STUDY OF SAFE WALKING ROUTES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

In Fulfillment of Assembly Bill 231 (2005)
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SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

This study responds to Assembly Bill 231 (AB 231), passed during the 73rd Session of the Nevada Legislature, approved by the Governor May 24, 2005, and effective July 1, 2005. In Washoe County, it is the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission (RPC) that must coordinate and submit this study to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the 74th Session of the Nevada Legislature. Specifically, the study must include, without limitation:

a) A review and evaluation of the existing walking paths and sidewalks within a 1-mile radius of each public school located in the county;
b) Recommendations for improvements to the conditions of those walking paths and sidewalks; and
c) A review and evaluation of the programs currently implemented in the county to ensure safe walking routes for pupils to schools.

The RPC study embodied in this report is a result of coordination and collaboration with a multi-jurisdictional team (Team) that includes the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA), City of Reno (Reno), City of Sparks (Sparks), Washoe County (County), Washoe County School District (WCSD), and the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). The Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) was also a participant and provided key input to the report.

1.1 PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose of this study is to meet the requirements of AB 231 by documenting the safety of children walking to school in Washoe County, and ultimately helping to ensure that students who walk to and from public schools are provided with safe walking routes. According to the legislative record, the study’s key points of interest are:

- Documentation of the ability and obstacles for children to safely walk to school with a focus on pedestrian safety at newly constructed schools; and,
- Local recommendations for infrastructure improvements within one mile of the school sites where local governments have right-of-way access.

While the scope of the study is specific to AB 231, the issue of safe pedestrian and bicycle routes to schools is gaining nationwide momentum. The Team providing this report for Washoe County felt it was also important to describe the broader issues at hand, including non-infrastructure improvement recommendations, the benefits of safe routes to schools, and potential future planning efforts to ensure a cohesive approach is taken for the safety of Washoe County school children.

This study does not attempt to quantify the amount of, or cost of, potential infrastructure improvements for safe routes to public schools within Washoe County.
1.2 **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Travel to school by walking and bicycling has declined dramatically over the past several decades. This decline has been associated with:

- suburbanization of cities and towns with new schools being located at sites too distant for students to walk conveniently,
- increased school busing for social and geographic reasons,
- parental concerns about traffic safety and personal security; and,
- a greater number of families in which parents do not have the time to walk their children to and from school.

In recent years there has been growing momentum to reverse this trend. Reasons for this movement include an interest in re-establishing livable communities, in which non-vehicular movement is desirable, and the smart growth movement that fosters bicycling and walking as most appropriate for shorter trips. The cost of school busing is sometimes an issue, and health advocates point to the benefits of increased exercise for children, particularly with increased child obesity, associated type II diabetes, and asthma.

It was agreed that the approach to this study would be regional in nature rather than specific to jurisdictions or individual schools. Since 71% of students in Washoe County attend elementary and middle school, there was greater emphasis on evaluation of walking paths and sidewalks to these schools than high schools.

The evaluation of walking paths and sidewalks to schools was conducted in a slightly different manner than that stated in AB 231. The evaluation was performed based on the distance that the school bus drives (1-mile along streets from a school) rather than the distance that the crow flies (1-mile radius from a school). All Team members agreed this was most appropriate for Washoe County since the information was readily available and since evaluation at a 1-mile radius for each school would involve evaluating almost all sidewalks within Reno and Sparks. This evaluation was conducted using maps prepared by WCSD Geographic Information Systems (GIS) staff. The evaluation went beyond the 1-mile distance requirement stated in AB 231 since the maps match WCSD’s walk zones (boundaries within which children do not ride the school bus). Per WCSD policy, for elementary schools, the walk zone is 1-mile from the school. For middle schools, the walk zone is 2-miles from school, and for high schools, 3 miles.

The Team provided input to this report both in workshop format and through individual local government meetings, telephone interviews, and written submitted comment. Regional walking path and sidewalk conditions were grouped according to 3 types of conditions: 1) conditions that are currently addressed, 2) conditions requiring increased attention, and 3) conditions not currently addressed. It is important to understand that conditions listed as currently not addressed do not necessarily create unsafe conditions for pupils; however, they may have the potential to create unsafe conditions.
Through the process of conducting this study, much information was brought to light and shared among the participating entities. A number of recommendations were made, and are included in this report, to improve the safety of children walking to schools.

Specific infrastructure improvement evaluation and recommendations for each of the schools is beyond the scope of this study, requiring major manpower, and possibly expense, to accomplish. The Team agreed that a set of standards needs to be developed that can be applied to each public school based on local government consensus of what constitutes a safe versus unsafe condition. This set of standards, coupled with provision of adequate resources, should be utilized to conduct a thorough evaluation of walking paths and sidewalks for school children. Currently there is no specific, comprehensive manual addressing the needs of school children based on environmental and engineered conditions in Washoe County.

There is a need in the region for a Washoe County Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program which goes beyond the physical review and evaluation of walking routes in the region, although this is a good starting point. While each local government may choose different approaches to a SRTS program, it is important that any programs that are developed are shared with a regional authority and that this information is summarized as a Washoe County SRTS program. A regional future planning effort for programs such as education programs for SRTS would be important to pool efforts to leverage grant funding opportunities.

Prior to developing and implementing a Washoe County SRTS program, there are steps that can be taken to improve safety awareness for students and parents. As described in Section 3 of this report, increased communication between WCSD and the local governments, and vice versa, is one step that can be taken now. In addition, there could be greater interaction between the Safe Kids Washoe County Coalition, WCSD, and local governments in the future to maximize currently available resources. Increased future coordination between WCSD and local government entities in both the planning stage and operation of safety-related infrastructure for schools will have tremendous positive benefits for all parties.
SECTION 2: REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF EXISTING WALKING PATHS AND SIDEWALKS

Over 65,000 students attend 103 schools within the WCSD. Attachment A of this report provides the official “count day” for the 2006-2007 school year. Of the total 103 schools, 90 public schools are considered in this report. Picollo (K-12), Washoe Middle, RTI, TMCC Magnet, Washoe High School and all the charter schools are not considered in this report.

The table below shows the breakdown of number of public schools considered in this report by jurisdiction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Washoe County</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Schools [1]</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Number of Students [1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>33,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparks</td>
<td>10,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Washoe County</td>
<td>17,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Students [1]</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,071</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WCSD, November 2006.
[1] Excludes Picollo, Washoe Middle, RTI, TMCC Magnet, Washoe High School and all charter schools.

Of the total number of students, 71% attend elementary and middle school; therefore, in preparation of this report, there was greater emphasis on evaluation of walking paths and sidewalks to elementary and middle schools than high schools.

2.1 CRITERIA FOR REVIEW AND EVALUATION

The Team agreed at its first meeting that criteria for qualitatively assessing the walking routes included items such as surface type, connectivity, school zones, and crossing guards. Each local government was responsible to conduct this assessment based on maps provided by WCSD. The level of assessment was confined to the safety of children getting to school in general rather than on details of cracked sidewalks or tripping hazards. Specific locations with safety issues would not be pinpointed.

WCSD treats child safety to and from school very seriously and rigorously assesses the safety of walking routes to schools continually by employing three full-time field supervisors to inspect walk routes, respond to parental concerns, and drive the bus routes. Regardless of where a child lives in relation to the school that he/she attends, WCSD will bus when there is a need due to an unsafe situation (need to cross a major arterial for example). Children with special needs are picked up from outside their homes in specially-equipped buses.

WCSD has established “walk zones” around schools that are the boundaries within which children do not ride the school bus. WCSD Administrative Regulation 3545 included as Attachment B to this report describes the conditions under which transportation of students by bus will be considered. For elementary schools, the walk zone is 1-mile from the school.
For middle schools, the walk zone is 2-miles from school, and for high schools, 3 miles. These mileage distances are not based on how the crow flies (radius from a school) but rather how far the children will have to walk assuming that sidewalks along roads are used to get to school. The distances are measured by the WCSD’s field supervisors as they drive the school bus.

The Team felt that it was most appropriate to conduct the review and evaluation of existing walking paths and sidewalks using WCSD’s criteria of how the bus drives rather than how the crow flies.

Children living within the walk zone may or may not walk to school. Many parents choose to drive their children to school. Some children may walk to a school bus stop located just outside of the walk zone, which is permitted so long as there is room on the bus to accommodate them.

2.2 Evaluation Methodology
The Team provided input to this process both in workshop format and through individual local government meetings, telephone interviews, and written submitted comment. Several meetings were held to discuss the direction of the study, the level of study and detail to be included within the report. Dialogue between each of the Team members provided the foundation for the report, and was integral to accomplishing this report.

WCSD and the local governments examined each of the 90 public schools within Washoe County independently; however, given the volume of comments from such review, the findings of these evaluations were condensed into groupings that summarize the issues at a regional level.

WCSD’s GIS staff created maps showing school attendance zone boundaries and the school walk zones within those boundaries. An example map has been created to illustrate the process used to conduct the review and evaluation of existing walking paths and sidewalks for each of the public schools. The map is shown in Attachment C of this report. The map shows streets along which children are not bused because they are in the walk zone (green lines), and streets along which children are bused even though they are in the walk zone (red lines) due to a safety concern. Children residing along streets shown in orange on the map live more than 1 mile from school as the bus drives; however, they are not bused because they live within 1 mile of the school along an established pathway. Individual school maps are available on request, but, due to the large quantity of maps, are not included in this report.

2.3 Findings of Regional Conditions
The Team grouped findings of regional walking path and sidewalk conditions within 1-mile of each of the schools based on the known current status of those conditions. WCSD field supervisors verified the map information by driving the bus routes and visually inspecting walking paths around school. The local governments were not able to conduct field visits to
each of the school sites due to a lack of available resources to perform such visits during the study period. Sparks has inventoried all crosswalks, signals, and stop sign locations near all public schools within their jurisdiction. This GIS data will be updated annually and shared with WCSD.

**Group 1: Conditions Currently Addressed**

Included in this group are conditions that were noted by the Team at schools in Washoe County that are safety concerns for children wanting to walk or bike to school. These conditions are adequately addressed currently by WCSD, local governments, RTC, or any combination of these entities working together cooperatively.

a) **Crossing Major Road Required**

Some children may have to cross a major road to reach their school by foot. Reasons may include the boundary of the school attendance zone, school placement along an arterial or other busy road, and school location in an area that historically had low traffic volumes that has increased over time. WCSD field supervisors judge the safety of crossing major roads, and may bus children who would have to cross these roads even if adequate traffic controls are installed. Adequate traffic controls are those required by the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), American Association of Street and Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO), American Disabilities Act (ADA), and NDOT. Assessments are always conducted, and strategies to address concerns are implemented, prior to a new school opening. If parents are still concerned, field supervisors will conduct a specific site visit to that location and evaluate the safety of children at that site. Any ambiguity is always resolved by offering bus service to those children.

b) **Inadequacy of Traffic Controls at Crossings**

There are only a few instances in which it has been determined, after a school has opened, that the crossing(s) were not safe enough for the children. Such determinations are typically made by city or county government based on constituent concerns. When this occurs, local governments install appropriate devices to reduce the speed of vehicular traffic, and more rigorously enforce speed limits on those stretches of road. Lower speeds can reduce the chance of injuries at crossings but are not the only solution. Children must be educated how to responsibly use the crossings.

**Group 2: Conditions Requiring Increased Attention**

There are several conditions that are currently addressed but that the Team acknowledged could perhaps be better addressed in the future. These include:

a) **Lack of walking paths within 1-mile radius**

There are many instances throughout the region where children living within a 1-mile radius of the school cannot reach the school without walking more than a mile. This situation is caused by layout and design features of subdivisions that have either not constructed walking paths that connect to the school, or access to walking paths that
do connect to the school. Cul-de-sacs are a good example of this type of situation. Developers are currently encouraged, but are not required to, provide such walking paths. As a result, there is increased vehicular traffic around schools at drop-off and pick-up and/or a greater number of children that are required to be bused. The safety of those children who do walk is compromised by increased traffic.

b) Lack of pathway connectivity
Where there is a lack of pathway connectivity either from sidewalks on one side of a road to another or transition from a regional trail to another walk path, for example, children may be forced to take an unsafe and/or undesignated walk route. Examples of such walk routes include walking in the street, creating a path across another person’s property, crossing busy roads without the appropriate crossing signs and signals, and so forth. Currently these children may be bused to school or left to make their own decision whether to walk. In many instances, the parents will drive the children.

c) Crossing safety in front of schools
Assistance crossing roads in front of schools is evaluated by each school independently rather than coordinated by WCSD. Seventy eight percent of the elementary schools have some road crossing supervision, and fourteen percent of the middle schools do[^1]. The majority of this supervision is by school staff, in some instances by the principal of the school. Many of the elementary schools have student crossing guards (typically 5th and 6th graders), and a few schools have parent supervision (sometimes called Parent Patrol), which is a voluntary program. One school’s PTA has hired a crossing guard.

d) Construction zone activity
Each of the local governments provides public notification of construction activity in neighborhoods including anticipated start and end dates. During construction activity, school bus routes may be changed, and children who typically walk may be bussed. Since construction activity has potential for life-threatening accidents, this is a situation that must be well coordinated between the local governments and WCSD.

Group 3: Conditions Not Currently Addressed
For a select number of conditions, the Team recognizes there are improvements that could be made to enhance the safety of children walking to school. These conditions are most typically found in outlying areas of the county which were at one time, or are now, more rural in character. The conditions listed in this group do not necessarily create an unsafe condition for pupils, but rather, are recognized as having the potential to create an unsafe condition.

[^1]: Source: WCSD, October 2006
Snow events, although frequent in Washoe County during the winter, were not considered by the Team to be a problem for students using sidewalks. Light snowfall typically does not impede walking on sidewalks, and property owners are required to remove snow in front of their property. Heavy winter storm events result in school closures or delays.

a) Narrow walk paths
   The safety issues associated with narrow walk paths in Washoe County include increased trip and fall hazards, inability for children to walk in groups (only allows for single file), and an inability for wheelchairs to use the paths. As mentioned earlier, all special needs children have the option to use the specially-equipped buses for transportation to and from school; however, for those capable and wishing to use their wheelchair to transport themselves to school, narrow walk paths reduces the safety of this option.

b) Ditches next to paths
   Child play next to ditches may result in real danger; dares and jokes may result in serious injury. The potential for injury or fatality increases during storm events, particularly in places where culvert crossings are narrow.

c) Lack of designated walk path
   There are several issues associated with the lack of a designated walk path, a couple of which are already mentioned such as lack of path during storm events (especially dangerous in areas prone to flash flooding during certain periods of the year), lack of access for wheelchairs, and increased trip and fall hazards. Non-infrastructure issues include trespassing, stranger danger, and other perceived dangers that accompany the lack of boundary between pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Each of the local governments has, or is in the process of, compiling the data to create maps illustrating all types of paths including trails that could be utilized by school children.

d) No sidewalk
   Where there is no sidewalk, children are more prone to creating their own paths which may result in conditions a) through c) listed above. Alternatively, children will walk in the streets where there is no designated separation between vehicle and pedestrian traffic. This problem is exacerbated in neighborhoods with narrow streets.
SECTION 3: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

3.1 WALKING PATHS AND SIDEWALKS REGIONAL CONDITIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT
Team review of the input from entities on their evaluation of safety at each school resulted in the three groupings of regional conditions provided in Section 2 of this report. Of these groups of conditions, group 1 documents existing conditions that are adequately addressed. Group 2 documents existing and potential conditions that are addressed by the responsible entities, or combination of responsible entities, but require increased attention. Group 3 documents conditions that potentially provide unsafe situations for students who walk or bike to school.

To put some perspective on the seriousness of safety for children walking and biking to school, the Nevada Department of Transportation ran a query of injuries and fatalities in Washoe County between 1994 and 2006 to children ages 4 to 19. The query was run for Monday through Friday, between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m., 11:00 a.m. and 12:30 p.m., and 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. Injuries to school children going to and from school have averaged 32 injuries per year over the past 12 years, with a total of 386 injuries. During this time there have also been 3 fatalities. All three fatalities were to pedestrians, 2 of whom were age 5, and one age 9.

The data suggests a negative correlation between number of injuries and population growth; since number of injuries per year has remained stable since 1994, but number of enrolled school children has increased from 38,466 in 1990 to 65,013 in 2006. Of the total number of injuries, 53% were to pedestrians, and 47% to children operating bicycles, tricycles, unicycles, or pedal cars. Approximately 43% percent of bike and pedestrian injuries were on city-owned roads, approximately 51% on county-owned roads, and the remaining 6% on state-owned roads.

Given the highly subjective determination of whether a situation is safe or not for a child to walk to school, the recommendations provided by the Team in this section of the report are based on application of common sense to known regional conditions as well as a review of programs implemented across the US. The majority of the recommendations provided herein pertain to non-infrastructure improvements, chiefly increased coordination and awareness between the responsible participating entities. Recommendations for non-infrastructure improvements reflect not only solutions to the conditions described in Section 2, but also an evaluation of the programs currently implemented in Washoe County, as detailed in Section 4 of this report.

Designated staff members from each of the participating entities need to be in regular contact with each other to continually work on identifying issues, developing recommendations and implementing action plans.

2 Source: WCSD website: http://www.washoe.k12.nv.us/district/facts/. Total numbers include charter school children.
3.2 Recommendations for Infrastructure Improvements

Local governments respond to reported infrastructure hazards as detailed in Section 4 of this study. Specific infrastructure improvement evaluation and recommendations for each of the schools is beyond the scope of this study, requiring major manpower, and possibly expense, to accomplish. The Team agreed that a set of standards needs to be developed that can be applied to each public school based on local government consensus of what constitutes a safe versus unsafe condition. This set of standards, coupled with provision of adequate resources, should be utilized to conduct a thorough evaluation of walking paths and sidewalks for school children. Currently there is no specific, comprehensive manual addressing the needs of school children based on environmental and engineered conditions in Washoe County.

Recommendation: Local agreement on Safe versus Unsafe Conditions

Local government entities responsible for safe routes to school should work together to identify the most critical areas of safety-related infrastructure to be addressed. In Section 2 of this report, conditions were identified that have potential to be unsafe for school children walking to school. Workshops or some other meeting form could be used by the local governments to define when conditions are safe versus unsafe. Consensus on these definitions in Washoe County is essential to proceed with identifying and prioritizing critical safety-related infrastructure to be addressed in the design and conditions of approval for new school construction.

Recommendation: Develop School Safety Handbook for Washoe County

National standards for safety of children including condition of sidewalks and paths and level of traffic control are currently available and applied in Washoe County. The MUTCD, AASHTO, ADA, and NDOT requirements are met or exceeded by all participating entities. The Team recommends taking these requirements further by developing a school safety handbook for Washoe County that addresses the safety needs of school children based on environmental and engineered conditions found within Washoe County.

This safety handbook would be used to a) ensure adequate provisions for safe walking routes are incorporated into conditions of approval for new schools, and b) objectively rather than subjectively assess safe routes to schools at existing schools. Through assessment of existing conditions using this handbook, the affected entities could prioritize infrastructure improvements to be performed, and begin the process of estimating costs of those improvements. Examples of items to be evaluated include whether sidewalks are continuous and in good condition, adequacy of crosswalks and pedestrian signals, inventory of obstacles blocking sidewalks, and ADA compliance.

3.3 Recommendations for Non-Infrastructure Improvements

Recommendation: Increased cooperative efforts between WCSD and local governments through the development approval process

By law, WCSD is required to provide a review of development applications received by each of the three local governments (City of Sparks, City of Reno, and Washoe County).
WCSD’s primary focus has historically been to analyze the applications in terms of the number of school students the new developments will generate to aid long-range school planning efforts. Specifically, WCSD’s concern has been the number of and location of new schools, as well as potential rezoning of school attendance zones to accommodate new students. WCSD will comment on proposed school sites when it’s clear that there is an issue with that site from their perspective. Greater formal direction from WCSD and increased coordinated interlocal government planning would assist each of the jurisdictions in their planning review of school site considerations.

Reno and Sparks require some, but not all, proposed developments to provide a SRTS plan that identifies how children within a 1-mile radius of the future school site can walk to school. The cities’ community development departments prioritize safety and connectivity of paths when reviewing SRTS plans for future school sites. Washoe County conditions a SRTS plan of WCSD at application for a building permit as part of a special use permit to build a school, but this may be too late to maximize potential for children to walk or bike to school safely. It would be ideal to bring safe routes to schools to the forefront of the planning process rather than at the tail-end of the process. Increased cooperative efforts are particularly important for infill developments which may currently have proposed land uses that were originally unanticipated and that may impact existing walk paths to established schools.

**Recommendation: WCSD Development of guidelines for adequate safety-related considerations and infrastructure**

The formal set of WCSD written policies and/or guidelines on suitability of school sites should be disseminated to local governments and developers early in the development process to garner consensus on desirable school locations.

Although local governments would not be bound by law to adhere to such a set of guidelines, the principles embodied in the document could be fostered by each of the local governments and help developers understand WCSD and child needs when designing / planning a new community. Adhering to such a set of guidelines would increase proactive measures, and potentially reduce reactive measures to controlling traffic and making walk/bike routes safe.

**Recommendation: Require Safe Routes to Schools plans from developers**

SRTS plans are already required of many new developments in Reno and Sparks, but are not required by Washoe County. It would be helpful to have a consistent set of guidelines for SRTS plans applied in each of the jurisdictions for local government and WCSD review since occasionally a safe route to school will be the shared responsibility of jurisdictions. These SRTS plans could be enhanced with additional criteria that the WCSD identifies as important in certain geographical locations. Planning for remote drop off sites is an example of a consideration that would need to take place early in the development process and that could be included in a SRTS plan from a developer.
Recommendation: Place burden of new school-related safety infrastructure on developers
Local governments do require developers to bring infrastructure as close to a school site as possible, to the degree that it is a reasonable condition of development. Since WCSD does not always use the site that the developer is required to set aside for purchase, it is difficult to require that utilities be brought to the future site. To the degree that it is reasonable, developers should be required rather than encouraged to bring utilities, walking paths, trails, and other pedestrian safety features to the future school site.

Recommendation: Integrate all available walking path and trail data in the WCSD GIS database
Currently there is no one GIS with the ability to illustrate all walking paths and trails in Washoe County. Sparks does have this information available, and Reno and Washoe County are currently working on providing such data for each of their jurisdictions. WCSD is in the process of consolidating their GIS data to provide an illustration of all potential walking routes to each school. These illustrations should be put into leaflet or handout form for parents to make informed decisions how their child can walk or bike to school safely. The leaflets should be distributed to local governments and put in highly visible public places, as well as posted on the WCSD and local governments’ websites.

Recommendation: Improved communication between local governments and WCSD on action plans to mitigate unsafe situations
Currently the local governments, RTC, and WCSD respond to public infrastructure grievances independently of one another. This independence has in the past created situations in which one entity is unaware of the intentions of another, sometimes working at odds to one another, and oftentimes resulting in confusion to the public. Improved communication between the local governments, RTC, and WCSD would leverage resources and more efficiently respond to the public’s complaints regarding public infrastructure hazards at or near schools.

Recommendation: Increase safety education programs and promote pedestrian and bicycle traffic to schools
Having the adequate infrastructure to provide safe routes to schools does not necessarily result in increased pedestrian and bike traffic, or the safe use of the infrastructure. Several school sites, particularly newer schools that have good infrastructure in place for walking and biking, have a greater percentage of children driven to school by their parents than children walking to school. Many of the older schools with less walk and bike infrastructure have greater volumes of children walking to the school. The number of children walking to school is not only dependent on the infrastructure that is provided but more broad social and cultural issues.

Education programs that are successful in getting children out of cars and onto walking paths help improve child health and air quality in those areas. Another benefit of increased education programs is reducing the perceived danger of children making their own way to
school. Each school could participate in various education strategies to encourage walking and biking to school. One method would be to map out both primary routes currently used by children, as well as potential routes. Parents could be involved in walking the routes to identify the best routes for their children and report any hazards that may emerge, or develop over time. Parents should be educated too by obtaining and sharing speed, traffic volume, and crash statistics with them. Education efforts should also be coordinated with WCSD and local government law enforcement.
SECTION 4: REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS CURRENTLY IMPLEMENTED

This section of the report documents programs currently implemented in Washoe County, programs provided through the State, and programs implemented across the US. The evaluation of the programs currently implemented in Washoe County is reflected in the non-infrastructure recommendations detailed in Section 3 of this report.

4.1 PROGRAMS AND INITIATIVES IN WASHOE COUNTY

The Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority (REMSA) leads the Safe Kids Washoe County Coalition. Established in 2000, this coalition is part of the national Safe Kids campaign. Its mission is to prevent injuries to children ages zero to fourteen. Having recently achieved non-profit 501(c)(3) status, the coalition is looking to expand its activities. For the past two years, Safe Kids has conducted a ‘Walk this Way’ campaign at select elementary schools (one school in 2005 and two schools in 2006) coinciding with International Walk to School Day. A pedestrian rodeo was conducted as part of that campaign for all the children at these schools.

Reno-Sparks Kiwanis provides bicycle safety courses and equipment to promote cycling in Washoe County. Established in 1993 and run solely by volunteers, the Reno-Sparks Kiwanis holds special events for children and adults in the area, providing them with better skills for using and maintaining their bikes, including bike rodeos, workshops, and fun activities. Volunteers also recondition bikes using supplies donated by individual citizens and community organizations. These bikes are distributed to children in need.

The City of Reno

New developments are often required to provide a SRTS plan, and to comply with that plan as part of their conditions of approval to obtain a building permit to proceed with development although there is no written policy requiring such a plan for Reno globally.

Reno responds to citizen requests for safety concerns through its Trip and Fall program, through its Reno Direct hotline, or direct calls to public works with complaints of sidewalk conditions. Reno goes to great lengths to ensure that any child can walk safely to school, including children who are disadvantaged by being visually or hearing impaired, and has in the past installed appropriate signals, signs and other traffic devices on request. Pedestrian facilities are required to be built as part of any new development. When Reno reconstructs or resurfaces roads, the sidewalk, curb, and gutter is also routinely replaced.

Applicable to all local governments in Nevada, with the passage of NRS 278.02313 in 2003, a governing body shall not require an owner of property to maintain, reconstruct or repair a sidewalk in a public right-of-way that abuts his property. A governing body is; however, not prohibited from:
(a) Imposing an assessment or other charge authorized by law for any reconstruction or repair of a sidewalk that the governing body causes to be performed within a public right-of-way;
(b) Requiring any reconstruction or repair of a sidewalk as a condition of approval for a change in the use of the land;
(c) Requiring an owner of property to maintain a sidewalk in a public right-of-way that abuts his property if the sidewalk was constructed pursuant to standards that exceed the general standards of the governing body for sidewalks; or
(d) Requiring, by ordinance, owners of property to be responsible for:
   (1) The repair and reconstruction of a sidewalk in the public right-of-way that abuts the property of the owner if the owner caused the need for such repair or reconstruction.
   (2) The general maintenance of a sidewalk in the public right-of-way that abuts the property of the owner, including, without limitation, sweeping, removal of snow, ice and weeds, and maintenance of any grass, shrubs or trees that encroach on the sidewalk.

When complaints or requests for improvements are received by Reno, the public works department will respond to the call with a site visit. If curb, sidewalk, and gutter facilities do not meet the City’s guidelines for determination of deteriorated sidewalks, curb and gutter, Chapter 12.20 of the Reno Municipal Code requires that the property owner will be notified of their code violation. The property owner has 30 days to address the deficiency noted. Property owners who do not take action become liable for the costs incurred by the City to rectify the deficiency, and the City places a lien against the real property to ensure repayment of costs.

City police enforce speed limits at and around schools. Police officers are assigned to different schools throughout the week, rotating from school to school. Speed is their primary focus. Officers provide limited pedestrian and bicycle safety training and will speak in classrooms on request. Stranger danger is taught under the DARE program. Reno police do not train crossing guards.

The City of Sparks
New developments are often required to provide a SRTS plan, and to comply with that plan as part of their conditions of approval to obtain a building permit to proceed with development. There is no written policy requiring such a plan for the City of Sparks globally, but each planned development is required to include a SRTS plan in its development handbook. WCSD is also required as a condition of a special use permit to provide a SRTS plan prior to issuance of a building permit for a new school.

The public works department responds to citizen concerns for child safety, which may include sidewalk widths, ADA requirements, clear zones for sight, lighting at intersection and cross walks, for example. Sparks will build sidewalks if unsafe situations are documented.
Sidewalks are usually built when the property fronting the area develops per City Code Section 17.16.070. Pedestrian ways on dedicated right-of-way along blocks longer than 1,000 feet are also required where deemed necessary for circulation and access to schools, playgrounds and other civic uses. When the City reconstructs or resurfaces roads, the sidewalk, curb, and gutter is also routinely inspected. School crossings are installed by WCSD when a school is located on a roadway, and installed by the local government when the school does not abut a roadway.

The City maintains walking paths and bike paths within its right of way when no other party has been named responsible. Responsibility for maintenance of paths varies from one planned development to another; however, Sparks Parks and Recreation Department is always responsible for maintenance of the Regional Trail system. Per Sparks Municipal Code Section 12.16.020, any sidewalk ordered built by the city council shall be paid for by the owner of the property which abuts upon the sidewalk. If the owner fails to pay the cost, the cost and all expense entailed by the city in building the sidewalk and collecting of the cost shall be a lien against the property. Property owners are responsible for repair and reconstruction of sidewalks in the public right-of-way abutting the property of the owner if the owner caused the need for such repair and reconstruction.

There are two Sparks police officers assigned to the DARE and other child safety programs at Sparks’ public schools. At the beginning of the school year, these police officers teach “Safety Patrol” which is a course that trains 5th and 6th graders how to be effective crossing guards during the 10 minute periods before and after school. Although there is no formal training for parents and other volunteers, the officers will also provide tips to parents whenever asked. The officers monitor traffic volumes outside of schools as part of the student crossing guard evaluations and will put out flyers and warnings when safety is being compromised.

Washoe County

Sidewalks are required to be constructed on both sides of the street along all arterials and on one side of the street along collector and local streets serving lot sizes of 0.5 to 1.5 acres (Washoe County Code Section 110.436.25). Sidewalks are not required along streets serving lot sizes greater than 1.5 acres. Washoe County Code is currently in the process of being updated; however, current code states that, “It is unlawful for any person owning, having charge or control of or occupying a property, building lot, part of a lot, land or real estate open to public use or abutting on any street or roadway in the unincorporated area of Washoe County to fail, refuse or neglect to remove or cause to be removed all ice or snow resulting from a storm from the sidewalk or sidewalks in front of such property, building, lot, part of a lot, land or real estate (Section 85.365).”

Although the County does not have a specific Trip and Fall program, any citizen may submit a ‘Citizen Traffic Request Form’ to the Washoe County Engineering Division stating their concern at a location and offering solutions to address their concern. A low volume of these forms are received each year. Most complaints received are regarding road crossings. The County will install traffic controls where deemed appropriate.
The Washoe County Sheriff Department concentrates enforcement efforts in school zones, and specifically targets elementary and middle school areas. In the past volunteers have assisted with school safety issues but this program is no longer in effect. Officers will assist with training of crossing guards on request.

**Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)**
The RTC’s 2030 Transportation Plan (RTP) houses overall bicycle and walking plans for regional roads and routes connecting those regional roads. As the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Reno/Sparks metropolitan area, RTC is required to develop and carry out a comprehensive and cooperative transportation plan that incorporates programs and facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians.

As part of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), transportation plans and projects must consider safety and contiguous routes for bicyclists and pedestrians, installing appropriate devices such as audible traffic signals. Future facilities offering alternatives to automobile travel such as facilities for non-automobile school trips are given higher priority than those serving primarily recreation functions.

The RTP calls for regional and local participation to encourage the increased use of safe bicycling and recognizes the need to create a network of bicycle facilities throughout the Truckee Meadows, as well as a well-organized education and safety program for bicycle users and motorists. One of the bicycle and pedestrian facilities element objectives in the RTP is that by 2012 there will be uniform policies and standards for the location and installation of sidewalks in the region adopted by the local governments.

### 4.2 State and Nationwide Programs

**State of Nevada Programs**
The Nevada Department of Transportation is in the process of setting up a formal SRTS program to disburse money made available through the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). This Act (also known as Public Law 109-59) provides funding for all 50 states administered by a Safe Routes to Schools coordinator in each state. Funding is for grades K-8 only. At least 10% but no more than 30% of funding provided must be for non-infrastructure related projects. This program and its funding are not only to address safety concerns but also promote a culture of walking and biking to school in a nationwide effort to decrease traffic and pollution and increase the health of children and the community. The grant application process in Nevada is anticipated to be in place by spring of 2007.

The Department of Transportation also has a State Bicycle/Pedestrian Program Manager and hosts an annual conference on bicycle and pedestrian safety issues. The conference brings presenters from across the U.S. to share their lessons learned and describe future new programs and innovations applicable to bicycle and pedestrian safety.
The Nevada Office of Traffic Safety provides education and training on bicycle and pedestrian safety in an effort to reduce injuries and deaths resulting from traffic crashes. The program was established in 1991 and provides mini grants and larger grants from Federal funds and State drivers license fees for organizations to purchase equipment and provide courses on bicycle and pedestrian safety. In Fiscal Year 06-07, several Washoe County organizations received traffic safety grants ranging from $4,000 to $42,000, with one grant to the Reno-Sparks Kiwanis Club specific to providing bicycle and pedestrian safety events for kids.

The Nevada Elementary Instructors Course provided by the Nevada Office of Traffic Safety is designed to train teachers, law enforcement officers and community volunteers how to teach bicycle and pedestrian safety. The course is designed for K-5 students. Graduates of this course are eligible for special category grant funding for projects promoting bicycle and pedestrian safety. The course takes 16 hours to complete and is free.

Other Programs in Nevada

In Clark County, the Kids About-A Safety Coalition strives to promote school zone and school route traffic safety through advocacy and education programs. Its mission is to change the culture of poor driver behavior in school zones and on school routes. The coalition is comprised of police, sheriff, school district, public works, and Regional Transportation Commission staff, as well as Parent Teacher Associations.

The City of North Las Vegas launched a School Zone and Traffic Safety campaign, run by the police department. This campaign focused on reducing traffic congestion around school during drop off and pick up times. A brochure was created and distributed, and is available on their website.

Local advocacy groups such as Silver State Bike Coalition in Las Vegas also advocate increased pedestrian and bicycle activity. In Carson City, Muscle Powered is a citizen-based group promoting a more walkable and bikeable Carson City. In 2006 this group led a pilot project at two elementary schools to increase foot traffic and reduce vehicular traffic to the schools.

Through a combination of training, increased education and participation in Walk N Roll to School Days, this pilot project determined that:

- Raising community awareness is essential, even prior to implementing a SRTS program.
- Organized events and training sessions are important.
- Wide driveways increase exposure to traffic.
- School entrance and exit design is essential to safety of child pedestrians and cyclists. Sidewalks should be continued through the driveway.
- On-street parking in front of schools is hazardous to pedestrians.
- Crossing guards are not trained adequately. There are not enough crossing guards for the width of the road.
- Speeding is a problem during school drop-off and pick-up.
- There are several schools poorly located along arterial roads.
Programs in Other States

Nationally documented direct benefits of SRTS programs include increased pedestrian and bicycle safety around schools and thereby reduction of number of children hit by cars, more children walking and biking to schools, reduction of congestion around schools, and improved child health. Particular health benefits include helping to tackle overweight and obese children, which is a major cause of type II diabetes. At least 13 percent of children and adolescents are overweight or obese, which is more than twice the percentage two decades ago\(^3\).

Other benefits include improved air quality and reduced fuel consumption, cost savings for schools running fewer buses, enhanced community accessibility, and increased sense of freedom for children\(^4\).

The declining number of students walking to school may largely reflect cultural changes. In 1969 42% of children walked to school, but in 2001 only 15% of children were estimated to walk to school\(^5\). This trend may also be a result of changed design and planning practices. A generation ago schools were much smaller (averaging 127 students); now schools average 653 students. Schools were often in community centers, located in town with good walking paths. Schools now are often located on 10 to 30 acres of fringe land\(^6\). According to the National Highway Transportation Safety Agency in 2003, parents driving their children to school account for 20-25% of morning rush hour traffic.

Across the U.S. communities have adopted any number of the following 5 ‘E’s':

*Education*

Education trains motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists about their rights and responsibilities and promotes intermodal travel. Educational examples include providing public traffic safety courses and teaching safety programs in the classroom, promoting walking and biking through route maps, incentives, and so forth, and establishing drop-off and pick-up procedures.

Example\(^7\): At B.B. Harris Elementary in Duluth, Georgia, SRTS Project staff collaborated with the school’s physical education teachers to train 450 children in grades three through five in bicycle safety over one month. Using the League of American Bicyclists Kids Bicycle Education and the Basics of Bicycling curricula, the school developed a 5-session bicycle safety program to fit the physical education schedule. The course was entitled, “Safe Bicycle Driving,” and the instructor (certified by the League of American Bicyclists), began each class by telling the students that this was effectively their very first driver’s

\(^3\) Transportation Tools to Improve Children’s Health and Mobility. Fact sheet prepared by Parisi Associates.

\(^4\) U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration.

\(^5\) Center for Disease Control, 2005.

\(^6\) U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration.

\(^7\) Example is one of many provided at www.saferoutesinfo.org, and is transcribed verbatim.
education class; whatever they grow up to drive — cars, trucks, motorcycles, or bicycles, the same rules of the road apply.

Through the training, the children had opportunities to fit helmets and bicycles, practice bicycle-handling skills, and learn four basic rules of the road. On the final day, the students were introduced to “Harristown, A Bicycle-Friendly City,” in the gym, with simulated streets and destinations such as a store, a park, and a library. The students rode around the “city” to the Harristown destinations, some as bicycle-drivers and some as car-drivers. A few served as police officers, giving out tickets to those who violated a rule of the road. The students then received a “Safe Bicycle Drivers License” and an activity booklet by the same name.

Enforcement
Enforcement increases awareness and reduces the frequency of crime and traffic safety problems. Residents and local police can be enlisted to focus on efforts around schools. Enforcement examples include posting visible speed limits and school crossing signs, aggressively enforcing traffic violations, and fostering neighborhood watch programs.

Example\(^8\): Miami Beach, Florida implemented a successful pedestrian decoy operation. Police conducted a two-week driver yielding enforcement program using informational fliers, written and verbal warnings, decoy pedestrians and saturation enforcement operations along two corridors with a high pedestrian crash experience.

The pedestrian decoy operation increased the percentage of motorists yielding to pedestrians. These increases were sustained for a period of a year with minimal additional enforcement, according to results from an evaluation of the program.

Engineering
Engineering includes planning, designing, and constructing the actual safe routes that students follow. Routes are assessed based on street width, pavement conditions, conditions of existing sidewalk, traffic volume and speed and distance to the destination. Engineering approaches to safe routes will reduce speed, narrow crossing distances and improve children’s visibility and safety. Examples include designing streets that calm traffic, installing walkways and bike paths, and improving safety where pedestrians cross streets.

Example\(^9\): One of the main barriers to walking and bicycling to school is distance. A child who lives a short distance from a school may need to be bused or driven if there is not a reasonable connection between home and the school. Disconnected subdivision street layout often makes distances between origins and destinations much longer than the straight line distance between the two

\(^8\) Example is one of many provided at www.saferoutesinfo.org, and is transcribed verbatim.

\(^9\) Example is one of many provided at www.saferoutesinfo.org, and is transcribed verbatim.
locations. By not connecting to another street, cul-de-sacs contribute to the problem.

As part of a new subdivision in Chapel Hill, NC a connector path was built to connect Mary Scroggs Elementary School to a cul-de-sac of an adjacent residential street. Sixty percent of students at Mary Scroggs Elementary School now walk or bicycle to school.

**Encouragement**

Enthusiastic participants are critical to the success of a SRTS program. Participants may be encouraged through long-term campaigns and one-day events such as the International Walk to School Day, or setting up a “walking bus” for a parent or other volunteer to pick up children at their homes and follow a route to school. An example of encouragement is Marin County, CA’s Frequent Rider Miles program that awards points each time a student walks, rides or carpools to school. The points are accumulated and redeemed for prizes.

In Chicago, nearly 90% of public school children walk to school. The City of Chicago and Chicago Police Department created a walking school bus program to make walking to school safer by providing adult supervision for those children walking to school. Adults volunteer for the program by signing their name next to where they live on street maps displayed at the local school. Clusters of households are identified and linked with one another and safe and enjoyable routes are mapped out for the group.

Example\(^{10}\): In 2004, the Olive Chapel Walk to School Coalition kicked-off a monthly walking school bus, giving families an opportunity to walk to school despite the construction that neighborhoods near the school had experienced in recent years.

“Neighborhood captains,” parents and children walk from six separate departure points to the school. One route meets in a parking lot so families who live too far to walk can participate. Reminders about the monthly walk are sent home on the previous Friday and children who participate receive prizes. Parent volunteers act as neighborhood captains. At the start of the school year, they receive safety training. During the walks, they wear green vests and use whistles to communicate to children when they need to stop. Because the activity is designed to be family-oriented, parents are required to walk with their children to school, but they are free to arrange among themselves to supervise each other’s children.

A volunteer parent and the school physical education teacher share leadership of this growing activity. Since it began, one route has had as many as 200 people who regularly walk.

\(^{10}\) Example is one of many provided at www.saferoutesinfo.org, and is transcribed verbatim.
Enabling
To implement a SRTS program requires funding as well as a good pool of volunteers and active participants. Several states, including California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Oregon, Texas, and Washington have enacted legislation to implement SRTS.

California
The California SRTS program has been sited as having the most well funded program. Spearheaded by the Health Department, the program provided funds from 1999 through 2007 of approximately $25 million to $40 million per year primarily for construction to improve the safety of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Under the program, educational, enforcement and encouragement activities could be funded so long as they were related to facility improvements. The grant program provided 90% of costs up to a total project cost of $500,000. The program is being eliminated with the implementation of SAFETEA-LU; however, and funding will be dramatically decreased.

In Marin County, seed money for SRTS initiatives were awarded by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Together with a coalition of private foundations, funds are distributed to participating schools to identify hazard areas and consultants are selected to provide engineering solutions. These funds are managed by the Marin Congestion Management Agency.

Texas
The Matthew Brown Act promotes a bicycle-safety package to ensure the safety of children and other cyclists on Texas roads. Funding supports construction of projects that improve bicycle and pedestrian safety of school age children. Money is provided under the Hazard Elimination Program up to 80% of the project cost (unless the project is along a state road), with a total project cost up to $500,000. Applications are scored to successfully identify and demonstrate the needs and safety hazards for students as well as the proposed improvement to correct the problem.

Pennsylvania
In Pennsylvania, SRTS is combined with “Home Town Streets”, both of which aim to improve quality of life in Pennsylvania communities. The objective is “to establish, where feasible, safe walking routes for our children to commute to school and to promote healthy living”. The program is managed by Pennsylvania’s Department of Transportation but works in conjunction with school districts, local governments and pedestrian and bicycle safety advocates. Up to $200 million over four years has been dedicated to fund these two programs. Local projects have a 20% matching requirement. Funds may be used for both physical improvements and pedestrian education efforts.

South Carolina and Washington
Less well-funded programs focus on education and encouragement. In South Carolina walkable routes to school surveys were completed to identify and address problems that make walking to school difficult or unsafe. A walking bus program, the “Discover and Understand Carolina, Kids” (DUCK) program promotes walking as a fun way to exercise and get to school for elementary students and teachers. These activities were completed with
grants from the Department of Health and spearheaded by the Walkable South Carolina Committee of the South Carolina Governor’s Council on Physical Fitness.

In Washington, the Washington Coalition for Promoting Physical Activity in partnership with the Cascade Bicycle Club Education Foundation and the Skagit County Physical Activity Coalition implemented “Moving Ahead: Safe and Active Routes to School Program”. This program promotes International Walk to School Day held in October each year and works with two middle schools to survey and identify environmental barriers to physical activity and to promote biking and walking to school. As a result of this effort and partnerships with other leading Safe Routes participants, a statewide program has been implemented for SRTS.

New Jersey
A Technical Advisory Committee has been guiding the development of a statewide SRTS program in New Jersey since 2003. It is comprised of representatives of the NJ Departments of Transportation, Health, Education, Law & Public Safety and Community Affairs. Other participating institutions include the Voorhees Transportation Center of Rutgers University, several Transportation Management Associations, municipal police departments, school administrators, boards of education, parent-teacher associations, the American Automobile Association, mayors and advocates.

Following a study in 2004, NJDOT focused its efforts on developing web-based tools and educational materials. In 2005, on-site workshops were held at three SRTS Demonstration Schools. Parent/student surveys were completed along with action plans for each school. A one-day retreat was held in March 2006 for a task force of state, regional, local and national experts to define a framework and structure for the NJ SRTS Program. Efforts are currently under way to advance the action items that were identified at this retreat, including the NJ SRTS Program Funding Application, a guidance document, technical resource materials and Regional Awareness Clinics.11

11 http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/community/srts/programs.shtm
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS

This report documents some important observations made over the course of conducting the AB 231 study.

1. There are over 65,000 children in Washoe County public schools\(^{12}\), all of whose safety is of utmost importance to the WCSD and community at-large. Although it is not known at this time how many of these children reside within walk zones, there is consensus that there is potential to increase the number of children walking or biking to school.

2. All Team members agree that the current methodology used by WCSD to determine the walk zones boundaries, which is based on how far the bus drives, rather than how far the crow flies, is appropriate for public schools in Washoe County.

3. WCSD has a very proactive approach to child safety. Whenever it is evaluated by a field supervisor that a situation is unsafe for a child to walk to school, bus service is always offered even if the child resides within a walk zone boundary.

4. Evaluation of the walk zone maps by each of the local governments and WCSD revealed that there are essentially three groups of regional conditions affecting the safety of walking to school: 1) conditions that are currently addressed, 2) conditions requiring increased attention, and 3) conditions not currently addressed.

5. Regional conditions have the potential to be improved. Over the past 12 years there have been 3 fatalities during the periods of the day when school children are going to and from school. Injuries to school children (pedestrians and bicyclists) resulting from vehicle crashes have averaged 32 per year.

6. The process of conducting this study has brought much information to light. Increased future coordination between WCSD and local government entities in both the planning stage and operation of safety-related infrastructure for schools will have tremendous positive benefits for all parties.

7. This report does not include any specific infrastructure improvements to particular geographic locations. Specific infrastructure improvement evaluation and recommendations for each of the schools is beyond the scope of this study and would be highly subjective since there are no definitions of safe and unsafe for purposes of this report.

A number of recommendations were made and are included in this report to improve safety of children walking to schools. These recommendations are based on conditions observed

\(^{12}\) Includes charter school children.
that do not necessarily create an unsafe condition for pupils, but rather, are recognized as having the potential to create an unsafe condition.

There is a need in the region for a full SRTS program which goes beyond the physical review and evaluation of walking routes in the region, although this is a good starting point. A potential spin-off positive benefit of creating a SRTS program is that it can also lead to momentum for local governments to evaluate other routes that children may take, such as routes to parks, recreation centers, and libraries.

Prior to developing and implementing a Washoe County SRTS program, there are many steps that can be taken to improve safety awareness for students and parents. As described in Section 3 of this report, increased communication between WCSD and the local governments, and vice versa, is one step that can be taken now. In addition, there could be greater interaction between the Safe Kids Washoe County Coalition, WCSD, and local governments in the future to maximize currently available resources.

Funding sources that may be available to implement a Washoe County SRTS program include Federal funding opportunities, such as SAFETEA-LU, TEA-21, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds, State and Federal funding grants through the Nevada Office of Traffic Safety, State funds for enhancement projects administered by NDOT, county and city funding, including redevelopment agency funds, and other dedicated sources (private donations and non-profit grant funding for example).

### 5.1 Potential Future Planning Efforts

Development of a formal SRTS program forms a partnership between parents, schools, city and private engineers, police/sheriff, and elected officials. In this partnership everybody has a role. In Washoe County, the City of Sparks has already begun the process of developing a SRTS program. Sparks will be updating their program annually.

Although each local government may choose different approaches to a SRTS program, it is important that any programs that are developed are shared with a regional authority and that this information is summarized as a Washoe County SRTS program. In particular, it may be beneficial to have a region-wide education program with dedicated funding sources that it not staffed solely by volunteers. A regional future planning effort for programs such as education programs for SRTS would be important to pool efforts to leverage grant funding opportunities. The SAFETEA-LU funds for instance only provide $1 million per year to Nevada (gradually increasing after 2007), and it is anticipated that competition for these funds will be fierce.
## ATTACHMENT A

### WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT STUDENT COUNT 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beasley*</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannan</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caughlin Ranch</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Heights</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diedrichsen</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodson</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donner Springs</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Diamond*</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmcrest</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elms*</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomm</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbrae</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Valley</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffaker</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunsberger</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Lake</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incline Elem</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniper</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemmon Valley</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenz</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Park</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loder</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews*</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Rose</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natchez</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paloner</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peavine</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picollo (PK-6)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Valley</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risley</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepulveda*</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Vista</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lake*</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Alice*</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Kate</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithridge</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Springs</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stead</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Valley</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor*</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towles</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Gorder*</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdi</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westergard</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehead</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnemucca</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billinghurst</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Springs</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damonte Ranch</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilworth</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerlach Middle</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Incline High</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQueen</td>
<td>1,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Valley</td>
<td>2,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picollo (9-12)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>2,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>1,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Springs</td>
<td>2,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparks</td>
<td>1,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMCC Magnet</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooster</td>
<td>1,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Totals</td>
<td>18,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charter Schools</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Academy</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Desert Mont</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Can Do Anything</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainshadow</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Nevada Acad</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elementary Totals** 33,840

**District Total including Charter Schools** 65,013

---

*Indicates Multi-Track School
ATTACHMENT B

WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION
3545 ‘TRANSPORTATION OF STUDENTS’

WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

TRANSPORTATION OF STUDENTS

Transportation of students by bus will be considered under the following conditions:

1. For elementary students, if the shortest walking distance is more than one (1) mile.
   a. “One-way” transportation will be provided for students attending kindergarten in the school for which they will be regularly zoned for first grade. Morning kindergarten students will be provided transportation to school on regularly scheduled elementary buses. Afternoon kindergarten students will be provided transportation from school on regularly scheduled elementary buses. Parents are responsible for transportation from school for morning kindergarten students and to school for afternoon kindergarten students.

2. For middle school students, if the shortest walking distance to the school is more than two (2) miles.

3. For high school students, if the shortest walking distance to school is more than three (3) miles.

4. Exceptions to Nos. 1, 2 and 3 above may be made when:
   a. Extreme hazardous conditions make bus transportation advisable for the safety of children.

   b. Students are shifted from their own school zone to another school zone by action of the Washoe County School District.

   c. Space is available on buses transporting eligible students and then only for the period of time this space remains available.

5. Special Education children may be offered transportation or transportation allowances if their residence is outside the attendance area of their regular school.

6. A transportation allowance of $0.18 per mile for one round trip officially recorded per day of school attendance is allowed where bus routes are impractical.
   a. For students attending schools outside the Washoe County School District, the transportation allowance will be paid for the distance from the student's home to the closest bus stop where transportation is provided to a school of the appropriate level.

   b. All mileages will be verified by an officially calibrated Washoe County School District odometer.
7. An "in lieu of transportation" subsistence allowance of $6.00 per day may be made for students who live at such distances from their school of attendance to make bus or transportation allowances impractical.

   a. For students attending schools outside the Washoe County School District, the subsistence allowance will be paid only in those cases where an Inter-district Attendance Agreement exists providing for the student to attend school in that district.

New bus service may be provided for special cases as noted in Nos. 6 and 7 above, only upon approval of the Board of Trustees.

Adopted: 09-11-79  
Revised: 06-15-84; 08-18-88; 05-12-92  
Reviewed: 11-11-97
ATTACHMENT C

EXAMPLE OF GIS ANALYSIS BY WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

School Walk Zones

[Map showing School Walk Zones with different symbols for School, Approved Walk Zone, Walking Pathway Within a Mile, Busing Inside Walk Zone, Streets, and School Zone Attendance Boundary.]