or burdensome for local administration. Also, serving as an information clearinghouse to local jurisdictions, schools districts, and schools facilitates local Safe Routes to School program development and maintenance.

Safe Routes to School Web Enhancements

**Key Elements**
- A Safe Routes to School page and upgrades to iCommute Trip-Tracker

**Lead Agency**
- SANDAG

**Partners**
- Local governments, school districts, schools, non-profit organizations, and other Safe Routes to School implementers

Knowledge about and access to existing resources is an initial hurdle to initiating Safe Routes to School efforts. One recommended approach to raising awareness about Safe Routes to School resources is by creating a Safe Routes to School Web page that incorporates the following possible elements:

- A summary or listing of Safe Routes to School programs and resources offered throughout the San Diego region;

- Announcements of Safe Routes to School events or related activities in the region; and

- Links to Safe Routes to School resources and publications available throughout the United States including the National Center for Safe Routes to School, iWalk International Walk to School Day, and California Active Communities Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance Resource Center Web sites.
The Strategic Plan also recommends developing a system to automatically log children’s trips to school or enable children to track their trips in Trip-Tracker, the iCommute program function that allows users to log their trips and review the estimated economic and air quality benefits derived from using alternative modes of travel. Currently this web tool is only accessible to parents, school officials, or other guardians. Thus, for households without computers, or when adults in the home do not use computers, the tool is underutilized. Auto-log technology or a child-accessible Trip-Tracker available through the school [i.e. supervised] could be accompanied by a children-oriented fun, interactive, and educational Web page.

Another recommended Web tool to consider includes updating the ride-matching interface of Trip-Tracker to accommodate multi-modal trips. This could facilitate the formation of “Bus Buddies,” a mechanism to connect families that use transit for at least one segment of their school trip. The popularity of transit for school-based trips is increasing steadily across the region in response to school-bus service reductions and is a viable option for students who live farther than walkable or bikeable distance from school. A “Bus Buddies” tool could help enable safe and active trips on the first and last leg of children’s school trips.

These additions are proposed to complement SchoolPool’s existing carpool, Bike Buddies, and Walking School Bus ride-matching system.
Outreach and Promotional Campaigns

Key Elements
Coordinate campaigns, activities, and events that promote walking and biking to school.

Lead Agency
SANDAG

Partners
Local governments, non-profit organizations, and school communities

Raising awareness through public outreach efforts and regional campaigns can increase school and parent participation in Safe Routes to School initiatives.

As described in Chapter 3, iCommute launched a Walk, Ride and Roll to School campaign in 2011 to expand school and parent participation in SchoolPool and to introduce “Walking School Bus” and “Bike Buddies” elements to the program. These program elements encourage students to walk or bike to school as a group, supported by adult-supervision and safety education.

With adult-supervision as an essential element, Walking School Bus and Bike Buddies programs address personal security concerns, which is a significant barrier to walking and biking to school. Older adults within the community can be trained to supervise groups, which would benefit the older community as well as students and their families. Evaluations of Walking School Bus initiatives have shown them to be effective in low-income, urban neighborhoods where concern with criminal activity can
be paramount (Mendoza, et al., 2009). Adding and promoting a “Bus Buddies” component also holds potential to increase personal safety.

Building on the momentum of Healthy Works, the plan recommends SANDAG continue to coordinate with school officials and parent organizations to promote and administer the iCommute SchoolPool program through regular communication and through robust incentive-based campaigns similar to Walk, Ride, and Roll to School.

In addition, SANDAG should continue to conduct outreach, provide incentives, and coordinate campaigns, activities, and events that promote walking and biking to school. This includes annual coordination of a regional Walk and Bike to School Day in conjunction with International Walk to School Day.
Education Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Elements</th>
<th>Education courses for students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agencies</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-profit organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Schools, parent volunteers, school districts and local public safety personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education is a vital element to any Safe Routes to School program. The content and format of educational activities should be designed to address known barriers to walking and biking to school, and therefore, can vary substantially between communities. Programs commonly involve teaching students traffic safety skills and can also incorporate lessons about personal security measures and health, science, and math topics. Material can be presented in a variety of formats including skills practice in a simulated streetscape setting, school assemblies, and ongoing classroom coursework.

Because there is a spectrum of possible programs, the Strategic Plan recommends conducting a ‘best practices’ and needs analysis to identify education programs that will have the broadest benefit to the region. The study should include a strategy for offering education programs so that they reach communities with the greatest need for assistance. The results of this assessment can be both shared with and informed by the Regional Safe Routes to School Coalition and planning efforts described in this chapter. After initial implementation, the effectiveness of the courses offered should be regularly assessed as a part of the evaluation program described on pages 53 and 54 of this Strategic Plan.
IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

Following adoption of the Strategic Plan, the recommendations will be prioritized. A phasing and financing strategy will be developed and incorporated into an Active Transportation Early Action Program. The 2050 RTP calls for an Active Transportation Early Action Program by 2014 to accelerate implementation of the regional Active Transportation Program.

Implementing the Strategic Plan also requires a needs analysis to define areas that will receive priority for some of the resources recommended in the strategy. This analysis will consider demographic and land use patterns with emphasis on safety, health impacts and social equity considerations. Using the results of the analysis to prioritize implementation will help meet a major social equity objective identified in the 2050 RTP, “to create equitable transportation opportunities for all populations regardless of age, ability, race, ethnicity, or income.”

In future years, this assessment will be addressed within Evaluation and Action Plans (p. 53) that will provide recommendations based on analysis of data and public input collected through the ongoing Safe Routes to School Data Collection and Evaluation program (p. 53 - 55). This approach allows the strategy to evolve and respond to the changing needs of the regions’ local communities and schools.
Appendix A:
RESOURCE LIST

Schools and community members interested in Safe Routes to School are encouraged to contact their local government to learn about opportunities within their jurisdiction. There is also a multitude of resources available to assist communities in developing individualized Safe Routes to School programs. This reference list can be used as a starting point for collecting more information on active transportation and how to initiate and sustain Safe Routes to School programs.

SAN DIEGO REGION

Caltrans District 11 – San Diego & Imperial Counties
Division of Local Assistance
Luis Z. Medina, Safe Routes to School District Coordinator
(619) 278-3735
luis_z_medina@dot.ca.gov
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm

Division of Transportation Planning
Seth Cutter, District 11 Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator
(619) 688-2597
Seth.Cutter@dot.ca.gov
(619) 688-6699 (general number for District 11)
http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist11/

County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency
Katherine Judd, Health Promotion Specialist
(619) 668-3758
Katherine.Judd@sdcounty.ca.gov
http://www.healthyworks.org/

Rady Children’s Hospital Center for Healthier Communities
Dane Lotspeich, Safe Routes to School Project Coordinator
(858) 573-1700, ext. 3656
dlotspeich@rchsd.org
Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance Resource Center
California Active Communities, CA Department of Public Health
Kristin Haukom, Safe Routes to School Project Coordinator,
San Diego Region
(916) 208-1885
Kristin.Haukom@cdph.ca.gov
http://www.casaferoutestoschool.org/

SANDAG
Regional Active Transportation Program
Chris Kluth, Program Manager
(619) 699-1952
ckl@sandag.org
Bridget Enderle, Active Transportation Planner
(Safe Routes to School contact)
(619) 595-5612
ben@sandag.org

iCommute SchoolPool
Kim Weinstein, Senior Transportation Planner
(619) 699-0725
kwe@sandag.org
Call 511 (say “SchoolPool” when prompted)
schoolpool@sandag.org

San Diego County Bicycle Coalition
Maria Olivas, Education Program Coordinator
(858) 472-6025
education@sdcb.org
http://www.sdcb.org/

San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Coalition
Kristin Haukom, Chair
(916) 208-1885
Kristin.Haukom@cdph.ca.gov

Bridget Enderle, Advisory Member
(619) 595-5612
ben@sandag.org

WalkSanDiego
Leah Stender, Program Manager
(619) 544-9255
lstender@walksandiego.org
http://www.walksandiego.org/
CALIFORNIA

California Project LEAN
(916) 552-9907
http://www.californiaprojectlean.org/

California Safe Routes to School (Caltrans)
Caltrans Division of Local Assistance
Dawn Foster, California Safe Routes to School Coordinator
(916) 653-6920
dawn_foster@dot.ca.gov
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm

California Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance Resource Center
California Active Communities, CA Department of Public Health
(916) 552-9874
CAactivecommunities.org
http://www.casaferoutestoschool.org/

California Walks
Wendy Alfsen, Director
(510) 684-5705
wendy@californiawalks.org
https://californiawalks.org/

California Walk to School Day Headquarters
California Active Communities
(916) 552-9874
walktoschool@cdph.ca.gov
http://www.cawalktoschool.com

Safe Routes to School California: A Project of the Safe Routes to School National Partnership
http://saferoutescalifornia.wordpress.com/

NATIONAL

America Walks
(703) 738-4889
http://americawalks.org/

iWalk International Walk to School in the USA
(866) 610-SRTS
http://www.walktoschool-usa.org
Center for Disease Control and Prevention of the Department of Health and Human Services
Kids Walk-to-School
http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/kidswalk/resources.htm

League of American Bicyclists
(202) 822-1333
bikeleague@bikeleague.org
http://www.bikeleague.org/

National Center for Safe Routes to School
University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center
(866) 610-SRTS
http://www.saferoutesinfo.org

National Complete Streets Coalition
http://www.completestreets.org/

National Policy & Legal Analysis Network to Prevent Childhood Obesity
Public Health Law & Policy
http://www.nplanonline.org/

Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center
University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center
http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/

Safe Routes to School National Partnership
Jessica Meaney, California Policy Manager
(213) 221-7179
jessica@saferoutespartnership.org
http://www.saferoutespartnership.org/home

United States Federal Highway Administration Safe Routes to School Program
http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/saferoutes/

The National Center for Bicycling and Walking
http://www.bikewalk.org/
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