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Executive Summary

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) efforts are gaining momentum nationally, state-wide and locally for a wide variety of reasons. Health trends, incorporation of more physical activity into daily routine, availability of funding, lack of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and stress on academic achievement are some of the many reasons why schools, parents and communities are excited to participate in SRTS efforts. Now, fewer children are walking or bicycling to school than ever before and school officials, health advocates and transportation officials feel that increased walking and bicycling to school can positively contribute to the well-being of students.

This Safe Routes to School Plan and the continuing SRTS program in the Clarkfield community uses the model of “The Five E’s” to improve the health and safety of children walking and bicycling to school. “The Five E’s” include Education, Encouragement, Engineering, Enforcement and Evaluation. Recommendations in this Plan cover each of these five core areas.

Before changes can take place, it is important to understand current conditions and issues; develop a shared vision and goals for Safe Routes to School; and engage stakeholders and the community in developing strategies to overcome barriers regarding walking and bicycling to school. All of these steps were taken as part of the Clarkfield SRTS planning process. As another part of the SRTS planning process, a SRTS Team was formed to provide input into the process and was ultimately responsible for the direction of the SRTS Plan and future program in the Clarkfield community. SRTS Team members included representatives from the schools, the City of Clarkfield, parents, and other interested stakeholders. The SRTS Team met at key benchmarks during the process to oversee the preparation of the plan and provide direction for policy development.

The SRTS Team developed recommendations to address current barriers to walking or bicycling to school as well as strategies on how to increase the number of students walking and bicycling to school. The recommendations have been developed into an action plan for implementation prioritized by the SRTS Team. In general, this plan recommends education and encouragement activities for the near-future and bigger infrastructure improvements for the long-term. Potential funding sources for implementation of infrastructure and non-infrastructure strategies are also listed in the action plan in Chapter 5.

Finally, evaluation of SRTS efforts is a key component to a successful SRTS Program and Chapter 5 details evaluation that should be done to measure the effectiveness of SRTS strategies that have been implemented.
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Chapter 1 | Introduction

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND
Safe Routes to School (SRTS) has recently been gaining popularity among health advocates, school officials and transportation officials nationally, state-wide and locally. However, research on the safety of children walking and bicycling to school began in the United States in the early 1970s and was highlighted by release of the United States Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) publication “School Trip Safety and Urban Play Areas” in 1975. The term “Safe Routes to School” was first used in Denmark in the late 1970s as part of a very successful initiative to reduce the number of children killed while walking and bicycling to school. Safe Routes to School spread internationally, with programs springing up throughout Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States.

The first modern Safe Routes to School program in the U.S. began in 1997 in the Bronx, N.Y. Then in 1998, Congress funded two pilot SRTS programs through the US DOT. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) issued $50,000 each for Safe Routes to School pilot program in Marin County, California and Arlington, Massachusetts. Within a year of launching the pilot programs, many other grassroots Safe Routes to School efforts were started throughout the United States.

Efforts to include a larger SRTS program in federal legislation began in 2002. In 2003, the League of American Bicyclists organized the first meeting of leaders in pedestrian and bicycle issues to talk about Safe Routes to School and how a national program might work. At the same time, a number of states were developing their own SRTS programs, continuing to build momentum for the movement.

After the initial success of Safe Routes to School pilot programs in the United States, subsequent federal funding facilitated SRTS’s expansion nationwide. The 2005 passage of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) institutionalized Safe Routes to School by allocating $612 million among the fifty states. The Federal Highway Administration administered the Safe Routes to School program funds and provided guidance and regulations about SRTS programs. Federal SRTS funds were distributed to states based on student enrollment, with no state receiving less than $1 million per year. SRTS funds could be used for both infrastructure projects and non-infrastructure
activities. The legislation also required each state to have a Safe Routes to School Coordinator to serve as a central point of contact for the state.

Safe Routes to School programs operate in all 50 states and Washington D.C. Children benefiting from SRTS funds live in urban, rural and suburban communities representing varying income levels and a range of walking and bicycling conditions. With legislative extensions, the Federal Safe Routes to School Program has apportioned nearly $1.15 billion to states as of September 30, 2012. These funds have benefited or will benefit more than 13,000 schools.

In July 2012, Congress passed a new federal transportation bill, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), which continued funding for SRTS activities; however it eliminated SRTS as a stand-alone program. SRTS activities are now eligible to compete for funding alongside other programs including the Transportation Enhancements program, the Recreational Trails program and National Scenic Byways program, as part of a new program called Transportation Alternatives. SRTS funds can still be used for both infrastructure projects and non-infrastructure activities; however states are no longer required to have a SRTS Coordinator under MAP-21.

Historical investment of SAFETEA-LU federal dollars on SRTS activities in Minnesota has ranged from $1 million in 2005 to a high of nearly $3.4 million in 2011. Between 2005 and 2012, a total investment of $18,573,023 in federal funds has been made on SRTS projects, programs and initiatives. This does not include funding for SRTS activities under MAP-21 because states are currently in the process of determining how to adapt the program to the new legislation.

In addition to federal funds that support SRTS programs, the State of Minnesota has recently made the decision to invest in the program, a step that few other states have taken. This step shows the broad support for SRTS in Minnesota as an effective and successful program to make walking and bicycling to school safer and increase the number of students who do so. In the 2013 legislative session, Minnesota provided funding for a statewide SRTS program. This new SRTS program provides $500,000 for the biennium for non-infrastructure SRTS activities. Additionally, SRTS advocates hope to secure funding for infrastructure projects during the next legislative session.

Another opportunity unique to Minnesota that supports Safe Routes to School is the Minnesota Department of Health’s (MDH) Statewide Health Improvement Program (SHIP). One of the focus areas of this program is active living and MDH has made SRTS a big part of that focus area.
Immediate Health Effects:

- Obese youth are more likely to have risk factors for cardiovascular disease, such as high cholesterol or high blood pressure. In a population-based sample of 5- to 17-year olds, 70% of obese youth had at least one risk factor for cardiovascular disease.
- Obese adolescents are more likely to have pre-diabetes, a condition in which blood glucose levels indicate a high risk for development of diabetes.
- Children and adolescents who are obese are at greater risk for bone and joint problems, sleep apnea, and social and psychological problems such as stigmatization and poor self-esteem.

Long-Term Health Effects:

- Children and adolescents who are obese are likely to be obese as adults and are therefore more at risk for adult health problems such as heart disease, type 2 diabetes, stroke, several types of cancer, and osteoarthritis. One study showed that children who became obese as early as age two were more likely to be obese as adults.
- Overweight and obesity are associated with increased risk for many types of cancer, including cancer of the breast, colon, endometrium, esophagus, kidney, pancreas, gall bladder, thyroid, ovary, cervix, and prostate as well as multiple myeloma and Hodgkin’s lymphoma.

---

1 http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/obesity/facts.htm
The CDC says that healthy lifestyle habits, including healthy eating and physical activity, can lower the risk of becoming obese and developing related diseases. The CDC also emphasizes that schools play a particularly critical role by establishing a safe and supportive environment with policies and practices that support healthy behaviors and that schools also provide opportunities for students to learn about and practice healthy eating and physical activity behaviors.

Despite the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ recommendation of at least one-hundred and fifty minutes of physical activity per week, inactivity among adults and youth remains high throughout the country. According to County Health Rankings, twenty-one percent of Yellow Medicine County residents are physically inactive, compared to only nineteen percent for the State of Minnesota as a whole. The health implications of inactive Americans are problematic not only to public health officials, but to all residents, communities and tax payers due to rising healthcare costs.

In 2000, medical costs in Minnesota associated with physical inactivity were $495 million (Minnesota Department of Health, 2002). However, just one additional day of physical activity per week has been found to reduce medical charges by 4.7% (Pronk, Goodman, O’Connor & Martinson, 1999). Bicycling and walking are healthy transportation options for students and people of all ages. If students walked or bicycled to school more often, that time could help contribute to the recommended levels of physical activity per week that many people are not getting.

Environmental: According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), transportation is the fastest growing source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, accounting for twenty-eight percent of all greenhouse gas emissions. Of that twenty-eight percent, passenger vehicles account for nearly half of all U.S. transportation sector’s greenhouse gas emissions.

Children in particular are more vulnerable to air pollution because they breathe faster than adults and inhale more air per pound of body weight. The congregation of school buses and

---

2 http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/app/minnesota/2013/yellow-medicine/county/outcomes/overall/snapshot/by-rank
3 From Why Parks and Trails are Important, the Foundation for Preserving a Minnesota Legacy, 2010.
passenger vehicles around schools where children are present then become even more harmful air pollution hazards.

Walking and bicycling are the most environmentally friendly forms of transportation and could play a large role in helping Americans of all ages reduce their carbon footprint. For all ages, the potential to replace driving with bicycling or walking trips is high for many Americans, including many Clarkfield residents. The U.S. DOT reports half of all trips in the United States are three miles or less, a distance easily traversable by bicycle. However, seventy-two percent of those trips are made by vehicles and less than two percent are made by bicycle. Additionally, trips of a mile or less are made by automobile sixty percent of the time.

For short trips, switching to a more environmentally friendly mode choice, such as bicycling or walking, can make the most environmental impact; as short automobile trips cause the most pollution per mile driven. According to the League of American Bicyclists, “sixty percent of the pollution created by automobile emissions happens in the first few minutes of operation, before pollution control devices can work effectively. Since ‘cold starts’ create high levels of emissions, shorter car trips are more polluting on a per mile basis than longer trips.” Reducing the short automobile trips to and from school can help to reduce the auto emissions and pollution around the schools where they are harmful to children.

With an area of just over one square mile, the City of Clarkfield is easily traversable by foot or bicycle. However, there are many barriers to walking and bicycling in Clarkfield that are discussed in the existing conditions chapter of this plan.

**Land Use & Livability:** Land use patterns have a big impact on the ability to walk or bicycle safely and easily in a city. The cores of many cities are walkable and bikable, due to their well-connected grid patterned streets, available sidewalk infrastructure, compact and mixed-use development and a building scale that is comfortable for bicyclists and pedestrians. However, areas of cities that were developed in the last sixty or seventy years are much more auto-oriented in nature with a lack of sidewalk infrastructure, large intersections that make crossing the street as a pedestrian a terrifying experience, and seas of parking between the road and buildings. Additionally, newer developments use more land, making the distance
between places too great to walk or bicycle. Recent development patterns are one reason parents may choose to drive their children to school.

School siting or location has been a major barrier to walking and bicycling to school in many communities. Traditionally, schools were located in the center of communities and in close proximity to residential areas. This made it easy for students to walk and bicycle to school. However, beginning in the 1970s, rather than renovating existing schools or building schools within existing residential communities, districts often built new schools located on the edges of communities where the land costs were lower. School siting policies may also dictate a certain acreage minimum that precludes many inner-community locations. Schools located on the edges of communities inherently have fewer children who live close enough to these facilities to make walking or biking to school practical.

Clarkfield Area Charter School is located on the southside of Clarkfield in a mixed use area. There are a few barriers, such as the State Highways that bisect the city, to walking and bicycling to Clarkfield Area Charter School due to its location. The charter school is the only school currently located in Clarkfield. A majority the housing is located within the northern half of the city.
Safety: Safety was often the number one concern and impetus to undergo the Safe Routes to School planning process for schools and communities in the Upper Minnesota Valley Region. School officials and community members were right to be concerned about student’s safety when it comes to transportation to and from school. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), motor vehicle traffic crashes were the leading cause of death for ages 3 through 14 as of 2007. During 2009, there were a total of 33,808 traffic fatalities in the United States. The 14-and-younger age group accounted for 1,314 or 4 percent of those traffic fatalities. This represents a three percent decrease from the 1,350 fatalities in 2008. However, an average of 4 children, age 14 and younger, were killed and 490 were injured every day in the United States in motor vehicle crashes during 2009.4

While traffic fatalities are decreasing among many modes of transportation, pedestrians were one of the few groups of road users to experience an increase in fatalities in the United States in 2011. Pedestrian deaths accounted for 14 percent of total motor vehicle deaths nationwide in 2011, totaling 4,432 deaths.

Traffic fatalities also increased nine percent among pedalcyclists from 2010 to 2011. Pedalcyclists include bicyclists and any other riders of wheeled, non-motorized equipment powered solely by pedals. According to NHTSA, 677 pedalcyclists were killed and an additional 48,000 were injured in motor vehicle traffic crashes in 2011. Pedalcyclist deaths accounted for two percent of all motor vehicle traffic fatalities and made up two percent of the people injured in traffic crashes during the year.5

Often these pedestrian and pedalcycle crashes are most prevalent during morning and afternoon peak periods, when traffic levels are highest, and coincidentally, when children are out of school. Bicycle crashes, like pedestrian crashes, affect all age groups, but the highest injury and fatality rates (per population) are associated with younger bicyclists. The 10 to 15 age group has both the highest fatality rate and the highest injury rate. Crash-involvement rates are also highest among 5-9 year-old males, further emphasizing the gravity of preventative traffic safety efforts. Crash types for this age group include ride-outs from driveways and intersections, swerving left and right, riding in the wrong direction and crossing midblock. These are not the same crash types observed in other age groups. Overwhelmingly, crashes experienced by child bicyclists are due to inappropriate behavior by the bicyclist. Likewise, nearly three out of four pedestrian deaths occur in urban areas at non-intersections, again indicating inappropriate behavior by the pedestrian.

4 http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/811387.pdf
5 http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/811743.pdf
Therefore, bicycle and pedestrian safety training is crucial to a successful Safe Routes to School Program. Children are not adults and they do not have the same understanding of traffic safety. There are several key differences between children and adults that affect children negatively when it comes to traffic safety. Children have a narrower field of vision, cannot easily judge a car’s speed and distance, assume that if they can see a car, the driver is able to see them, and have difficulty concentrating on more than one thing at a time.

Fortunately, safety training and education programming can increase a child’s awareness of automobiles and their place within the traffic network, potentially reducing traffic conflicts leading to crashes. There are many safety training programs readily available. In fact, MnDOT has recently created a traffic safety curriculum specifically designed for Safe Routes to School programs for all schools in the state to use and adapt as they see fit.

Wearing proper safety equipment, such as helmets, also affects the severity of crashes children experience. While wearing a helmet may not impact the frequency of crashes, numerous studies have found that use of approved bicycle helmets significantly reduces the risk of fatal injury, serious head and brain injury, and middle and upper face injury among bicyclists of all ages involved in all types of crashes and crash severities. This is where Safe Routes to School programs can provide guidance in safety education and enforcement. A detailed list of education programs is provided in Chapter 5.

WHY SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL?
Nationally, and locally in Clarkfield, students are walking and bicycling to school less than ever before. At the same time, childhood obesity is increasing, more children are dying in automobile crashes, air quality has deteriorated, time for physical activity during the school day has decreased, and land use practices have centered on automobile reliance.

Figure 1.1 shows a dramatic inverse representation of students’ transportation modes to and from school in 1969 compared to 2001. In 1969, over 40 percent of children walked or biked to school, while about 15 percent were driven in a personal vehicle. However, by 2001, the statistics had inverted with approximately 45 percent of students arriving to school via car and approximately 15 percent walking or bicycling to school.
Over the same time period, the rates of overweight and obesity among children in all age categories increased dramatically. There are many factors that contribute to this increase, however the lack of physical activity is certainly a big one. Walking or bicycling to school can help increase levels of physical activity among students.

Walking and bicycling to school can be important tools to help address and potentially reverse the previously identified trends. Walking and biking to school can help to increase physical activity among students to help lower rates of childhood obesity, prevent environmental pollution caused by automobiles, cut back on gas costs for school transportation departments and families, and lower traffic congestion at school drop off and pick up areas. Walking and bicycling to school can also empower children by giving them a sense of responsibility and independence, allow for time to enjoy the outdoors, and provide time to socialize with their parents, friends and neighbors.

Safe Routes to School programs are sustained efforts to improve the health and well-being of children by enabling and encouraging them to walk and bicycle to school. The SRTS effort begins by understanding why children are not walking and bicycling to school safely. Safe Routes to School programs audit conditions around the school and conduct surveys of parents, teachers and students to determine existing attitudes and facility conditions surrounding the school. SRTS programs then identify opportunities to make bicycling and walking to school a safer and more appealing transportation choice, thus encouraging a healthy and active lifestyle from an early age.
THE SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PLANNING PROCESS

The planning effort undertaken by the Clarkfield Area Charter School SRTS Team and planners from the Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Development Commission (UMVRDC) entailed collecting and analyzing information, identifying community needs and priorities, and recommending steps to remedy existing problems and accomplish community goals and objectives.

Safe Routes to School refers to a variety of multi-disciplinary programs and facility improvements aimed at promoting walking and bicycling to school. SRTS largely centers around five core areas, called “The Five E’s”. They are Education, Encouragement, Engineering, Enforcement, and Evaluation, and are described below. This plan is organized around policy change, programs and projects in all five core areas.

Engineering -
Engineering is a broad concept used to describe the design, implementation, operation, and maintenance of traffic control devices or physical measures. It is one of the complementary strategies of SRTS, because engineering alone cannot produce safer routes to school. Safe Routes to School engineering solutions may include adequate sidewalks or bike-paths that connect homes and schools, improved opportunities to cross streets (such as the presence of adult crossing guards, raised medians, or pedestrian signals), and traffic calming measures (such as reduced speed limits, speed bumps, or stanchions).

Enforcement -
Enforcement includes policies that address safety issues such as speeding or illegal turning, but also includes getting community members to work together to promote safe walking, bicycling, and driving.

Education -
Education includes identifying and promoting safe routes, teaching students to look both ways at intersections, obey crossing guards, learning how to handle potentially dangerous situations, and to recognize the importance of being visible to drivers. Education initiatives also teach parents to be aware of bicyclists and pedestrians and the importance of practicing safety skills with their children. SRTS education efforts alert all drivers to the potential presence of walkers and bikers and the need to obey speed limits, especially in school zones. Additionally, the Safe Routes to School plan educates local officials by identifying regulatory changes needed to improve walking and bicycling conditions around schools. This strategy is closely tied to Encouragement strategies.

Encouragement -
Encouragement combines the results of the other “E’s” to improve knowledge, facilities and enforcement to encourage more students to walk or ride safely to school. Most importantly, encouragement activities build interest and enthusiasm and help ensure the program’s continued success. Programs may include “Walk to School Days” or “Mileage Clubs and Contests” with awards to motivate students.
Evaluation -

Evaluation involves monitoring outcomes and documenting trends through data collection before and after SRTS implementation to identify methods and practices that work and those that need improvement.

While Safe Routes to School plans largely prioritize improvements in areas where children predictably congregate, such as school zones and major transportation links between the school and residential areas, it is important to remember that children are a part of every community. Adequate facilities are therefore necessary everywhere people walk or can be expected to walk. Streets that allow children to walk and bicycle to school safely will better accommodate all users and create a more vital pedestrian environment.

Formation of the Safe Routes to School program in Clarkfield was a community-driven effort with planners from the Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Development Commission working in tandem with the local SRTS Team. The SRTS team was made up of school staff, municipal officials, local law enforcement, local elected officials, the county engineer, parents and other interested community members. Development of the plan entailed collecting and analyzing information, identifying community needs and priorities and recommending steps to remedy existing problems and accomplish community goals and visions.

The SRTS Team was comprised of a variety of people from different disciplines and among “the 5 E’s” to help guide the planning process and set the vision and goals for the plan. The people listed in the chart to the right made up the Clarkfield Safe Routes to School Team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarkfield SRTS Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becca Schrupp, Clarkfield City Administrator (Team Leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Koetter, CACS Director (Team Leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Linscheid, City Council Member &amp; Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Sander, Yellow Medicine County Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Schaub, Yellow Medicine County Assistant Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Jenson, Yellow Medicine Deputy Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Lobdell, Clarkfield Public Works Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial kick off meeting focused on giving the SRTS Team an overview of the SRTS planning effort, including the purpose and benefits of SRTS, planning process timeline and goals and the role of the SRTS Team. The second meeting was used to discuss local issues and concerns, develop a vision statement to guide the planning process and assign specific tasks to the SRTS Team members.

The third SRTS Team meeting was used to finalize the vision statement and goals for Clarkfield’s planning process. This meeting also focused on the importance of data collection and strategies to get input from both students and parents. The team was introduced to WikiMapping, a crowdsourcing tool to obtain input from the greater Clarkfield community.
The fourth SRTS Team meeting was used to share with the SRTS Team the information and data that had been collected through the student travel tallies and parent surveys. The Team also developed an action plan of projects, programs, and policies that can be implemented over the next five years to increase the number of students and community members who walk and bicycle. They then prioritized the implementation strategies and began discussing the first strategies to be completed.

Over a 12-month time period, there were four SRTS Team meetings, a walking and biking audit completed by a small group of SRTS Team members, and discussion around strategies for obtaining community input. The planning process is outlined in greater detail below. All meeting materials, notes, tools and reports can be found in the Appendix.
VISION STATEMENT, GOALS AND STRATEGIES

The SRTS Team, with help from the planning team, developed a vision statement, goals objectives and strategies for Safe Routes to School in the Clarkfield community. A vision statement is an idealistic statement about where the community aspires to be in the future. As such, a vision statement must combine idealism and pragmatism. It should express the highest hopes for what citizens want their community to become regarding Safe Routes to School, while taking into account the realities of where the community is at and the directions it is currently going. The vision statement for Safe Routes to School in the Clarkfield community is as follows:

Vision Statement | Clarkfield is a community where students can and do walk and bike to school safely because the physical and social environment promotes active transportation.

To support and achieve the idealistic and futuristic vision statement, it needs to be broken down into more specific actionable items that can take place over time that contribute to and move in the direction of the vision statement. These specific actionable items are the goals and strategies.

Goals are the main framework for the strategies, which in turn, provide specific information on how decisions should be made by the schools, city, county, and other SRTS partners on a day-to-day basis. Strategies are based on Clarkfield’s current and emerging issues that were identified during the SRTS planning process and parent survey. Together these goals and strategies establish a foundation for implementing the action plan related to “The 5 E’s” in Chapter 5.

Goals are general, broad, idealistic statements that express the overall focus of this Safe Routes to School Plan and are intended to be attained at some undetermined future date. They are purposely general in nature and describe ideal outcomes for which the community will strive. Goal statements answer the question, “What do we want to achieve?”

Clarkfield’s Safe Routes to School Goals are as follows:

1. Increase the number of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and amenities so that more students are able to walk or bike to school safely.
2. Educate students, parents and community members about safe driving, walking and biking practices.
3. Increase the number of students walking and biking to school, thereby decreasing the prevalence of family vehicle congestion at arrival and dismissal.
4. Promote walking and biking to school through educational and encouragement programs and events.

Strategies offer a recommended course of action to achieve the desired outcomes described in the community’s goals. Strategies can also be converted into action work plans. It should be noted that the strategies are “guides” that may not be feasible to carry out in all
circumstances. Strategies are specific, measurable activities that answer the question, “How will I meet my goal?”

**Strategies for Goal #1: Increase the number of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and amenities so that more students are able to walk or bike to school safely.**

1.1 Identify the primary routes students use, or could use if they existed, to access the school.
1.2 Make specific recommendations regarding bicycle and pedestrian facilities on identified primary routes to school that will make getting to and from school via foot or bicycle safer and more enjoyable.
1.3 Identify costs, where possible, and potential funding sources for proposed recommendations.
1.4 Ensure that the City and School work together to identify bicycle and pedestrian needs throughout the city, especially on identified routes to school.
1.5 Seek outside sources of funding, such as federal and state Safe Routes to School funding, to fund the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

**Strategies for Goal #2: Educate parents, students, and the community about safe driving, walking, and biking practices.**

2.1 Build awareness in the community about bicycle and pedestrian laws through events, community education, enforcement, marketing materials and other efforts.
2.2 Educate students about Minnesota bicycle and pedestrian rules and helpful safety pointers through classroom curriculum, Bike Rodeo events and other efforts.
2.3 Work and partner with other entities and programs that are working to educate the public about safe driving, walking, and bicycling practices such as SHIP, Bicycle Alliance of Minnesota or MnDOT’s Toward Zero Deaths Initiative.

**Strategies for Goal #3: Increase the number of students walking and biking to school, thereby decreasing the prevalence of family vehicle congestion at arrival and dismissal.**

3.1 Develop an effective off-site loading/drop-off location to mitigate traffic conflicts and increase the incidence of walking and bicycling to school.
3.2 Ensure the continuation of separate areas for school buses and parent vehicles.
3.3 Continue to work cooperatively with local units of government, such as the police department, city officials and traffic authorities to enhance the safety and effectiveness of the bicycle and pedestrian network.

**Strategies for Goal #4: Promote walking and biking to school through education and encouragement programs and events.**

4.1 Make walking and biking to school part of a normal routine through education and encouragement activities taught in the classroom and throughout the community.
4.2 Incorporate Safe Routes to School principles and ideas into other City Plans and whenever possible, incorporate Safe Routes to School ideas into planned construction projects.
4.3 Encourage and take advantage of programs from a variety of local, state-wide and national sources, including, but not limited to, the school, community education, the City of Clarkfield, Yellow Medicine County Law Enforcement, Bicycle Alliance of Minnesota and others as they become available.
Chapter 2 | Existing Conditions

This chapter provides an overview of the Clarkfield Community and the Clarkfield Area Charter School site. It details an inventory of existing policies, plans, physical and social infrastructure and programs related to biking and walking and Safe Routes to School concepts. This chapter also highlights past plans or studies that may impact recommendations or action steps identified in Chapter 5 of this plan.

COMMUNITY AND SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Clarkfield Area Charter School is located in Clarkfield, Minnesota, located in Yellow Medicine County. It is approximately 140 miles west of Minneapolis, 50 miles west of Willmar, Minnesota, 75 miles east of Watertown, South Dakota and 140 miles south of Fargo, North Dakota. Clarkfield is the third largest city in Yellow Medicine County behind Canby and Granite Falls (the county seat).

The population estimate according to the 2012 American Community Survey was 770. Over the years, Clarkfield has seen a fluctuation of population gains and losses; however its overall rate of change, since 1960, has been negative at over 20 percent. Clarkfield’s population is projected to continue to decline slightly over the next several decades. The major highways that run through Clarkfield include U.S. Highway 59 and Minnesota State Highway 67.

Clarkfield Area Charter School serves approximately 75 students, grades kindergarten through 6th grade. Students primarily live in the City of Clarkfield and the surrounding rural areas. Table 2.1 provides a snapshot of demographic information for the City of Clarkfield and Yellow Medicine County, as well as a comparison to the Upper Minnesota Valley Region (Big Stone, Chippewa, Lac qui Parle, Swift and Yellow Medicine Counties), the State of Minnesota and the Nation. The data provided is five-year estimates gathered from the 2008 - 2012 American Community Survey from the U.S. Census Bureau.
Table 2.1 Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Clarkfield</th>
<th>Yellow Medicine County</th>
<th>Upper MN Valley</th>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>10,357</td>
<td>44,938</td>
<td>5,313,081</td>
<td>309,138,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average HH Size</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Family Size</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>50.14%</td>
<td>49.70%</td>
<td>49.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>49.86%</td>
<td>50.30%</td>
<td>50.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median HH Income</td>
<td>$36,979</td>
<td>$52,134</td>
<td>$48,089</td>
<td>$59,126</td>
<td>$50,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Status</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.22%</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grad +</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>91.90%</td>
<td>85.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree +</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>16.48%</td>
<td>32.20%</td>
<td>28.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, % White</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>96.22%</td>
<td>88.10%</td>
<td>74.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2008-2012 American Community Survey

Beyond the school, the City of Clarkfield has numerous amenities to which children in the community may want to travel. There are many parks throughout the city that children walk or bicycle to as well as other community facilities, such as the library and swimming pool.

Figure 2.2 Community Amenities Map
DATA – Crash Data | AADT | Student Travel Tallies

Crash Data
Minnesota Data:
In 2012, there were 395 fatalities on Minnesota roadways. Of those 395 fatalities, seven were bicyclists. An additional 47 bicyclists were severely injured in a crash, 261 moderately injured, 566 sustained minor injuries and 54 were not injured in their crash. Overall 935 bicyclists were involved in a crash in Minnesota in 2012 alone. Of the 395 fatalities, 40 were pedestrians. An additional 108 pedestrians were severely injured in a crash, 285 were moderately injured, 480 sustained minor injuries and only 6 were not injured in their crash. Overall, 919 pedestrians were involved in a crash in Minnesota in 2012 alone.

Local Clarkfield Data:

There have been 24 crashes within the City of Clarkfield from 2003 – 2013. In 2006, there was a fatal crash involving a pedestrian. This was the only fatal crash between 2003 and 2013. There was also one crash in that 10 year period that resulted in a serious injury. The rest of the crashes involved non-serious injuries, property damage or less. From 2003 – 2013, there were no crashes that involved bicyclists or trains. Since 2004, the number of crashes occurring yearly has decreased from a high of seven per year to a low of zero crashes in a year. The reduction of crashes in recent years is a trend seen across the state of MN and many parts of the US.

Speed plays a factor in survival rates for pedestrians. If a vehicle traveling 20 miles per hour or slower crashes into a pedestrian, that pedestrian has a 95 percent survival rate. However the survival rate decreases dramatically as vehicle speeds increase. For example, if a vehicle travels at 30 miles per hour and hits a pedestrian, the pedestrian only has a survival rate of 55 percent. The survival rate drops to 15 percent if the vehicle speed is 40 miles per hour.
The map below depicts all of the crashes that have occurred in Clarkfield from 2004 through 2013 and highlights bicycle or pedestrian crashes, severe injury crashes and fatal crashes. There has only been one pedestrian crash during this time. This map also depicts all other crashes, which make up the majority of the crashes in the City of Clarkfield.

Figure 2.4 Crash Data Map

Clarkfield Crashes 2004 - 2013
Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)

U.S. Highway 59 intersects MN State Highway 67 in the center of the city. These highways carry the most traffic within the city. Although the traffic counts on these highway are not particularly high, the roads do create barriers for residents trying to walk to different locations within Clarkfield, particularly the school.

Figure 2.5 AADT
Student Travel Tally Results

Student travel tallies were conducted in the Fall of 2014 to gather baseline data regarding the number of students who walk and bicycle to school. They were conducted for all grades, pre-kindergarten through sixth grade, at Clarkfield Area Charter School. The student travel tallies revealed that most students arrived and left school in a family vehicle or the school bus.

The majority of students arrived to Clarkfield Area Charter School in the morning via the school bus or family vehicle. Congestion at the school is worse in the mornings due to the increased number of parent vehicles at that time. In the afternoon, the number of children who left school in an family vehicle dropped and the number of those who took the school bus increased.

A large portion, 47 percent, of Clarkfield Charter School students traveled to and from school via the school bus. Of the 47 percent, most of those students were picked up within the city limits of Clarkfield, where students could easily walk or bicycle to school. However, the majority of the students who ride the school bus are riding because of the dangerous highways and lack of pedestrian infrastructure surrounding the school.

The Clarkfield SRTS Team feels it is important to involve all students in the SRTS program. This might be accomplished through remote drop-off locations for walk and bicycle to school days, encouraging walking and bicycling as healthy and fun forms of exercise as well as a means of transportation.
Another 47 percent of students get to and from school via family vehicle. While some of these students probably live too far from school to walk or bicycle, it is likely that many live within distances easily walkable or bikeable to school. For those students, mode switch from family vehicle to walking or bicycling is encouraged and will be a focus of the SRTS encouragement activities.
COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE - Physical | Social | Political—Laws & Policies

Physical Environment/Infrastructure -
The city of Clarkfield has an existing network of infrastructure that serves pedestrians relatively well in many areas of the city due to the grid street network and existing sidewalks. However, there are also many areas throughout the city that lack sidewalk infrastructure and carry a considerable amount of traffic. Clarkfield sees a good amount of heavy commercial truck traffic as well.

Roads
Clarkfield has approximately 10 miles of roads contained within the city limits. There is approximately two miles of US or state roads, 1 mile of county highway and about 8 miles of local roads.

Sidewalks
The approximate number of miles of sidewalk in Clarkfield is unknown; however there are not sidewalks along all city streets. A next step would be to map the existing sidewalk infrastructure in ArcGIS or another program to have that data readily available for future evaluation metrics of the SRTS Program.

Bike Lanes
As of the spring 2015, there are no marked bike lanes, sharrows or other on street bicycle facilities in the City of Clarkfield.

Trails
There is an unpaved walking path in Vahalla Park on the northside of Clarkfield.

Social Infrastructure -

Social Infrastructure -
Social infrastructure is as important as physical infrastructure to a Safe Routes to School Program or any other successful active transportation initiative. The community and school have strong social infrastructure, in that there are many individuals within the school system, city government, and community who are excited and passionate about the students, safe and active transportation, and making their community a better place for all residents. There are many partners in the Clarkfield community who currently do and potentially could play a large role in Safe Routes to School and active living efforts.

Partnerships
- Clarkfield Area Charter School
- City of Clarkfield
- Yellow Medicine County
- Clarkfield Lions Club
- Local Businesses
- Local Media
- Safe Communities Coalition
- Countryside Public Health
- Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Development Commission

Current Bike-Walk/Active Transportation Initiatives and Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/project/event/program</th>
<th>Inception</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Wellness Policy/Committee</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Student and Faculty Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School Team</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Planning and Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political Infrastructure—Laws and Policies Related to Active Transportation -

Sidewalk Requirements
Sidewalks are not currently required with new development. Sidewalk maintenance is the responsibility of the property owner.

Snow Removal Requirements
Snow removal on sidewalks is required and the responsibility of the property owner. The City is responsible for snow removal on streets and sidewalks on City-owned property.

Crossing Guard Policies
Clarkfield Area Charter School currently has no safety patrol program or crossing guards in the City of Clarkfield.

School Wellness Policies
The Clarkfield Area Charter School has a wellness policy with a purpose to assure a school environment that promotes and protects students’ health, well-being, and ability to learn by supporting healthy eating and physical activity. Under this wellness policy, the following are general statements of policy:

1. The school board recognizes that nutrition education and physical education are essential components of the educational process and that good health fosters attendance and education.
2. The school environment should promote and protect students’ health, well-being, and ability to learn by encouraging healthy eating and physical activity.
3. The school district encourages the involvement of students, parents, teachers, food service staff, and other interested persons in implementing, monitoring, and reviewing school district nutrition and physical activity policies.
4. Children need access to healthy foods and opportunities to be physically active in order to grow, learn, and thrive.
5. All students in grades K-12 will have opportunities, support, and encouragement to be physically active on a regular basis.
6. Qualified food service personnel will provide students with access to a variety of affordable, nutritious, and appealing foods that meet the health and nutrition needs of students; try to accommodate the religious, ethnic, and cultural diversity of the student body in meal planning; and will provide clean, safe, and pleasant settings and adequate time for students to eat.

Related to physical activity, the policy states the following:

1. Students need opportunities for physical activity and to fully embrace regular physical activity as a personal behavior. Toward that end, health education will reinforce the knowledge and self-management skills needed to maintain a healthy lifestyle and reduce sedentary activities such as watching television.
2. Opportunities for physical activity will be incorporated into other subject lessons, where appropriate; and
3. Classroom teachers will provide short physical activity breaks between lessons or classes, as appropriate.

Transportation Policies
All Clarkfield Area Charter School students have the option to ride the bus to school. There are no sidewalks connecting the school with the rest of the city and it would be dangerous for students to walk along the highway traveling to and from school.

Bus Policies: There are five bus stops within the City of Clarkfield. These can be seen in the map below.
Past Studies and Plans

- **2013 Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Development Commission Trails Plan**: the Plan provides trail guideline priorities and resources for not only trail developers, but also trail funders such as the DNR and MnDOT. Below are the overall priorities in the region for trail development. The plan places the highest priority on local and community trails that connect residential areas to schools, parks, downtowns and other community attractions.
  - Priority #1: local and community trails
  - Priority #2: trails that are part of the Minnesota River State Trail
  - Priority #3: other regional trails
Chapter 3 | Issue Identification

This chapter explores issues and barriers related to walking and bicycling that may exist in the community regarding attitudes, policies, programs, and infrastructure. Issues and barriers to walking and bicycling to school in Clarkfield were identified in a number of ways. Information was collected from the SRTS Team; parent surveys, student travel tallies and a walking/biking audit were conducted; observations of the dismissal procedures at the school sites were made; and a WikiMapping crowdsourcing site was created to get further input from the larger community.

PARENT SURVEY RESULTS

Student travel tallies and parent surveys were administered in early 2015 as part of the SRTS planning process. They provided valuable insight on parent views regarding walking and bicycling to school as well as information on how many students are currently walking or bicycling to school. The parent survey response rate and age representation were good. This section of the plan shares some of the information gathered from the parent survey, but all survey results can be found in Appendix F.

Half of respondents say their child lives between a half mile and a mile of Clarkfield Area Charter School and 22 percent live within a half mile of the school. However, as previously mentioned, a number of students live more than two miles from school. According to the parent survey, 11 percent of respondents live more than 2 miles from CACS and their children will likely never walk or bicycle to or from school the entire way to or from their home.

Currently, no parents reported that their children walk or bike to school. However, with 72 percent of students reportedly living
within one mile of school, the number of students who walk or bicycle to school could be significantly higher. When parents were asked, “At what age would you let your child walk or bicycle to school without an adult,” many (41 percent) responded that they would not feel comfortable at any age. Some of these responses may be due to the distance students live from school, however, with nearly 90 percent of respondents living within 2 miles of the school, this number is high.

Approximately 18 percent of parents say they would allow their child to walk or bicycle to school without an adult when they reach the fifth grade. Figure 3.3 shows all of the responses from the survey question asking, “At what age would you allow your child to walk or bike to/from school without an adult?”

When asked about the issues affecting parents’ decisions to allow or not allow their child to walk or bicycle to school, distance was cited the most often as a barrier to walking or bicycling to school. Weather or climate and the amount of traffic along route were also commonly cited issues affecting parents’ decisions.
Another question in the parent survey asked, “Would you probably let your child walk or bike to or from school if this problem were changed or improved?” Many parents responded that they would let their child walk or bicycle to school if sidewalks or pathways were available. Several other popular positive responses, related to issues that could be changed, included addressing the lack of crossing guards, having adults to walk or bike with, and safety of intersections and crossings. All answers are shown below in Figure 3.5.

![Figure 3.5](image)

Some issues, such as weather or climate, distance, and children’s before or after school activities cannot be easily changed. However, many of the issues presented in the survey, such as crossing guards, safety of intersections and crossings, and sidewalks or pathways can be addressed throughout the SRTS planning process. The SRTS Team spent time looking at those issues that can be changed or improved and focused the plan around the resulting concerns. The plan also addresses those issues identified that, if changed or improved, parents would probably let their child walk or bicycle to school. Comments from the parent surveys reveal that parents are worried about the safety of their children. However, some indicated that if measures were taken to address safety issues, such as having crossing guards at more intersections or having a sidewalk or pathway along Highway 59, they would feel more comfortable allowing their children to walk or bicycle to school.
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
A small group of SRTS Team members met to observe dismissal at Clarkfield Area Charter School to assess current procedures and identify issues.

Arrival/Dismissal Procedure at CACS:

All drop-off and pick-up happens in front of Clarkfield Area Charter School in the loop driveway off of Highway 59. The two school buses park alongside the building toward the south end. Students that attend other school districts in the area are picked-up and dropped-off at the old school location (along Highway 59 and north of MN 67), and the city hall, (located along MN 67).

Family vehicles park anywhere in the school parking lot, although they do try to avoid where the buses park. Most parents get out of their vehicles to walk into the school to drop-off and pick-up their students. This is encouraged by the school.

There are a few students that occasionally walk or bike to school. There are currently no crossing guards or school patrol, but the school is interested in starting some kind of program to enable more students to walk or bike to school.

Walk/bike Audit Results

After observing dismissal, the small group of SRTS Team members conducted a walk/bike audit around the schools to assess and evaluate biking and walking infrastructure in the community. Sidewalks exist on many, but not all city streets throughout Clarkfield. Crosswalks are sometimes marked and most are marked with two white lines.

School Infrastructure:

Bike Racks: There is currently only one bike rack in front of the school on the south end. There is one entrance at the south end of the school, but also an entrance at the north end.

Pedestrian Paths: There are some walking paths in Vahalla Park, but there are currently no other trails or paths in the community.
Community Infrastructure:

Sidewalks: Sidewalks exist on some but not all streets. Some sidewalks are in better condition than others. Curb ramps will be replaced along Highway 59 in 2014 and MN 67 in 2015.

Streets: Most streets are quite wide, especially Highway 59 and Highway 67. They are 40 feet or more curb to curb. MnDOT would not mind narrowing them if they were ever to be reconstructed. This city is open to traffic calming measures along the major highways even if that means removing parking along Highway 67.

Intersections: The three main intersections of concern are US Highway 59 at the school parking lot, US Highway 59 and MN Highway 67/railroad, and MNhighway 67 and 10th Street. These intersections are described in more detail in Figure 3.13.

Traffic: Since the school is located on US Highway 59, it sees a lot of traffic and a lot of heavy commercial truck traffic. During harvest, 800-1,000 trucks go through the elevator each day, which is located in close proximity to the school.

Other Community Infrastructure/Resources: There are no sidewalks leading up to the school on US Highway 59. This is the biggest barrier preventing students from walking to and from school. The main places children and adults would like to travel by foot or bicycle are: the Library on MN Highway 67, as well as the pool and Vahalla Park, both located on the northside of town.
SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND BARRIERS TO WALKING AND BICYCLING IN CLARKFIELD

Physical Environment: Generally, the City of Clarkfield is well suited for residents of all ages to walk and bike. The city is relatively compact in size, has good street connectivity and relatively good sidewalk connections. The major barrier to walking for school children in Clarkfield is the lack of sidewalk connecting to the school and an unsafe crossing along Highway 59. There are also other intersections throughout the city that could be improved to enhance safety for children walking or bicycling to school. Figure 3.11 depicts difficult crossings on suggested routes to school. Each of these crossings is on a highway with heavy traffic and heavy commercial traffic. Although speeds at each of these intersections are posted at 30 miles per hour, they are often difficult to cross and dangerous for young students because they are often wide, lack signals, and experience a lot of traffic.

Specifically, Figure 3.13 identifies the intersections that are problematic, identifies what makes them problematic and offers suggestions to help mitigate the problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crossing</th>
<th>Current Conditions</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Highway 59 at the school parking lot</td>
<td>- No marked crossing</td>
<td>- Directly south of this intersection, the speed limit changes from 30 to 55 mph.</td>
<td>- Paint crosswalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Busy road</td>
<td>- The students living East of Hwy 59 do not have a safe place to cross to get to and from school</td>
<td>- Curb bump outs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Many speeding vehicles</td>
<td>- Bikers and pedestrians from the trail also need a safe place to cross</td>
<td>- Pedestrian signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No sidewalk leading up to this intersection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Pedestrian scale streetscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- High visibility crosswalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Highway 59 and MN Highway 67 and railroad tracks</td>
<td>- Intersection of two highways and busy rail line</td>
<td>- Busy intersection</td>
<td>Pedestrian scale streetscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rail crosses diagonally</td>
<td>- Long crossing distance</td>
<td>4-way stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wide crossing</td>
<td>- Fast moving vehicles</td>
<td>Pedestrian signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Busy road</td>
<td>- Unfriendly environment for pedestrians</td>
<td>Raised crosswalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 way stop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN Highway 67 and 10th Street</td>
<td>- State highway</td>
<td>- Not currently known as a place to watch for pedestrians</td>
<td>Increase visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wide crossing</td>
<td>- Lengthy crossing distance</td>
<td>Raised crosswalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lacks signage</td>
<td>- Low visibility</td>
<td>Pedestrian signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Crossing guards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.14 shows priority routes to school that the SRTS Team identified. These routes should be a high priority in terms of investing in bike and pedestrian infrastructure as funds become available in order to make them safer for students to walk or bicycle to school. Some of the identified routes to school are currently missing sidewalk segments.
**Social Environment:** The major social barrier to walking and biking to school is fear for children’s safety related to traffic volumes, speeds, and the fear of children being unsupervised. Additionally, like in many cities both large and small throughout the country, walking and bicycling are not the primary modes of transportation in Clarkfield, despite its compact size. There are many misconceptions about bicycle and pedestrian laws which tend to put drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians at odds against one another, and the City of Clarkfield is no exception.

**Political Environment:** The major political barrier to walking and biking to school is that funding bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects can prove to be difficult and are sometimes viewed as non-essential when funds are in short supply. While there may be political support for walking and bicycling to school, it is difficult to actually allocate the appropriate funds to make positive impacts on bicycling and walking throughout the city. Additionally, there are few Safe Routes to School or bicycle and/or pedestrian advocate groups that exist at the local level to give a political voice to bicycle and pedestrian concerns and issues.
Chapter 4 | Best Practices and Implementation Resources

This chapter provides information on best practices for Safe Routes to School programming and implementation as well as resources for ideas, case studies and funding Safe Routes to School projects and programs. Before jumping into the recommendations specific to the Clarkfield community, this chapter offers a variety of different bicycle and pedestrian facility types that could provide solutions to problems identified in Clarkfield related to walking and biking.

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

Flourishing Safe Routes to School projects see remarkable changes in the way students and parents choose to travel to and from school. These projects succeed by including each of the “Five E’s” of Safe Routes to School to ensure that their project is a well-rounded, multi-faceted and time-tested approach to getting more students walking and bicycling. The Five E’s of Safe Routes to School include:

- **Engineering** - Creating operational and physical improvements to the infrastructure surrounding schools that reduce speeds and potential conflicts with motor vehicle traffic, and establish safer and fully accessible crossings, walkways, trails and bikeways.
- **Evaluation** - Monitoring and documenting outcomes, attitudes and trends through the collection of data before and after the intervention(s).
- **Education** - Teaching children about the broad range of transportation choices, instructing them in important lifelong bicycling and walking safety skills, and launching driver safety campaigns in the vicinity of schools.
- **Encouragement** - Using events and activities to promote walking and bicycling and to generate enthusiasm for the program among students, parents, staff and others in the community.
- **Enforcement** - Partnering with local law enforcement to ensure that traffic laws are obeyed in the vicinity of schools (this includes enforcement of speeds, yielding to pedestrians in crosswalks and proper walking and bicycling behaviors) and initiating community enforcement such as crossing guard programs or student safety patrols.
BEST PRACTICES – Engineering Solutions, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Types:

This section of the chapter provides an overview with illustrations of common, but not all, bicycle and pedestrian facilities that the Clarkfield community may wish to consider to carry out the goals and recommendations of the Safe Routes to School Plan. These facility types are simply meant to give an idea of what other communities are doing to become more bicycle and pedestrian friendly for people of all ages. They are not intended to be specific recommendations, and some of these solutions may not be appropriate for young children, or may not be a good option for the City of Clarkfield.

Bicycle Boulevard: Low-volume, low-speed streets that have been optimized for bicycle travel through treatments such as traffic calming, traffic reduction, signage, pavement markings and intersection crossing treatments. Bicycle boulevards often restrict through traffic, forcing automobiles to turn left or right while bicyclists and pedestrians can make through movements. Traffic calming measures can be as many or as few as needed to achieve the desired level of automobile traffic on the bicycle boulevard.

Bicycle Lanes: One-way, on-street lanes that are marked and signed to designate the space occupied by cyclists on the roadway, typically in the direction of traffic. Common widths for bicycle lanes range from five to six feet.

Bicycle Path or Trail: A paved path physically separated from motor vehicle traffic. It is often shared with pedestrians and other non-motorized users. Typical widths are ten to twelve feet.

Bike Boxes: An intersection safety treatment designed to prevent bicycle/car collisions. The box creates space between motor vehicles and the crosswalk that allows bicyclists to position themselves ahead of motor vehicle traffic at the intersection. They are especially helpful for bicyclists wanting to make a left turn.
Bike Dots or Wayfinding Pavement Markings: In Seattle, bike dots are used as a tool to provide wayfinding. They are pavement markings for signed bicycle routes. Unlike sharrows, bicycle dots are not intended to provide guidance on bicycle positioning, they are rather to mark designated bike routes.

Buffered Bike Lane: Bicycle lanes that are buffered from motor vehicle lanes with extra width from striping or cross-hatching.

Color Contrast Crosswalks: Create a more visible crosswalk by differentiating the color and/or texture of the crosswalk from the roadway.

Colored Bicycle Lane: Bicycle lanes that are striped and painted with a solid color of paint. They increase the visibility of the bike lane for drivers and are particularly helpful in conflict areas, such as turning lanes.

Contraflow Bike Lane: Bicycle lanes in the opposite direction of motor vehicles on a one-way street. They are usually separated by delineators and marked with signage. Contraflow lanes are not preferred, but are a good choice when it is the most direct route or provides access to a popular destination.
Curb Extensions or Bump Outs: Areas at intersections where the sidewalk and curb extends to reduce the roadway width from curb to curb. They increase pedestrian crossing safety as they shorten the crossing distances, draw attention to the crosswalks and increase visibility of pedestrians for drivers. They also tighten the radii at corners, reducing the speed of turning vehicles.

Cycletrack or Median Separated Bicycle Lane: Bicycle lane or lanes in one or two directions that are physically separated by a curb or median from motor vehicle lanes.

High Intensity Activated Cross Walk (HAWK): A treatment to make midblock crosswalks on busy streets safer. The HAWK consists of red and yellow signals for motorists to stop for pedestrians crossing the street. The signals remain off until a pedestrian activates the system by pressing a button. Drivers are allowed to proceed during the flashing red after coming to a complete stop and making sure there is no danger to pedestrians.

Medians or Refuge Islands: Raised islands placed in the street at an intersection or midblock to separate crossing pedestrians from motor vehicles. They are typically used when the street is very wide, or at a crossing where no light exists to provide a safe midpoint resting spot for pedestrians crossing the street.

Pedestrian Linkages: When a grid or other dense street network is not available, pedestrian linkages should be provided to maintain walking continuity. Cul-de-sacs, loop roads and similar road designs that disrupt pedestrian continuity should incorporate pedestrian linkages, such as ‘cut-throughs’ to adjoining developments. These shortcuts enable pedestrians to travel by the most direct route between destinations. In most cases, routes will have fewer vehicular conflicts since the pedestrian does not have to use an arterial street to get from one local street to another.
Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB): User-activated amber LEDs that supplement warning signs at un-signalized intersections or midblock crosswalks. They can be activated by pedestrians manually by a push button or passively by a pedestrian detection system. Cost is approximately $10,000 to $15,000 for purchase and installation of two units (one on either side of a street). This includes solar panels for powering the units, pad lighting, indication units (for both sides of street) with RRFBs in the back and front of each unit, signage on both approaches, all posts, and either passive infrared detection or push buttons with audio instructions. Costs would be proportionately higher for additional units placed on a median island, etc.

Reverse Angle Parking: Improves visibility so motorists are able to see oncoming traffic and bicyclists when leaving a parking space. It also creates a safer environment for pedestrians and children when exiting a vehicle, as doors open in a way that directs them toward the sidewalk rather than the street. Additionally, it improves loading and unloading conditions as the trunk is located adjacent to the sidewalk rather than the street.

Road Diet: The reconfiguring of a roadway to reduce the number of travel lanes or the effective width to improve safety or provide space for other users. In a study conducted for MnDOT, it was found that the highest urban corridor accident rates are found on four-lane undivided roads. The collision rate was 35 percent higher than on urban three-lane roads.

Sharrow or Shared Roadway: Marked and signed roads where cyclists and motor vehicles share the roadway. Sharrows are a bicycle-friendly solution when road widths do not accommodate a bicycle lane. Unlike bicycle lanes, sharrows do not designate a particular part of the road for the exclusive use of bicyclists. They are simply a marking to guide bicyclists to the best place to ride and help motorists expect to see and share the lane with bicyclists.
**Speed Humps**

Round, raised areas placed across the roadway. They are good for locations where very low speeds are desired.

**Speed Tables and Raised Crosswalks**

Flat-topped speed humps often constructed with brick or other textured materials on the flat section. Raised crosswalks are speed tables with crosswalk markings and signage. They raise the level of the crossing, making pedestrians and the crosswalk area more visible to motorists.

**Traffic Circles**

Raised islands placed in the center of intersections around which traffic circulates. They are good for calming intersections, especially within neighborhoods where large vehicle traffic is not a major concern, but speeds, volumes and safety are problems.

**Woonerf or Living Street**

Popular in the Netherlands, these are streets where pedestrians and cyclists have legal priority over motorists. The techniques of shared spaces, traffic calming and low speed limits are intended to improve pedestrian, bicycle and automobile safety.
EVALUATION

Evaluation is an important component of all Safe Routes to School programs. SRTS planning efforts begin and end with evaluation. The two most common types of evaluation for Safe Routes to School, and those required by MnDOT of all SRTS grantees, are the student travel tallies and parent surveys. These are excellent evaluation tools to assess how students are getting to and from school as well as parent attitudes regarding how their children get to and from school.

However, there are other evaluation tools that schools and communities can use in conjunction with the student travel tallies and parent surveys to get a more robust idea of how the community is stacking up in terms of not only Safe Routes to School, but broad-scale bicycle and pedestrian amenities as well. Three other areas to consider tracking are bicycle and pedestrian facilities, behavior and attitudes in the community, and broader measures of community performance.

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are the easiest to measure and they provide a good sense of what exists in the community in terms of opportunities to walk and bike. Things to consider keeping track of in this category include, but are not limited to:

- Miles of: sidewalks, multi-use trails, bike lanes, sharrows, bike boulevards, etc.
- Number of bike racks, benches, waste receptacles, drinking fountains, informational kiosks, etc., or anything that supports a healthy bicyclist and pedestrian environment
- Number of improved intersections
- Number of traffic calming measures installed
- Number of road construction/reconstruction projects that have included bicycle and pedestrian needs
- Number of recommendations in the Plan that have been implemented
- Number of crosswalks painted or repainted

Tracking behavior and attitudes can be a bit more difficult and less scientific; however, it is important to know if improvements made have impacted community members. Measurements to track behavior and attitudes include, but are not limited to:

- Deaths and injuries by mode
- Crashes by mode and type
- Mode shift: tracking bike and walk trips over time
- Percentage of children walking and bicycling to school (student travel tallies)
- Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) or Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trip reduction
- Incorporation of multi-modal level of service into transportation plans versus only automobile level of service
- Bicycle and pedestrian counts throughout the city
- Number of participants at SRTS and bike/walk events
- Number of participants at bicycle and pedestrian education classes
- Surveys and survey responses
- Groups participating in the maintenance of trails
- Volunteer hours for all bicycle and pedestrian activities
- Bicycle organization membership

Finally, while broader community performance measures may be harder to quantify and collect, they show that bicycling and walking have had wide reaching positive impacts on the community. Broader community performance measures could include, but are not limited to:

- Air quality improvement, specifically around the school (ground-level ozone, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide)
- Health indicators (obesity, chronic disease, diabetes, physical activity)
- Economic impact of bicycling and walking and SRTS events (new jobs created/businesses opening in proximity of multi-modal streets or trails, dollars spent from walk/bike or SRTS events, etc.)

EDUCATION

Education is a key component to Safe Routes to School programs for not only students, but also the entire community. There are a number of formal and informal educational opportunities related to SRTS and walking and bicycling in general. The list below is simply meant to offer ideas; it is in no way exhaustive of all educational activities that could be a part of a successful SRTS program. More educational ideas are provided in Appendix K in the Safe Routes to School Matrix designed by MnDOT's Safe Routes to School consultant, Alta Planning and Design.

Bicycle Rodeos: Events that offer bicycle skills and safety stations for children, and sometimes parents, to visit (i.e. obstacle course, bicycle safety check, helmet fitting, instruction about the rules of the road, etc.). Bicycle rodeos can be held as part of a larger event or on their own and either during or outside the school day. Adult volunteers can administer rodeos or they may be offered through the local police or fire department.

Bike Mechanic Training: Learning bike repair skills encourages students and families to bicycle to school and empowers students to take charge of their own transportation. A bicycle mechanic training can be made available to students as a one-time basics lesson or as a multi-session course. This training can be offered after school or on weekends and can be combined with an earn-a-bike program, bike rodeo, or bicycle safety/skills trainings.

Classroom Lessons: Safe Routes to School classroom lessons address walking and/or bicycling and other related topics while also meeting state or district curriculum standards. Lessons can
be taught as part of many subjects, including math, science, social studies, health and physical education.

**Family Biking Class:** Family biking classes are great tools for educating and encouraging families to ride bicycles. Education trainings can cover safety checks, skills instruction, basic bike maintenance, how to carry kids by bicycle, cargo bike demonstrations, bike rodeos, and/or guided bike rides.

**Walk and Bike to School Route Map:** Route maps show signs, signals, crosswalks, sidewalks, paths, crossing guard locations, and hazardous locations around a school. They identify the best way to walk or bike to school. Liability concerns are sometimes cited as reasons not to publish maps; while no route will be completely free of safety concerns, a well-defined route should provide the greatest physical separation between students and traffic, expose students to the lowest traffic speeds, and use the fewest and safest crossings.

Other educational ideas include presentations to community groups and City Council about Safe Routes to School and bicycle and pedestrian issues, incorporating bicycle education into driver’s education classes, bicycle safety trainings for trainers, and many more.

**ENCOURAGEMENT**

Encouragement programs keep students and community members excited about Safe Routes to School and walking and bicycling in general. Encouragement events and programs can also induce students who would not otherwise walk or bicycle to school. The list below offers several ideas of encouragement events. More ideas can be found in Appendix K and other online SRTS resources covered in Chapter 5.

**Bike Train:** A bike train is very similar to a walking school bus. Groups of students, accompanied by one or more adults, bicycle together on a pre-planned route to school. Routes can originate from a particular neighborhood, or in order to include children who live too far to bicycle the whole way, begin from a park, parking lot, or other meeting place. Bike trains help address parent’s safety concerns, while providing a chance for students and their families to socialize and be active.

**International Walk and Bike to School Day:** The event takes place each year in October and encourages students and their families to try walking or bicycling to school. Parents and other adults accompany students, and staging areas can be designated along the route to school where groups can gather and walk or bike together. These events are often promoted through press releases, backpack, folder, electronic mail, newsletter articles, or posters. Students can earn incentives for participating if there is a celebration at school following the morning event. These events can be held for more than one day.
Park and Walk: This program is designed to encourage families to park several blocks from school and walk the rest of the way to school. Not all students are able to walk or bicycle the whole distance to school; they may live too far away or their route may include hazardous traffic situations. This program allows students who are unable to walk or bike to school a chance to participate in SRTS programs. It also helps reduce traffic congestion at the school.

Poster, T-Shirt, or Video Contest: These types of activities are great for engaging middle and high school students in SRTS efforts. Students can get creative for a cause by designing and producing posters, t-shirts, videos or other materials that communicate about active transportation. A contest like this can be combined with any type of campaign, like a school safety or anti-idling campaign.

Trip/Mileage Tracking Program: A trip or mileage tracking program can be implemented as an opt-in club, a classroom activity, or a collaborative school-wide event. Students track trips or mileage by walking, bicycling, transit, and/or carpools with some type of goal or culminating celebration or reward. Students can work toward a certain milestone to earn a prize or raffle entry, or they can track their individual or group progress as miles across their town, the State of Minnesota, or the United States.

ENFORCEMENT

It is important to continue to work with the Yellow Medicine County Sheriff’s office to ensure officers are aware of Safe Routes to School efforts and that they are up-to-date on laws regarding bicyclist and pedestrians. However there are many community enforcement approaches that can aid in successful enforcement of Madison’s Safe Routes to School program. These community enforcement approaches come from www.walkinginfo.org, which provides numerous resources for Safe Routes to School programs.

Neighborhood Speed Watch: In this approach, a radar speed unit is loaned to residents who are trained by law enforcement officials on how to collect speed data and vehicle descriptions. Residents send the information to the police who obtain the motorists’ address from the recorded license plate numbers. Then the vehicle owner will be sent a letter asking for voluntary compliance. This measure often has limited long-term effectiveness in changing the problem, but can be useful in other ways. It can educate neighbors about the issue; for example, most speeders live in the neighborhood, and help boost support for long-term solutions such as traffic calming.

Slow Down Yard Sign Campaigns: Allow residents of neighborhoods with speeding problems to participate in reminding drivers to slow down. Neighborhood leaders, safety advocates and law enforcement officials work in partnership to identify problem areas, recruit residents to post yard signs, organize distribution of yard signs, garner media attention, and evaluate the
effectiveness of the campaign. Slow down yard sign campaigns may be conducted along with other speed enforcement efforts such as pace car campaigns and the use of speed radar trailers.

**Pace Car Campaigns:** Neighborhood pace car programs aim to make neighborhoods safer for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers. Resident pace car drivers agree to drive courteously, at or below the speed limit and follow other traffic laws. Programs usually require interested residents to register as a pace car driver, sign a pledge to abide by the rules, and display a sticker or sign on their vehicle.

**Neighborhood Fight Back Programs:** Collaborative efforts between local governments and concerned residents to address crime, blight, and other issues negatively impacting their neighborhoods. Though traditionally used to address illegal drug activity, traffic and pedestrian safety may be one area of concern. The local government provides multi-agency support over a limited period of time to concentrate enforcement activities in specific neighborhoods.

**Radar Speed Trailers and Active Speed Monitors:** Fixed motorist feedback signs or movable radar speed trailers can be used as part of a community education program. Radar trailers are moved to different locations and are occasionally supplemented with motor officer enforcement for those motorists who do not believe that there is any reason to pay attention to the speed trailers. Some radar speed trailers can record speed data and traffic counts by 15-minute or hourly intervals throughout the day, which will help in targeting future police enforcement. As with neighborhood speed watch programs, these have limited long-term effectiveness in changing the problem, but can be useful in educating people and helping to boost support for long-term solutions.

**Adult School Crossing Guards:** Play a key role in promoting safer driver and pedestrian behaviors at crosswalks near schools. They help children safely cross the street and remind drivers of the presence of pedestrians. A guard helps children develop the skills to cross streets safely at all times. Adult school crossing guards can be parent volunteers, school staff, or paid personnel. Annual classroom and field training for adult school crossing guards, as well as special uniforms or equipment to increase visibility are recommended, and in some locations, required. The presence of guards can lead to more parents feeling comfortable about their child walking or bicycling to school.
Chapter 5 | Action Plan

This chapter presents possible solutions to alleviate, improve, or mitigate existing concerns related to walking and bicycling to school with the overall goal of increasing the number of students who walk and bicycle to school. The recommendations in this chapter have been developed around “The 5 E’s” of Safe Routes to School—Education, Encouragement, Engineering, Enforcement, and Evaluation in terms of policy change, programs and projects. A successful SRTS Program must incorporate components from each of “The 5 E’s” to thoroughly address all aspects of a Safe Routes to School Program and bicycle and pedestrian planning in general.

Implementation of this Safe Routes to School Plan will require the utilization of existing resources in new and innovative ways as well as seeking out outside funding specifically for Safe Routes to School.

It will not be feasible to address all of the recommendations included in this plan right away, or all at one time. This plan identifies short-term and long-range needs and recommendations to make Clarkfield a more walkable and bikeable community, not only for students, but all residents. Therefore, the plan lists projects or programs currently identified through the SRTS planning process with an estimated project timeline. The plan also identifies general project and program priorities for future projects that have not yet been identified.

POLICY, PROGRAM AND PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

Engineering:
1. Identify and fill in missing sidewalk gaps in the community. There are multiple segments along identified suggested routes to school as well as other areas of the city, where sidewalk infrastructure is missing. Another common problem is damaged sidewalks. A sidewalk inventory throughout the city should be done to better assess sidewalk needs. Priority should be given to identified suggested routes to school.

2. Improve crossing conditions throughout the city: Pedestrian signage would be beneficial at several intersections including, but not limited to US Highway 59 and MN Highway 67. Other intersection improvements should be considered throughout the city.

3. Calming traffic on all state and US highways that run through the city:
   a. Identify a school zone through signage and infrastructure
b. Post a speed trailer that tells drivers their speed

c. Move the 55 mph speed limit sign further south (to decrease acceleration in front of the school)

d. Other ways to change driving behavior include physical changes to the roadway or surrounding environment such as:
   i. Narrowing the feel of the roadway by adding a bike lane, planting boulevard trees to provide enclosure on the street, or adding permanent or seasonal curb extensions or bump outs at crosswalks/intersections

Education and Encouragement:

4. **Route Map:** Develop a walk and bike to school route map that can be distributed to students and parents and shows suggested routes to school—the suggested routes to school should have sidewalks, be low traffic volume streets, have controlled intersections or other features that make them more suitable for children walking and biking to school than other nearby routes.
   a. Once the routes have been identified, a map should be printed and distributed and students should be encouraged to use those routes. Perhaps in the future, the routes can be dressed up with public art, be home to several geocaching sites, or have other fun features that make students want to take those routes.

5. **Institute Remote Drop-Off:** This is designed to encourage families and school buses to drop students off at a designated spot several blocks from school and walk the rest of the way to school. Not all students are able to walk or bicycle the whole distance to school; they may live too far away or their route may include hazardous traffic situations. This program allows students who are unable to walk or bicycle to school a chance to participate in Safe Routes to School programs. It also helps reduce traffic congestion at the school.

6. **Develop a Walking Poster Contest:** The classroom teachers would be the lead and all classes in grades K-6 could participate. The students of the winning posters from each grade would get a prize. The posters could then be put on display around the school and around the community in local business storefront windows, at the library, and other places around the community. This could be done in the spring in conjunction with the bike rodeo.
7. **Develop a Mileage Club:** This could also be tied into walking and biking days. Incentive prizes would be given to students—these could be small prizes given to all students who participate or larger prizes for students who log the most miles each week, month or over the whole year, or some combination of these. Each classroom could also keep track of their miles to see how far they’ve gone (ie. they walked or biked all the way to Florida) and then each class could compete against each other.

8. **Walking School Bus or Bike Train:** Develop a formal or informal walking school bus or bike train program so that small children can be accompanied by adults or older children while they walk or bike to school. If a formal program is used, parents, teachers or other supervisors of the walking school bus or bike train will be needed and the lead of the program will need to spend time to determine what kids/families are interested in the program in order to determine routes and stops. If an informal program is used, the lead of the program could be much more informal and simply leave the organizing of the walking school bus or bike train to the families that want to utilize the walking school bus or bike train. There is potential to ask senior citizens and retired community members to assist with this activity. This could be a long-term strategy as it may be difficult to implement right away.

9. **Formal Bicycle and Pedestrian Education:** Incorporate bicycle and pedestrian safety into the physical education curriculum, everyday classroom activities or community education offerings. The MnDOT bicycle and pedestrian safety curriculum can be used as a base curriculum. Participate in the trainings provided by MnDOT and other partners for teachers to learn the curriculum.

10. **Participate in Walk/Bike to School Day:** The school will participate in national and international walk and bike to school day events and potentially plan a more frequent walk/bike to school day to encourage students to walk and bike often. To get more students to participate, the school could utilize a remote drop-off location for all the students who arrive to school via the school bus.

11. **Bike Rodeo:** Host a bike rodeo with the Yellow Medicine County Sheriff’s Office. The bike rodeo teaches students valuable bicycle safety skills and empowers them to ride on their own. The bike rodeo could be held in conjunction with another school event, part of walk...
Enforcement:

12. Target enforcement of traffic laws at identified crossings for improvement.

13. Target enforcement of traffic laws on identified state and U.S. highways.

14. Limit bus pick-ups within the city limits. Bus stops could be combined to increase physical activity and minimize time.

Additionally, the SRTS Team, the school, City and community members should consider other creative community enforcement approaches such as the neighborhood speed watch or pace car campaigns identified in Chapter 4. These approaches further engage the community in SRTS efforts and take enforcement into their own hands. They are effective in helping communities or neighborhoods further evaluate an issue such as speeding. For example, the speeding culprits may mostly be neighborhood residents. Then the neighborhood can assess better ways to effectively address the problem. These community enforcement approaches can also be useful in educating the community and building support for long-term solutions.

Evaluation:

15. Continue to conduct student travel tallies.

16. Continue to conduct parent surveys: this could happen once every other year.

Additionally, the SRTS Team, the school, the City and community members should consider tracking bicycle and pedestrian facilities, behavior and attitudes and broader community performance measures as identified in Chapter 4. It is not necessary, or perhaps practical, to begin tracking all of these measures at once, however the more the community can track and measure, the better it will be at telling its story and potentially securing grant funding. Evaluation is essential to a Safe Routes to School program.
and it should be conducted in some fashion at least once per year, every year.

**Other Recommendations:**
There are other recommendations that do not fit as nicely into the “Five E” areas, but are still important. Those recommendations are presented here.

17. Continue to meet as a SRTS Team.
18. Continue to promote community input via the WikiMapping crowdsourcing site.
19. Apply for future SRTS funding through the state and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

The following page depicts all of the recommendations in an easy to read Implementation Matrix. It details the target audience, timeline and person(s) responsible for each project, policy or program recommendation.
### Clarkfield SRTS Implementation Matrix

**Engineering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Target Audience</th>
<th>Estimated Project Timeline</th>
<th>Project Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Identify &amp; Fill in Missing Sidewalk Sections</td>
<td>Students &amp; Community</td>
<td>X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>City of Clarkfield  SRTS Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Improve Identified Crossings</td>
<td>Students &amp; Community</td>
<td>X  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>City of Clarkfield  SRTS Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Calm Traffic on Identified Highways</td>
<td>Students &amp; Community</td>
<td>X  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>MnDOT &amp; City of Clarkfield  SRTS Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education & Encouragement**

| 4 Market SRTS Program                                   | Students & Parents         | X  X  X  X  X  X           | SRTS Team                        |
| 5 Remote Drop Off                                       | Students                    | X  X  X  X  X             | School  SRTS Team                |
| 6 Walking School Bus/ Bike Train                        | Students                    | X  X  X  X  X             | Parents                          |
| 7 Formal Bike & Ped Education                           | Students                    | X  X  X  X  X             | School                           |
| 8 Safety Patrol Training                                | Students/Volunteers         | X  X  X  X  X  X           | School  SRTS Team                |
| 9 Walk/Bike to School Day                               | Students                    | X  X  X  X  X             | School                           |
| 10 Bike Rodeo                                           | Students                    | X  X  X  X  X             | School  YMC Law Enforcement      |

**Enforcement**

| 11 Enforce Traffic Laws at Identified Crossings         | Drivers                     | X  X  X  X  X             | YMC Law Enforcement  Students/Volunteers |
| 12 Enforce Traffic Laws on Identified State & U.S. Highways | Drivers                     | X  X  X  X  X             | YMC Law Enforcement      |
| 13 Limit Bus Pick-Ups                                   | Students                    | X  X  X  X  X             | School                           |

**Evaluation**

| 14 Conduct Student Travel Tallies                       | School, MnDOT & National SRTS Clearinghouse | X  X  X  X  X  X           | School  Students             |
| 15 Conduct Parent Surveys                               | School, MnDOT & National SRTS Clearinghouse | X  X  X  X  X  X           | School  Students             |
| 16 Evaluate Participation in Walk to School Day         | School, MnDOT & National SRTS Clearinghouse | X  X  X  X  X  X           | School  Students             |
It should be noted that future implementations will likely surface as this plan is utilized for implementation and carrying out Clarkfield’s SRTS program. Therefore, the following general guidelines for project and program priorities may be helpful in determining the best use of time, resources, and energy to devote to new SRTS ideas. These general priorities guided the ranking of the projects that made it to the implementation matrix and that were previously identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and Program Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that have a high number of users (current and/or potential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that address safety concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that provide important connections and create greater bicycle and pedestrian access throughout the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that are located on identified suggested routes to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that have demonstrated community support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that have the best potential for grant or non-school or city funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that are feasible, politically, economically and practically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that have a high impact and lower costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES AND PARTNERS**

There are a variety of ways to fund the implementation of Clarkfield’s Safe Routes to School program. Having this Safe Routes to School Plan in place allows Clarkfield access to more funding opportunities than would be available without having gone through the Safe Routes to School Planning process. There are a variety of public and private funding sources that can help pay for Safe Routes to School improvements in the Clarkfield community. This section of the Plan lists those potential funding sources, partners that the Clarkfield community may wish to turn to for help with implementation of the Plan, and other helpful resources for ideas and inspiration as the Clarkfield SRTS program launches.

The following page, Figure 5.2, shows a table of many of the available public grant funding sources known at this time to support Safe Routes to School efforts. This list is constantly changing, so keep in contact with the Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Development Commission for the latest on public grant funding sources.
### Figure 5.2 Public Grant Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant/Program Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Minnesota Safe Routes to School Program</td>
<td>The MN Legislature authorized $500,000 in funds for the 2014-2015 biennium to be used for non-infrastructure SRTS activities.</td>
<td>Unknown at this time</td>
<td>MnDOT &amp; local RDCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)</td>
<td>SRTS planning, infrastructure and non-infrastructure activities are now eligible under TAP. TAP also funds bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements that address transportation needs.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>MnDOT &amp; local RDCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</td>
<td>This program can fund bicycle and pedestrian improvements that will achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries. It can be used on all public roads including non-state owned public roads and roads on tribal lands.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>MnDOT &amp; local RDCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Federal Recreational Trails Program</td>
<td>Funds motorized and non-motorized trail projects; maintenance/restoration of existing recreational trails; development/rehabilitation of recreational trail linkages; environmental awareness and safety education programs relating to the use of recreational trails; and redesign/relocation of trails to benefit/minimize the impact to the natural environment.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>MN DNR <a href="mailto:traci.vibo@state.mn.us">traci.vibo@state.mn.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Local Trail Connections Program</td>
<td>Eligible projects include acquisition and development of trail facilities. Projects must result in a trail linkage that is immediately available for use by the general public.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>MN DNR <a href="mailto:traci.vibo@state.mn.us">traci.vibo@state.mn.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Trail Legacy Grant Program</td>
<td>Eligible projects include acquisition, development, improvement, and restoration of park and trail facilities of regional or statewide significance.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>MN DNR <a href="mailto:audrey.mularie@state.mn.us">audrey.mularie@state.mn.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Statewide Health Improvement Program (SHIP)</td>
<td>SHIP funds projects and programs that are aimed at active living, healthy eating and tobacco-free living. SRTS activities have been funded in the past.</td>
<td>Unknown at this time</td>
<td>MDH &amp; Local County Health Boards <a href="mailto:katrina@countryside.co.swift.mn.us">katrina@countryside.co.swift.mn.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Funding:
Though some communities have implemented complex local government financing tools such as sales tax funding or bonds to fund SRTS programs, the easiest and most common way to access local funding is to identify existing pots of money that are currently flowing to transportation, safety or health issues and tap into them.

There are two categories of local funding through which to pursue SRTS funds: capital improvement projects and operating budgets.

Capital Improvement Projects: Capital improvement projects (CIPs) are new infrastructure projects implemented using public funds. These projects are identified through a capital improvement planning process which is tied to the local budget. During the planning process, the local government identifies and prioritizes capital improvements such as new roads and sidewalks, and then allocates funding for construction at least one year before the project is implemented.

Because CIPs may take a couple of years to complete, CIPs tend to have multi-year budgets. However, most CIPs have the capacity to make changes and fund newly identified projects and pressing needs. A local transportation planner or engineer serving on a SRTS taskforce or committee could assist in identifying infrastructure projects and including them in the capital improvement planning process.

Operating Budgets: Local operating budgets may provide avenues for non-infrastructure programs and infrastructure maintenance and repair. Transportation budgets may include funding for pedestrian and bicycle programs or school zone improvements. Police or public safety budgets may include funding for traffic law enforcement or school crossing guards. Public school budgets may include opportunities for safety education or walking and bicycling encouragement programs. Recreation budgets may include funding for after school programs. Including a representative from these departments on a SRTS taskforce or committee allows complementary sources of funding to be more easily identified.

Most local operating budgets include funding for general maintenance and repair of infrastructure. Depending on the size of the budget, these funds can be used for inexpensive projects such as striping crosswalks or installing signage, or more costly projects such as installing curb ramps.
Other Funding Sources:

Often, local Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs can solicit funding from non-governmental resources within their own communities. The multiple benefits of SRTS programs, including the safety, health, environment and community impacts, often align with the interests of the local community.

The following is a list of potential private funding sources taken from the Safe Routes to School Toolkit, published by National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA):

- **Corporations and businesses**: Contact local corporations and businesses to ask if they will support your program with cash, prizes, and/or donations such as printing services. It's good to ask your parent leaders where they work; they often can help you get a "foot in the door." When contacting a company, ask for information about their "community giving programs."

- **Foundations**: There are institutions throughout the country that provide funding to non-profit organizations. The Foundation Center is an excellent source of potential funding sources. Narrow your funding possibilities by first searching for geographic region of giving. Look under categories for transportation, health, environment, and community building.

- **Individuals**: Statistically, individuals give more money than corporations and foundations combined. You can begin a local fund drive by working within your existing network of team leaders, and outreaching to the larger community.

- **Events**: Many programs have raised funds by holding special events. Use the SRTS theme to attract funding. Hold a walkathon or a bicycling event. You also can choose more traditional fundraising efforts, such as bake sales, concerts, talent shows, etc.

- **Parent teacher associations (PTAs) and school districts**: Many PTAs have funds to distribute to school programs and often schools have safety funding. Contact your local PTA and the School District to see if there is a method for applying for a grant.

- **RWJF Grants**: One of the largest foundations in the country, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation offers grants that address public health issues such as childhood obesity and asthma. More information about the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation can be found on their website: [www.rwjf.org](http://www.rwjf.org)

- **People for Bikes**: People for Bikes is a bicycling advocacy group. They give out a variety of community grants to increase the numbers of people who ride bikes. More information about People for Bikes and their community grants can be found on their website: [http://www.peopleforbikes.org/pages/community-grants](http://www.peopleforbikes.org/pages/community-grants)
- **Target**: Target gives grants to schools and communities in areas related to education, the arts, public safety and more. For more information about Target’s giving, visit their grants page on their website: https://corporate.target.com/corporate-responsibility/grants.

- **Walmart**: Walmart gives a variety of grant funds to schools and communities for a variety of topics. For more information about Walmart’s giving, visit their grants page on their website: http://foundation.walmart.com/apply-for-grants/.

- **National Center for Safe Routes to School**: funds a local $1,000 mini-grant program that supports the goal of Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs, which is to enable and encourage children to safely walk and bicycle to school. SRTS programs are implemented nationwide by parents, schools, community leaders, and local, state, and tribal governments. Mini-grants may fund activities ranging from the nuts and bolts that help start or sustain a program to new ideas that explore the range of benefits of safe walking and bicycling. The National Center invites student and adult leaders to consider their school’s needs and interests and to propose solutions that are also part of a broader safe walking/bicycling to school effort.

**Other Resources:**
Beyond grant or funding sources, there are many free resources to help parents, educators, planners, city officials and communities develop and sustain successful Safe Routes to School programs. Some of these resources offer ideas for education and encouragement events, others offer case studies on what other communities have done and others provide more technical information about different bicycle and pedestrian treatments that are most effective. Following is a list of some, but certainly not all Safe Routes to School resources with information, ideas and inspiration.

**National Center for Safe Routes to School**: Established in May 2006, the National Center for Safe Routes to School assists states and communities in enabling and encouraging children to safely walk and bicycle to school. The National Center serves as the information clearinghouse for the federal Safe Routes to School program. The organization also provides technical support and resources and coordinates online registration efforts for U.S. Walk to School Day and facilitates worldwide promotion and participation.

The National Center is part of the University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center with funding from the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration. ⁶

---

Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center (PBIC): Their mission is to improve the quality of life in communities through the increase of safe walking and bicycling as a viable means of transportation and physical activity. PBIC offers information and training to diverse audiences on health and safety, engineering, advocacy, education, enforcement, access, and mobility as it relates to pedestrians and bicyclists.  

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s Safe Routes to School Toolkit: This toolkit is designed to help schools and communities initiate and implement a Safe Routes to School Program.

National Walk/Bike to School Site: This website is part of the National Center for Safe Routes to School and it has many ideas for creating a successful walk and/or bike to school day in your community. This is also the place to register of local walk and bike to school days for tracking purposes.

7 http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/
9 http://www.walkbiketoschool.org/
Chapter 6 | Conclusion

Clarkfield’s Safe Routes to School Plan lays the groundwork for a successful Safe Routes to School program. It identifies projects and programs to address engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement and evaluation needs related to children walking or bicycling to school.

This plan is a living document, meant to guide the development of SRTS projects and programs by defining a broad vision and setting goals for Safe Routes to School as well as walking and bicycling throughout the Clarkfield community for residents of all ages and abilities.

This plan was developed with stakeholder and public input through a thoughtful and data based process. It will put the Clarkfield community in a better position to receive grant funding for not only Safe Routes to School funding, but also grant funding for other bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs that are needed in the community.

The implementation of the Clarkfield Safe Routes to School Plan will provide Clarkfield residents of all ages with increased transportation options and contribute to making Clarkfield a more vibrant and livable community.
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Clarkfield Area Charter School Safe Routes to School Kick-Off Meeting

Wednesday November 6, 2013
3:15 – 5:00 Observation of Dismissal, Walking Audit & Debrief
5:00 Official Kick-Off Meeting
Clarkfield Area Charter School, 301 13th Street, Clarkfield, MN 56223

Agenda

3:15 – 4:00 Observation of dismissal & debrief
4:00 – 5:00 Conduct walking audit & debrief
5:00 Official kick-off meeting
5:00 – 5:15 Welcome & introductions
5:15 – 5:35 Brief overview of SRTS
   5 E’s of SRTS
   • Evaluation
   • Education
   • Encouragement
   • Engineering
   • Enforcement
5:35 – 6:00 Issue identification and summary of dismissal and walking audit
6:00 – 6:20 Develop goals and vision statement for Clarkfield
6:20 – 6:30 What’s next – Lindsey goes over the general SRTS planning process and next steps
Clarkfield Safe Routes to School Meeting #2

Wednesday, October 15, 2014
9:00 am
Clarkfield Area Charter School

Agenda

Welcome and introductions

Overview of SRTS in Clarkfield – What we’ve covered (vision and goals) & where we’re going (what’s needed for implementation)

Review of data gathered

- Student travel tally data
- Crash data

Identify existing conditions and barriers

- WikiMapping tool (to get broader community input)
- Large map exercise

Introduction to implementation ideas in each of the 5 E areas:

- Evaluation
- Education
- Encouragement
- Engineering
- Enforcement

Current MnDOT SRTS and TAP Solicitations

- Mini grants – up to $2,500 for items to support your school or community SRTS activities
- Bicycle fleets and trailers – to implement Walk! Bike! Fun! Curriculum
- Infrastructure grants - $1 million available statewide for SRTS projects
- Transportation Alternatives Program solicitation - $600,000 available in MnDOT district 8 for projects (SRTS projects are eligible)
- Upcoming Walk! Bike! Fun! Curriculum training in our region!

Next steps
# Agenda

Welcome and Introductions

- Review Intersections of Concern
- Priority Routes (for infrastructure improvements)
- Implementation Priorities based on 5 E’s – Dot Exercise
- Next Steps

## Project and Program Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects that have a high number of users (current and/or potential)</td>
<td>Programs that promote bicycling and pedestrian safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that address safety concerns</td>
<td>Programs that have the potential to promote walking and bicycling to users beyond students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that provide important connections and create greater bicycle and pedestrian access throughout the city</td>
<td>Programs that have demonstrated community support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that are located on identified suggested routes to school</td>
<td>Programs that have limited cost compared to impact or reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that have demonstrated community support</td>
<td>Programs that have the best potential for grant or non-school or city funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that have the best potential for grant or non-school or city funding</td>
<td>Programs that reach all students, not only those who live within the walk/bike area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that are feasible, politically, economically and practically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that have a high impact and lower costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Emily Zandt**  
Community Development Planner, UMVRDC  
emily.zandt@umvrdc.org  
Office: **320.289.1981 x 104**  
Cell: **612-558-7555**
Clarkfield Safe Routes to School – Final Meeting

Tuesday, April 14th, 2015
3:00 pm
Clarkfield Area Charter School

Agenda

Welcome and Introductions

- Review issues
  - Conversation with MnDOT District 8

- Review implementation matrix

- Questions?

- Moving Forward
  - Mini Grant
  - Walk to School Day
  - Bike Rodeo

Emily Zandt
Community Development Planner, UMVRDC
emily.zandt@umvrdc.org
Office: 320.289.1981 x 104
Cell: 612-558-7555
Appendix B: SRTS Team Meeting Notes
Clarkfield Area Charter School SRTS Kick-Off Meeting (#1) Notes

Wednesday, November 6, 2013
3:15 – 5:00 Observation of Dismissal, Walking Audit & Debrief
5:00 Kick-Off Meeting
Clarkfield Area Charter School, 301 13th Street, Clarkfield, MN 56223

Attendance for observation of dismissal and walking audit: Becca Schrupp, Lindsey Knutson & Jarrett Hubbard, MnDOT District 8.

The small group observed dismissal at Clarkfield Area Charter School and then conducted a walking audit around the school. See dismissal observation and walking audit worksheet for details.

Attendance for Kick-Off Meeting: Becca Schrupp, City of Clarkfield – team leader, Aubrey Johnson, Clarkfield Area Charter School, Scott Weske, City of Clarkfield, Neil Linscheid, City Council Member & Parent, Michael Jenson, Deputy Sheriff, Jarrett Hubbard, MnDOT District 8, and Lindsey Knutson, UMVRDC.

Lindsey gave a brief overview of the Safe Routes to School program, explaining that the main objectives of SRTS programs are to get children walking and biking where it is safe and where it is not safe, make changes. Lindsey went over the “5E” approach to address issues and barriers to walking to school:

1. **Evaluation**: monitoring and documenting outcomes, attitudes, and trends through the collection of data before and after the intervention(s).
2. **Education**: teaching children about the broad range of transportation choices, instructing them in important lifelong bicycling and walking safety skills, and launching driver safety campaigns in the vicinity of schools.
3. **Encouragement**: using events and activities to promote walking and bicycling and to generate enthusiasm for the program with students, parents, staff, and surrounding community.
4. **Engineering**: creating operational and physical improvements to the infrastructure surrounding schools that reduce speeds and potential conflicts with motor vehicle traffic, and establish safer and fully accessible crossings, walkways, trails, and bikeways.
5. **Enforcement**: partnering with local law enforcement to ensure that traffic laws are obeyed in the vicinity of schools (this includes enforcement of speeds, yielding to pedestrians in crosswalks, and proper walking and bicycling behaviors) and initiating community enforcement, such as crossing guard programs and student safety patrol.

**Issue Identification:**

- The biggest problem area is directly surrounding the school. The school is located on the southern edge of the city on U.S. Highway 59. There are sidewalks on both sides of 59 for the majority of the way to the school; however, they stop several blocks short of the school. Additionally, at the school, U.S. Highway 59 turns from an urban section of highway to a rural section of highway and the speed limit increases from 30 to 55 mph.
The current physical environment does not support children walking or bicycling to school.

- The second biggest problem area is the intersection of U.S. Highway 59, MN Highway 67 and the railroad tracks north of the school and on the west side of the city. This is a very wide intersection that sees a lot of heavy commercial truck traffic and lacks clearly defined spaces for pedestrians. Due to the layout of the city and the railroad tracks, this intersection must be traversed by students to get to school. The SRTS Team wants to figure out how to make this intersection safer for all modes and direct children to the safest places possible. Preliminary discussions support having children cross MN Highway 67 east of this intersection at 10th Street, where the visibility is the best, and walking on the south side of MN Highway 67 to the intersection of U.S. Highway 59 and then head south on 59 to the school.
  - If students are encouraged to cross MN Highway 67 at 10th Street, improvements to that crossing should be made. Ideas for improvements to increase safety could include:
    - Curb bump outs or extensions to shorten the width of the roadway children would be crossing.
    - High visibility crosswalk with signage.
    - HAWK or RRFB signals, see web links for further information about these pedestrian enhancements.
    - Put crosswalk flags on each side of the street for children to hold while crossing the street to increase their visibility to automobiles.
    - Have crossing guards present at this location.

- Currently most children do not walk or bicycle to school. However, the school is less than one mile from most residents within the city. The SRTS Team would like to see more students walk and bicycle to school for health, academic achievement, and social reasons—realizing that safety improvements will have to be made to get more students walking and bicycling.

- Currently there are no crossing guards and there is no school patrol program.

- There is great support from the community for the school and the students. This support will help the SRTS program.

**Goals for Clarkfield’s SRTS Program:**

- To make the entire city more walkable and bikeable for all residents and visitors.
- Increase education on the health benefits of increased physical activity.
- Increase the numbers of students who walk or bike to school.
- Use this as an opportunity to get better connected to outside resources and expertise.
Clarkfield Area Charter School SRTS Kick-Off Meeting (#2) Notes

Thursday, February 6, 2014
5:30 Meeting #2
Clarkfield Area Charter School, 301 13th Street, Clarkfield, MN 56223

Attendance for Kick-Off Meeting: Becca Schrupp, City of Clarkfield – team leader, Kathy Koetter, Clarkfield Area Charter School, Michael Jenson, Deputy Sherriff, and Lindsey Knutson, UMVRDC.

Lindsey presented data about Clarkfield to the group:

**Crash Data:** There have been 29 crashes within the City of Clarkfield from 2003 – 2013. One of those crashes was fatal and that fatal crash was the only crash in that 10 year period that involved a pedestrian, that crash happened in 2006. There was also one crash in that 10 year period that resulted in a serious injury. The rest of the crashes involved non-serious injuries, property damage or less. From 2003 – 2013, there were no crashes that involved bicyclists or trains. Since 2001, the number of crashes occurring yearly has decreased from a high of 7 per year to a low of zero crashes in a year. The reduction of crashes in recent years is a trend seen across the state of MN and many parts of the US.

![All Crashes in Clarkfield from 2001 - 2013](image-url)

**Demographic Data:** There are 341 households that call Clarkfield home. Of those, 196 are considered families and 89 or 26.1% of those families have children under 18 living in their household. See the following table for general demographic data for Clarkfield compared to Yellow Medicine County, the State of Minnesota and the United States.
At 6%, Clarkfield has a comparatively high percentage of the population who walk to work. Therefore, improving pedestrian mobility will help many residents in Clarkfield beyond just school children. To give a sense of how significant 6% of the population who walk to work actually is, see the table below to compare Clarkfield to other places in Minnesota.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>% of Residents who walk to work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Medicine County</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkfield</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group discussed the best routes to direct school children to walk to and from school. See attached map for suggested routes to school.

The group brainstormed project, program and policy solutions to some of the barriers to walking and biking to school in Clarkfield related to each of the 5 E’s. The following is a list of ideas discussed to date:

1. **Evaluation:** monitoring and documenting outcomes, attitudes, and trends through the collection of data before and after the intervention(s).
   a. Conduct student travel tallies at least once a year—two times a year, once in the fall and once in the spring is ideal.
b. Conduct parent surveys every couple years.
c. Continue to monitor crash data.

2. **Education:** teaching children about the broad range of transportation choices, instructing them in important lifelong bicycling and walking safety skills, and launching driver safety campaigns in the vicinity of schools.
   a. Bike Rodeo: An event that offers bicycle skills and safety stations for children to visit (i.e. obstacle course, bicycle safety check, helmet fitting, instruction about the rules of the road, et.). Bicycle rodeos can be held as part of a larger event or on their own, and either during the school day or outside of school. Adult volunteers can administer bike rodeos, or they may be offered through local law enforcement or fire department.
   b. Classroom Lessons/In-School Bike/Ped Safety Education: SRTS classroom lessons address walking and/or bicycling and other related topics while also meeting state or district curriculum standards. Lessons can be taught as part of many subjects, including math, science, social studies, health, and physical education.
      i. Pedestrian Safety Education: Pedestrian safety education aims to ensure that every child understands basic traffic laws and safety rules. It teaches students basic traffic safety, sign identification, and decision making tools. Training is typically recommended for first- and second-graders and teaches lessons such as “look left, right, and left again.” Curriculum often includes three parts: in-class lessons, mock street scenarios, and on-street practice. MnDOT, in partnership with the Department of Health and the Department of Education has developed a [bike/walk curriculum](#) for schools to use at no cost. MnDOT will also be putting on teacher trainings related to this curriculum this spring at no cost to schools. Stay tuned for more information about the trainings.
      ii. In-School Bicycle Safety Education: Bicycle safety training is most appropriate beginning in or after the third grade. It helps children understand that they have the same responsibility as motorists to obey traffic laws. In-school curriculum often includes three parts: in-class lessons, mock street scenarios or skills practice, and on-street riding. See the MN bike/walk curriculum referenced above.
   c. Walk/Bike to School Route Map: Route maps may show signs, signals crosswalks, sidewalks, paths, crossing guard locations, and the hazardous locations around a school. They identify the best way to walk or bike to school. Liability concerns are sometimes cited as reasons not to publish maps; while no route will be completely free of safety concerns, a well-defined route should provide the greatest physical separation between students and traffic, expose students to the lowest traffic speeds, and use the fewest and safest crossings.

3. **Encouragement:** using events and activities to promote walking and bicycling and to generate enthusiasm for the program with students, parents, staff, and surrounding community.
a. After School Club: An after school club can take many forms and address many different themes, including bike repair, sport cycling, environmental issues (green teams), community/civic engagement, etc.

b. Family Biking Class: Family biking classes are great tools for educating and encouraging families to ride bicycles. Education trainings can cover safety checks, skills instruction, basic bike maintenance, how to carry kids by bicycle cargo bike demonstrations, bike rodeos, and/or guided bike rides. This activity could also partner with the bike rodeo for students.

c. Bike/Walk Competition/Challenge: Competitions and contests reward students by tracking the number of times they walk, bike, carpool. Or take transit to school. Contests can be individual, classroom competitions, school wide, or between schools. Students and classrooms can compete for prizes and bragging rights. Inexpensive incentives, such as shoelaces, stickers, bike helmets, or class parties, can be used as rewards for participation. Examples include a golden sneaker award, classroom competition, or a walk and bike to school day challenge.

d. Trip/Mileage Tracking Program: This is similar to a competition/challenge, but a trip or mileage tracking program can be implemented as an opt-in club, a classroom activity, or a collaborative school wide event. Students can track trips or mileage made by walking, bicycling, and/or carpooling with some type of goal or culminating celebration or reward. Students can work toward a certain milestone to earn a prize or raffle entry, or they can track their individual or group progress as miles across their town, the state of Minnesota, or the United States. Example programs include Pollution Punchcards or Walk Across America.

e. Walk/Bike to School Day:

f. Park and Walk/Remote Drop-Off Location:

g. Walk/Bike Field Trips:

h. Walking School Bus: A walking school bus is a group of children walking to school with one or more adults. Parents can take turns leading the bus, which follows the same route every time and picks up children from their homes or designated bus stops at designated times. Ideally, buses run every day or on a regular schedule so families can count on it, but they often begin as a one-time pilot event. A walking school bus can be as informal as a few parents alternating to walk their children to school, but often it is a well-organized PTA-led effort to encourage walking to school.

i. Bike Train: A bike train is very similar to a walking school bus. Groups of students accompanied by one or more adults bicycle together on a pre-planned route to school. Routes can originate from a particular neighborhood or, in order to include children who live too far to bicycle the whole way, begin from a park, parking lot, or other meeting place. Bike trains help address parents’ safety concerns while providing a chance for students and their families to socialize and be active.
4. **Engineering:** Creating operational and physical improvements to the infrastructure surrounding schools that reduce speeds and potential conflicts with motor vehicle traffic, and establish safer and fully accessible crossings, walkways, trails, and bikeways.

   a. Construct a sidewalk along US 59 that fills the gap between existing sidewalk and the school property. The last several blocks of US 59 to the school are missing sidewalk infrastructure.

   b. Construct sidewalks along the north and south sides of MN 67. On the south side of 67, sidewalks are missing from 9th Street and east and on the north side; sidewalks are missing from 7th or 8th Street and east.

   c. Intersection improvements to the intersection of MN 67 and US 59: some suggestions have included installing a 4-way stop, installing flashing LED stop signs, a traffic signal and repainting the cross walks.

5. **Enforcement:** Partnering with local law enforcement to ensure that traffic laws are obeyed in the vicinity of schools (this includes enforcement of speeds, yielding to pedestrians in crosswalks, and proper walking and bicycling behaviors) and initiating community enforcement, such as crossing guard programs and student safety patrol.

   a. School Safety Patrols/Crossing Guards: Would be great to have school patrol or a crossing guard at the intersection of MN 67 and US 59. Might also want one at the intersection of 10th St. and MN 67, if we choose to have students cross MN 67 at that intersection instead of at US 59.

   b. School Safety Campaign: A safety campaign is an effective way to build awareness around students walking and biking to school and to encourage safe driving behavior among parents and passersby. A school traffic safety campaign can use media at or near schools, such as posters, business window stickers, yard signs, and/or street banners, to remind drivers to slow down and use caution in school zones. This type of campaign can also address other specific hazards or behaviors, such as walking or bicycling to school, school bus safety, and/or parent drop-off and pick-up behavior.

   c. Valet Parking or New Policies for Drop-Off/Pick-Up: In a valet program, students, teachers, or volunteers are trained to assist with drop-off and pick-up procedures to expedite and standardize the process. This allows students to get in and out of cars safely and quickly, discouraging parents from unsafe behaviors and reducing hazards for students arriving and leaving school.
Clarkfield Safe Routes to School Planning Meeting #3

Friday, December 19, 2014
3:00 pm

SRTS team Members Present: Kathy Koetter, Aubrey Johnson, Becca Schrupp, Katrina Henry, Mike Jenson, Neil Linscheid, Emily Zandt

Topics Discussed

Intersections of Concern:

- US Hwy 59 at the school parking lot
- US Hwy 59 and MN 67 and railroad tracks
- MN 67 and 10th Street – Possible “designated crossing” location

Priority Routes:

- No changes needed

Implementation Priorities:

Do first included:

- Enforce Traffic laws on identified State and US highways
- Market the SRTS program
- Conduct Parent Surveys
- Identify and fill in missing sidewalk sections
- Move speed limit sign on Hwy 59 heading south of town

Favorites included:

- Identify and fill in missing sidewalk sections
- Move speed limit sign on Hwy 59 heading south of town
- Participate in Walk to School Day
- Safety Patrol Training @ Legionville
- Bike Rodeo
- Weekly Walk to School Day
- Crossing Guards

Second Favorites included:

- Identify and fill in missing sidewalk sections
- Conduct student travel tallies
- Walking school bus/bike train
- Remote Drop Off
- Crossing Guards
Clarkfield Area Charter School SRTS Meeting #4

April 14th, 2015 3:00pm

Present: Kathy Koetter, Aubrey Johnson, Becca Schrupp, Katrina Henry, Mike Jenson, Neil Linscheid, Emily Zandt, Barrett Voigt

**Bike Rodeo** – is scheduled for **Tuesday, May 26th at 3:30pm**.

- The event will take place in the school gymnasium
- Mike will run the event
- Mike will contact Sabrina in Dawson to find out what they do for a Bike Rodeo
- Neil will contact the Lions club to see if they would like to volunteer
- The RDC will do a Notice of Public Meeting for this event, where comments on the SRTS plan will be taken

**Walk to School Day** is scheduled for **Wednesday, May 27th**.

- The 5 bus stops will be used as gathering places and the school kitchen will be used as a drop-off site for buses that pick up kids outside of Clarkfield
- Departure time needs to be determined (those eating breakfast need to be at school by 7:40)
- Neil will contact the Lions club to see if they would like to volunteer

- **Incentive Prizes** are to be determined.
  - Kathy will get helmets and prizes.
  - RDC will do a press release on National Walk/Bike to School day, provide a map, and provide safety handouts/other printed materials

**Evaluation**

- Request student tallies in May
- Conduct another parent survey in the fall

**Other items**

- Receipts should be received by June 1st
- Kathy will see if bike rack can be locally made
- Hwy 59 ROW is 33 feet from the road centerline
Appendix C: Student Travel Tally Form
## Safe Routes to School Students Arrival and Departure Tally Sheet

### Capital Letters Only – Blue or Black Ink Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name:</th>
<th>Teacher’s First Name:</th>
<th>Teacher’s Last Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade: (PK, K, 1, 2, 3...)</th>
<th>Monday’s Date (Week count was conducted)</th>
<th>Number of Students Enrolled in Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mm dd yy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Please conduct these counts on two of the following three days Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. (Three days would provide better data if counted)
- Please do not conduct these counts on Mondays or Fridays.
- Before asking your students to raise their hands, please read through all possible answer choices so they will know their choices. Each student may only answer once.
- Ask your students to answer the question “How did you arrive at school today?”
- Very, keep each answer choice and record the number of students that raised their hands for each. Place just one character or number in each box.
- Follow the same procedure for the question “How do you plan to leave home after school?”
- You can conduct the counts once per day but during the course, please ask students both the school arrival and departure questions.
- Please conduct this count regardless of weather conditions (i.e., ask these questions on rainy days, too).

### Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather</th>
<th>Student Tally</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunny</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example AM**
- “How did you arrive at school today?” Record the number of hands for each answer.
- “How do you plan to leave home after school?” Record the number of hands for each answer.

**Sample AM**
- Sunny: 5
- Rain: 0
- Snow: 2
- Walk: 2
- Bike: 3
- School Bus: 8
- Family Vehicle: 3
- Carpool: 3
- Transit: 1
- Other: 1

**Sample PM**
- Sunny: 0
- Rain: 1
- Snow: 2
- Walk: 3
- Bike: 8
- School Bus: 1
- Family Vehicle: 2
- Carpool: 3
- Transit: 2
- Other: 1

### Step 2

**Tues. AM**
- Sunny: 0
- Rain: 1
- Snow: 2
- Walk: 3
- Bike: 8
- School Bus: 1
- Family Vehicle: 2
- Carpool: 3
- Transit: 2
- Other: 1

**Tues. PM**
- Sunny: 0
- Rain: 1
- Snow: 2
- Walk: 3
- Bike: 8
- School Bus: 1
- Family Vehicle: 2
- Carpool: 3
- Transit: 2
- Other: 1

**Wed. AM**
- Sunny: 0
- Rain: 1
- Snow: 2
- Walk: 3
- Bike: 8
- School Bus: 1
- Family Vehicle: 2
- Carpool: 3
- Transit: 2
- Other: 1

**Wed. PM**
- Sunny: 0
- Rain: 1
- Snow: 2
- Walk: 3
- Bike: 8
- School Bus: 1
- Family Vehicle: 2
- Carpool: 3
- Transit: 2
- Other: 1

**Thurs. AM**
- Sunny: 0
- Rain: 1
- Snow: 2
- Walk: 3
- Bike: 8
- School Bus: 1
- Family Vehicle: 2
- Carpool: 3
- Transit: 2
- Other: 1

**Thurs. PM**
- Sunny: 0
- Rain: 1
- Snow: 2
- Walk: 3
- Bike: 8
- School Bus: 1
- Family Vehicle: 2
- Carpool: 3
- Transit: 2
- Other: 1

Please list any disruptions to these counts or any unusual travel conditions to/from the school on the days of the tally.
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CACS Student Travel Tally Results Fall 2014

Clarkfield Area Charter School 1 Week Total Travel Tally

- Walk: 0%
- Bike: 6%
- School Bus: 47%
- Family Vehicle: 47%
- Carpool: 0%
- City Bus: 0%
- Other: 0%

Clarkfield Area Charter School 1 Week Total Travel Tally

- Walk: 0%
- Bike: 6%
- School Bus: 47%
- Family Vehicle: 47%
- Carpool: 0%
- City Bus: 0%
- Other: 0%
Parent Survey About Walking and Biking to School

Dear Parent or Caregiver,

Your child’s school wants to learn your thoughts about children walking and biking to school. This survey will take about 5 - 10 minutes to complete. We ask that each family complete only one survey per school your children attend. If more than one child from a school brings a survey home, please fill out the survey for the child with the next birthday from today’s date.

After you have completed this survey, send it back to the school with your child or give it to the teacher. Your responses will be kept confidential and neither your name nor your child’s name will be associated with any results.
Thank you for participating in this survey!

**CAPITAL LETTERS ONLY – BLUE OR BLACK INK ONLY**

**School Name:**

1. What is the grade of the child who brought home this survey? □ Grade (PK,K,1,2,3...)

2. Is the child who brought home this survey male or female? □ Male □ Female

3. How many children do you have in Kindergarten through 8th grade? □ □

4. What is the street intersection nearest your home? (Provide the names of two intersecting streets)

   □ □ and □ □

5. How far does your child live from school?
   - □ Less than ¼ mile □ ¼ mile up to ½ mile
   - □ ½ mile up to 1 mile □ 1 mile up to 2 miles
   - □ More than 2 miles □ Don’t know

6. On most days, how does your child arrive and leave for school? (Select one choice per column, mark box with X)

   **Arrive at school**
   - □ Walk □ Bike
   - □ School Bus
   - □ Family vehicle (only children in your family)
   - □ Carpool (Children from other families)
   - □ Transit (cty bus, subway, etc.)
   - □ Other (skateboard, scooter, inline skates, etc.)

   **Leave from school**
   - □ Walk □ Bike
   - □ School Bus
   - □ Family vehicle (only children in your family)
   - □ Carpool (Children from other families)
   - □ Transit (cty bus, subway, etc.)
   - □ Other (skateboard, scooter, inline skates, etc.)

7. How long does it normally take your child to get to/from school? (Select one choice per column, mark box with X)

   **Travel time to school**
   - □ Less than 5 minutes □ 5 - 10 minutes
   - □ 11 - 20 minutes □ More than 20 minutes
   - □ Don’t know / Not sure

   **Travel time from school**
   - □ Less than 5 minutes □ 5 - 10 minutes
   - □ 11 - 20 minutes □ More than 20 minutes
   - □ Don’t know / Not sure
8. Has your child asked you for permission to walk or bike to/from school in the last year? □ Yes □ No

9. At what grade would you allow your child to walk or bike to/from school without an adult? (Select a grade between PK,K,1,2,3..) □ grade (or) □ I would not feel comfortable at any grade

Place a clear ‘X’ inside box. If you make a mistake, fill the entire box, and then mark the correct box.

10. What of the following issues affected your decision to allow, or not allow, your child to walk or bike to/from school? (Select ALL that apply)

□ Distance
□ Convenience of driving
□ Time
□ Child’s before or after-school activities
□ Speed of traffic along route
□ Amount of traffic along route
□ Adults to walk or bike with
□ Sidewalks or pathways
□ Safety of intersections and crossings
□ Crossing guards
□ Violence or crime
□ Weather or climate

□ My child already walks or bikes to/from school

□ Yes □ No □ Not Sure

11. Would you probably let your child walk or bike to/from school if this problem were changed or improved? (Select one choice per line, mark box with X)

□ My child already walks or bikes to/from school

□ Yes □ No □ Not Sure

12. In your opinion, how much does your child’s school encourage or discourage walking and biking to/from school?

□ Strongly Encourages □ Encourages □ Neither □ Discourages □ Strongly Discourages

13. How much fun is walking or biking to/from school for your child?

□ Very Fun □ Fun □ Neutral □ Boring □ Very Boring

14. How healthy is walking or biking to/from school for your child?

□ Very Healthy □ Healthy □ Neutral □ Unhealthy □ Very Unhealthy

Place a clear ‘X’ inside box. If you make a mistake, fill the entire box, and then mark the correct box.

15. What is the highest grade or year of school you completed?

□ Grades 1 through 8 (Elementary) □ College 1 to 3 years (Some college or technical school)
□ Grades 9 through 11 (Some high school) □ College 4 years or more (College graduate)
□ Grade 12 or GED (High school graduate) □ Prefer not to answer

16. Please provide any additional comments below.
Appendix F: Parent Survey Results
CACS SRTS Parent Survey Results, Winter 2014/2015

**Grade of Child**

- **K** 20%
- **1st** 7%
- **2nd** 33%
- **3rd** 27%
- **4th** 0%
- **5th** 13%
- **6th** 0%

**How far does your child live from school?**

- **1/4 mile to 1/2 mile** 11%
- **1/2 mile to 1 mile** 50%
- **1 mile to 2 miles** 17%
- **More than 2 miles** 11%
- **Less than 1/4 mile** 11%
On most days, how does your child arrive to school?

- School Bus: 25%
- Family Vehicle: 75%

On most days, how does your child leave from school?

- School Bus: 53%
- Family Vehicle: 35%
- Carpool: 12%
How long does it normally take your child to get to school?

- Less than 5 minutes: 65%
- 5-10 minutes: 29%
- More than 20 minutes: 6%

How long does it normally take your child to get home from school?

- Less than 5 minutes: 50%
- 5-10 minutes: 44%
- More than 20 minutes: 6%
Has your child asked for your permission to walk or bike to/from school in the last year?

- Yes: 47%
- No: 53%

At what age would you allow your child to walk or bike to/from school without an adult?

- 2nd: 6%
- 3rd: 17%
- 4th: 6%
- 5th: 18%
- 6th: 6%
- 10th: 6%
- I would not feel comfortable at any age: 41%
What of the following issues affect your decision to allow or not allow your child to walk or bike to/from school?

- Distance: 7%
- Convenience of driving: 2%
- Time: 4%
- Speed of traffic along route: 20%
- Amount of traffic along route: 2%
- Adults to walk or bike with: 13%
- Sidewalks or pathways: 16%
- Safety of intersections and crossings: 16%
- Crossing guards: 9%
- Weather or climate: 11%

Would you probably let your child walk or bike to or from school if this problem were changed or improved?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
In your opinion, how much does your child's school encourage or discourage walking and biking to/from school?

- Encourages 19%
- Neither 81%

How much fun is walking or biking to/from school for your child?

- Very fun 33%
- Fun 40%
- Neutral 27%
Comments:

- “Parent works at the school.”
- “My child has a learning disability that would greatly influence my decision on allowing him to travel alone to/from school.”
Appendix G: Bike/Walk Audit Assessment Worksheets
Walking Audit Form

**School:**
**Date:**
**Weather:**

**Items to have along during audit:**
- Clipboard and a pen/pencil
- Camera
- Map showing school zone

---

**Observations during drop-off / pickup**

**Walkers / Bikers**

Include a description of where students are accessing campus.

**Bus System**

Show circulation on a map. Note where public transit stops are located.

**Car Loop / Lot**

Show circulation on a map. Note any cones, signs, etc. that are being used to control traffic.

**Crossing Guards / Patrols**

Note exact locations and mark on a map.

---

**Observations were obtained during:**

- ☐ Arrival (___:___ AM - ___:___ AM)
- ☐ Dismissal (___:___ PM - ___:___ PM)

Community Design Group, LLC - Walking Audit Form, SRTS, OCT 2012
Observations from walking assessment

School Infrastructure

Bike Racks

*In addition to location, note number of spaces and type of rack.*

Pedestrian Paths

*Note the surface type and find out if they are plowed in the winter.*

Community Infrastructure (in school zone)

Sidewalks

*Note if there are any obvious issues such as major obstacles or deterioration of the surface.*

Bike Routes

*Are there bike lanes or other types of bicycle facilities?*

Streets

*Include traffic signs, speed control, signals and markings.*
Intersections

Provide detailed information on crosswalks (marked and what type*), curb ramps (do they exist and are they up to ADA standards), traffic control and pavement markings. Also, note crossing distances.

Traffic

Note traffic patterns and driver behavior.

Community Infrastructure (around school zone)

Note other community resources such as parks and community centers near the school. Also, note adjacent businesses that attract children such as convenience stores. Additionally, assess other intersections or conflict areas that have been identified outside of the school zone.

Some general questions to ask during the walking audit:

Do I have room to walk (are there sidewalks and paths)?
Is it easy to cross streets?
Do drivers behave well?
Is the walk generally pleasant?
Appendix H: Bike/Walk Audit Assessment Results
Walking Audit Form

School: Clarkfield Area Charter School
Date: 11/6/15
Weather: sunny, windy, chilly

Items to have along during audit:
- Clipboard and a pen/pencil
- Camera
- Map showing school zone

Observations during drop-off / pickup

Walkers / Bikers
None today, that we saw.
But there are a couple that usually walk or bike to school. They come from the northeast, where most of the houses in town are located.

Bus System
There are 2 buses that come to the school.
They park in the loop driveway in front of the school. However, there are several other busses from other districts (Dawson, Cottonwood + YME) that stop at the old school and city hall as well. Need to find out more about this.

Car Loop / Lot
Parent vehicles park anywhere in the school parking lot. They try to avoid where the buses park.
Most parents get out of their vehicles to walk into the school to drop off and pick up their children. The school encourages that.

Crossing Guards / Patrols
There are currently no crossing guards or school patrol, but the school is interested in having them.

Observations were obtained during:

☐ Arrival (____:____ AM - ____:____ AM)
✓ Dismissal (3:30 PM - 3:40 PM)

Include a description of where students are accessing campus.
Show circulation on a map. Note where public transit stops are located.
Show circulation on a map. Note any cones, signs, etc. that are being used to control traffic.
Note exact locations and mark on a map.
Observations from walking assessment

School Infrastructure

Bike Racks
There is one bike rack in front of the school on the south end. The main door is at the north end of the school.

Pedestrian Paths
There are some walking paths in Vahalla park. But other than that, there are no other trails or paths in the community.

Community Infrastructure (in school zone)

Sidewalks exist on some, but not all streets. Some are in better shape than others. Curb ramps will be replaced along Hwy. EF1 in 2014 and MN 67 in 2015.

Bike Routes
No bike routes at this time.

Streets
Most streets are quite wide, especially Hwys. 59 & 67. They are 40’ curb to curb. MnDOT wouldn’t mind narrowing them if they were ever to be reconstructed. The City is open to traffic calming measures along the major highways even if that means removing parking.
**Intersections** The 3 main intersections of concern are:
1) US Hwy 59 at the school parking lot - traffic is speeding up to 55 mph here and its a rural hwy section at this point.
2) US 59 and MN 67 and RR-tracks - this is a very wide intersection with many modes. Bike pedal space is not clearly defined.
3) MN 67 and 10th St - if students are encouraged to cross MN 67 here instead of at Hwy 59, increased visibility of crossing is needed.

**Traffic** Since the school is located on US 59, it sees a lot of traffic and a lot of heavy commercial truck traffic due to the grain elevator in town. During Harvest, 800 - 1,000 trucks go through the elevator each day.

**Community Infrastructure (around school zone)**
There are no sidewalks leading up to the school on US 59. This is a big problem.
The other main areas that kids want to go in the community are:
- the library on MN 67
- the pool on the north side of town
- Vanalla park on the north side of town

Some general questions to ask during the walking audit:

*Do I have room to walk (are there sidewalks and paths)?*  
*Is it easy to cross streets?*  
*Do drivers behave well?*  
*Is the walk generally pleasant?*
City of Clarkfield, MN

● = places kids like to go around Clarkfield
Appendix I: MnDOT & Alta Planning Program Matrix
### Education Programs - Safe Routes to School Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Target Audience</th>
<th>Primary Outcomes</th>
<th>Secondary Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Biking Safety</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Increased cycling</td>
<td>Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Infrastructure updates for biking lanes and pedestrian crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Safety</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Increased cycling</td>
<td>Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Infrastructure updates for biking lanes and pedestrian crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Bicycle Safety</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Increased cycling</td>
<td>Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Infrastructure updates for biking lanes and pedestrian crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-School Bicycle</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Increased cycling</td>
<td>Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Infrastructure updates for biking lanes and pedestrian crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Education</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Increased cycling</td>
<td>Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Infrastructure updates for biking lanes and pedestrian crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Workshop</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Increased cycling</td>
<td>Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Infrastructure updates for biking lanes and pedestrian crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk and Bike to School Route Mup</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Increased cycling</td>
<td>Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Infrastructure updates for biking lanes and pedestrian crossings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For downloadable pdf of activity matrix, click [here](#).
### Encouragement Programs Safe Routes to School Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Target Audience</th>
<th>Primary Outcomes</th>
<th>Secondary Outcomes</th>
<th>Resource Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Walk</td>
<td>This program is designed to encourage families to park several blocks from school and walk the rest of the way to school. This allows students to be active and enjoy the neighborhood on the way, and also provides an opportunity to engage in physical activity.</td>
<td>Walking/Running, Biking, Cycling</td>
<td>Elementary Middle School</td>
<td>Improved Safety Behavior, Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Improved Safety Behavior, Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Potential Lead Champions: PTA/parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster, T-shirt, or Video Contest</td>
<td>Types of activities give great engaging middle and high school students. Activities include posters, t-shirts, or videos. These programs are designed to encourage students to walk or bike to school.</td>
<td>Walking/Running, Biking, Cycling</td>
<td>Elementary Middle School</td>
<td>Improved Safety Behavior, Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Improved Safety Behavior, Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Potential Lead Champions: PTA/parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip/Meal Tracking Program</td>
<td>A new mileage tracking program can be implemented as a summer activity or a collaborative schoolwide event. Students track trips or miles made by walking, biking, or running, and prorate with some type of a contest or display, such as who walked the most miles during the month of June or the US States. Similar programs include Walk/Bike Month or Walk/Bike Month on the Competition/Challenge.</td>
<td>Walking/Running, Biking, Cycling</td>
<td>Elementary Middle School</td>
<td>Improved Safety Behavior, Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Improved Safety Behavior, Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Potential Lead Champions: PTA/parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk/Bike Train</td>
<td>A bike train is a way for children walking to school. Parents can start training the bus, which runs the same route every day and pick up children at designated locations. Finally, buses run every day or on a regular schedule to lanes or schools on an, but they often begin as a one-time event. A Walking School Bus can be as informal as a few parents alternating to walk their children to school, but often it self-organizes. PTA/parents can offer encouragement to walk.</td>
<td>Walking/Running, Biking, Cycling</td>
<td>Elementary Middle School</td>
<td>Improved Safety Behavior, Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Improved Safety Behavior, Health and Environmental Connections</td>
<td>Potential Lead Champions: PTA/parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>