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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this Safe Routes to School (SRTS) plan is to guide school officials, city staff, parents and educators in their efforts to make it easier, safer, and more comfortable for students to walk and bicycle to and from school. Physical inactivity and increased levels of obesity are considered a public health crisis and walking or biking to and from school is an easy way for children to get the regular physical activity they need to combat this problem. Physically active kids have fewer chronic health problems. They also have improved mood and concentration, a stronger self-image and more self-confidence which are all critical for succeeding in school and in life.

SRTS programs require community involvement and can improve the community's quality of life well beyond that of students attending school. The SRTS planning process began in August of 2014 with a kick-off meeting. The SRTS team envisions a community connected by sidewalks and crosswalks, where it is safe for children to walk and bicycle to school and where community members are educated and aware of pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The partnership between the City of Ashby and the Ashby Public School District makes the community uniquely suited to implement the identified recommendations. The recommendations in this plan address the five “E”s of education, encouragement, enforcement, engineering, and evaluation, which is the standard strategy in SRTS planning. Also addressed are possible issues of equity. After the SRTS planning document is approved by both the City of Ashby and the Ashby Public School Board, the City may seek out funding and resources to implement the identified recommendations.
SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

OBSERVATIONS AND WALKING AUDIT

- Conducted on Wednesday, September 10, 2014
- Number of students walking and biking to school.
  - 31 Pedestrians
  - 6 Bicyclists
- Number of students walking and biking from school:
  - 20 Pedestrians
  - 3 Bicyclists
- Location of bike racks
  - Front of the School,
- Over 20 students walked to and from school during the lunch hour and only four students utilized the crosswalks (20 percent).
- Poor East / West sidewalk connections.
- The school location, in relation to residential neighborhoods, is ideal.
- Parallel position of drain grates creates a safety concern for bicyclists.
- High proportion of single-family vehicles (morning and afternoon) when compared to pedestrians and bicyclists.

Note – The numbers of pedestrians and bicyclists observed during Observation Day are inconsistent with the results of the Parent Survey and Student Travel Tally. There was not a systematic attempt during Observation Day to survey the exact number of students walking and biking to school.

PARENT SURVEY AND STUDENT TRAVEL TALLY RESULTS

- Across grades pre-kindergarten through eight, the school bus was the most frequently used mode of travel to and from school.
- More students arrive to school by the family vehicle than leave by family vehicle in the afternoon. (Trips shift to riding the school bus or walking in the afternoon.)
According to the Parent Survey, 47 percent of children who live within one mile of the school already walk and bike to school in the morning. In the afternoon, that number increases to a sizable majority with 72 percent of children who live within one mile of the school, walking or biking home.

Distance was the main reason some parents do not allow their children to walk or bicycle to / from school.

Safety factors, such as traffic speed and volume were chosen more frequently than crime or violence as barriers to children walking or biking to school.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**EDUCATION**

*Goal: Establish at least two educational programs a year to foster and teach bicycle and pedestrian safety within the community.*

1. Facilitate an annual bicycle rodeo event to teach bicycle skills and safety to students.

2. Educate students about the proper walking and bicycling etiquette through in-school and after-school bicycle and pedestrian safety education.
   a. If not existing, establish an after-school club.
   b. Utilize the Walk! Bike! Fun! Curricula to help students understand the rules of the road.
   c. Identify the need for a bicycle fleet.

3. Develop a school safety campaign to build awareness of students walking and bicycling to and from school, and to encourage safe driving behavior among parents and passersby.

4. Design a parent workshop to provide tools, resources and support needed to encourage parents and other community members to begin walking and bicycling for transportation.

5. Create a family-oriented educational training program that builds upon the school safety campaign (3#) such as a family biking class and/or family biking guide to teach basic bicycle maintenance, safety checks, etc.
ENCOURAGEMENT

Goal: Explore strategies to promote walking and bicycling through the identification of safe routes, organizing events, rewarding participation, and educating adults.

1. Edit the Ashby Public School District Transportation and Wellness Policies to include language that is not only supportive but actively promotes walking and biking to and from school as long as students routes are deemed safe and within a reasonable distance to the school as defined in the MnDOT Walk / Bike Zone concept.

2. Develop informational messages to be included in the monthly school newsletter or the Golden Arrow, encouraging students to walk or bike to school and highlighting associated health benefits.

3. Explore the development of a remote school bus drop site. Explore / develop a competition or challenge to reward students by tracking the number of times they walk or bike to school (within one-half mile). Such a competition should also allow the children that also take the bus (over one-half mile) to participate in some way as well, preferably by having them do some sort of physical fitness activity like walking on school grounds, etc.

4. Participate in International Walk and Bike to School Days to encourage students and their families to try walking or biking to school.

5. Install a bicycle repair station near the front entrance of the school by the bicycle rack.

6. Investigate the need and/or feasibility of a walking school bus for students within one mile of school.

ENFORCEMENT

Goal: Address traffic and safety concerns by identifying and implementing enforcement measures within the school walk and bike zone.

1. Increase the prevalence of traffic law enforcement in strategic locations during student morning arrival and afternoon dismissal.

2. Identify the most effective form of automated speed feedback sign and investigate the possible installation of such signs in Ashby and around the school in an effort to reduce driver speed.

3. Consider a school policy that revokes the open-lunch privilege of any students found violating good pedestrian behaviors when leaving school grounds during lunch.
ENGINEERING

*Goal: Improve the existing infrastructure within the community to ensure active transportation is encouraged and made safe.*

1. Prioritize sidewalk improvements, focusing on those locations that connect neighborhoods with the school. Where practical, set sidewalks as far back as possible from the roadway curb to create buffer between pedestrians and motor vehicle traffic. Such buffers can reduce traffic stress on pedestrians and make walking safer and more enjoyable. These buffers are even more important on busier roadways with higher traffic volumes, faster vehicle speeds, and/or significant heavy truck traffic.

2. Consider installing a 30 mph speed limit sign on westbound CSAH 4 / West Main Street at the city limit to remind drivers that they are not yet beyond the speed zone that continues almost to the end of school grounds another 850 feet to the west.

3. Investigate installing street lighting at the intersection of Main and Birch Street to improve visibility.

4. Align drain grates so that the metal bars are perpendicular to the road-way to mitigate the safety hazard for bicyclists.

5. Conduct a feasibility study to determine effectiveness of a school speed zone on CSAH 4 / West Main Street near school grounds. Work with Grant County and MnDOT to identify the feasibility of graduated speed limits or other anti-speeding strategies as vehicles enter Ashby from the west on CSAH 4 near Ashby School property.

6. Coordinate with Grant County to improve sidewalk curb ramps, width, continuity, crosswalk enhancements (crosswalk markings, yield signs, pedestrian signing) and buffer zone, etc. during future reconstruction on CSAH 82.

7. Coordinate with Grant County to improve the downtown crosswalk on Main Street / CSAH 82 between Larson and Melby Avenues.

8. Coordinate with Grant County and/or conduct a feasibility study for long-term bicycle and pedestrian safety strategies and improvements at the intersection of CSAH 82, Birch Avenue and Norge Street.
9. Coordinate with Grant County when rebuilding sidewalks that curb ramps line up with the crosswalks and meet contemporary Americans with Disabilities Act standards, namely the Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG).

10. Explore separating bus loading/unloading from the parent pick-up and drop-off area.

11. Explore a trail connection from Cedar Street to Birch Avenue in the area south of Hawkins Street.

12. Explore a connection from the Central Lakes Trail to downtown Ashby. This includes identifying the feasibility of a sidewalk on the south side of Main Street.

13. Explore a sidewalk connection between Iverson Street and Melby Avenue (near Ashby Living Center).

14. Consider a pedestrian-friendly redesign of Birch Street at the loading/parking area just east of the school. This style of pedestrian-speed (less than 7 mph) street design is best known by its Dutch name of “Woonerf,” in German a “Spielstrasse” (play street), or occasionally in English a “Home Zone” (See Chapter 9 for more details).
EVALUATION

Goal: Evaluate the effectiveness of programming by tracking baseline data and, in addition, actively work on improvement, based on results.

1. Administer the student travel tallies at least once per year to track the number of students walking and bicycling in comparison to the 2014 baseline results.

2. Administer a parent survey questionnaire once every two to three years to track and analyze school travel behaviors and parents’ perceptions.

3. Explore establishing baseline health data (possibly already gathered) to evaluate possible health improvements over time related to SRTS improvements.

OTHER

Goal: Create partnerships with local businesses and organizations to increase support and encouragement of active transportation.

1. Identify opportunities or partners to fund bicycle helmets for educational events like bike rodeos and/or Walk! Bike! Fun! training events.

Goal: Work to ensure all City and School policies and ordinances are supportive of active transportation.

2. Modify Ordinance 94 – “An Ordinance Relating to the Establishment, Maintenance and Repair of Sidewalks and Alleys Within the City of Ashby” so that the city follows the best and latest accessibility design standards. Although not yet officially adopted as standards by the Department of Justice, the proposed Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) are the recommended Americans with Disabilities Act standards when planning, designing and constructing within the right-of-way.

3. In Ordinance 94 relating to the establishment, maintenance and repair of sidewalks in the City of Ashby, remove the language in ‘Subd. 5 Removal without Replacement’ to guarantee all sidewalks are replaced.

4. Identify snow storage areas that do not impede walking and bicycling to school. This is particularly important at the corners of intersections.
In April of 2014, the City of Ashby received a Safe Routes to School planning assistance award from the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT). This plan is a product of that award and was developed to encourage students that live within an appropriate distance of the Ashby School to walk and bike to and from school, and to do so safely. The City of Ashby established a partnership with the Ashby Public School District to develop a plan to encourage students to participate in active transportation to and from school. In a collaborative effort with the City of Ashby and the Ashby Public School District, West Central Initiative (WCI) staff developed this plan which is focused on developing strategies and identifying the infrastructure needs to help attain these goals.

**PURPOSE OF THE PLAN**

A Safe Routes to School (SRTS) plan is a multi-faceted guide for school officials, city staff, parents and educators to improve the conditions for students walking and biking to and from school. Walking or biking to and from school is an easy way for children to get the regular physical activity they need for good health. Physical inactivity and increased levels of obesity are considered a public health crisis and, as such, the Minnesota Department of Health has allocated funds and personnel through the Statewide Health Improvement Program (SHIP) to assist with SRTS programs such as Walk to School Day. Physically active kids have fewer chronic health problems, have improved mood and concentration, a stronger self-image, and increased self-confidence and independence—all of which are critical for succeeding in school and in life. In some communities, SRTS programs have had the added benefit of reducing and, in select cases, eliminating expensive student transportation costs. The recommendations in this plan are intended to improve safety, encourage walking and bicycling, empower students and reduce traffic congestion during the morning and afternoon school rush. Parents will only allow their children to walk to and from school if the parents are comfortable that it is safe for their children to do so. This plan was commissioned with these goals in mind.
While the primary goal of the plan is to make walking and bicycling to school a safe and desirable transportation choice, the safety improvements proposed have the potential to benefit the community as a whole. The sidewalk, trail and/or intersection improvements possibly built for students as a result of this report will always be there for any and all who wish to walk or bike for transportation and/or recreation, whether that be a couple going for an evening stroll after dinner or an elderly widow who needs to walk to her local church, convenience store, pharmacy, etc.

This five- to ten-year plan was developed for the City of Ashby and the Ashby Public School District, and is based specifically on the City’s geography, pre-existing conditions, school walk and bicycle zones, strengths, barriers, and student population. An SRTS plan greatly improves a school’s and community’s chance to be awarded state and federal SRTS infrastructure grant funds.

Figure 1: New sidewalks and street lights next to the Barnesville, MN football stadium were installed after the need was identified in a SRTS plan. While the sidewalk and lights were paid for with an SRTS infrastructure grant primarily to benefit students walking to and from school, these amenities are in the public right-of-way and benefit all in the community that wish or need to use them.
CHAPTER 2: ABOUT SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SRTS)

OVERVIEW

Today more than ever, there is a need to provide options that allow all children—including those with disabilities—to walk and bicycle to school safely. Many communities struggle with traffic congestion around schools and motor vehicle emissions polluting the environment. At the same time, children in general engage in less physical activity, which contributes to the prevalence of childhood obesity. At first glance, these problems may seem to be separate issues, but SRTS programs can address all these challenges through a coordinated action plan.

SRTS programs use a variety of education, engineering and enforcement strategies that help make routes safer for children to walk and bicycle to school and encouragement strategies to entice more children to walk and bike. They have grown popular in recent years in response to problems created by a growing reliance on motor vehicles for student transportation, an expanding built environment, as well as the development and availability of federal and state funding for SRTS programs.


HISTORY

The SRTS concept began in the 1970s in Odense, Denmark, rooted in concern for the safety of children walking and bicycling to school.

The SRTS concept spread internationally, with programs developing in other parts of Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States. The Bronx, a borough of New York City, started the first SRTS program in the United States in 1997. In the same year, the State of Florida implemented a pilot program. In August of 2000, the U.S. Congress funded two SRTS pilot projects through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Within a year of the launch of the pilot projects, many other grassroots SRTS efforts began throughout the United States.

Success with the pilot projects generated interest in a federally funded national program. In 2003, advocates convened meetings with experts in pedestrian and bicycle issues to talk about SRTS issues and ideas for developing a national program. Momentum for a national SRTS program in the United States continued to build as several states developed their own programs.

Congress created the Federal-Aid Safe Routes to School Program in 2005 through comprehensive transportation legislation, ultimately resulting in nearly $1 billion in funding. Subsequent transportation legislation, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) passed in 2012 making Safe Routes to School (SRTS) activities eligible to compete for funding alongside other programs, including the Transportation Enhancements program and Recreational Trails program, as part of a new program called Transportation Alternatives.


THE DECLINE OF WALKING AND BICYCLING

Not long ago, children routinely moved around their neighborhoods by foot or by bicycle, and that was often how they traveled to and from school. That is no longer the case. Whether looking at the total proportion of children walking and bicycling to school, the proportion of children who live within a mile of school or the proportion of children living within one mile of school who walk or bike, the decline is apparent.

- In 1969, 48 percent of children 5 to 14 years of age usually walked or bicycled to school.
- In 2009, 13 percent of children 5 to 14 years of age usually walked or bicycled to school.
- In 1969, 41 percent of children in grades K–8 lived within one mile of school.
  o 89 percent of these children usually walked or bicycled to school.
- In 2009, 31 percent of children in grades K–8 lived within one mile of school;
  o 35 percent of these children usually walked or bicycled to school.

The circumstances that have led to a decline in walking and bicycling to school did not happen overnight and have created a self-perpetuating cycle. As motor vehicle traffic increases, parents become more convinced that it is unsafe for their children to walk or bicycle to school. They begin driving them to

---

school, thereby adding even more traffic to the road and sustaining the cycle. Understanding the many reasons why so many children do not walk or bicycle to school is the first step in interrupting the cycle. Many factors contribute to the reduction in children walking and bicycling to school. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) conducted a nationwide survey of parents to find out the most common barriers that prevented them from allowing their children to walk to school. Parents of children aged 5 to 18 years cited one or more of the following six barrier reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier Reason</th>
<th>Percentage of parents identifying with the barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance to school:</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic-related danger:</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather:</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime danger:</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposing school policy:</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons (not identified):</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While this CDC report is from 2005, a report from the National Center for Safe Routes to School in 2010 found that these barriers remain the same.


**HEALTH RISKS**

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services recommends that children do 60 minutes (1 hour) or more of physical activity each day and that the bulk of this physical activity comes through aerobic exercise, such as walking and bicycling. For children and adolescents, regular physical activity helps build and maintain healthy bones and muscles, reduces the risk of developing obesity and chronic diseases, reduces feelings of depression and anxiety and promotes psychological well-being.

Despite these benefits, many children are not getting adequate physical activity. In the 2014 United States Report Card on Physical Activity for Children and Youth, the National Physical Activity Plan Alliance reports that only 24.8 percent of youth ages 12-15 years obtain 60 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity every day. A 2014 CDC study reports that during the school day, only 4 percent of elementary schools and 8 percent of middle/junior high schools provide daily physical

---

education classes, and in 2012 only 58.9% of all school districts required that elementary schools provide students with regularly scheduled physical activity. Unfortunately, less active children are more likely to be overweight, according to the American Academy of Pediatrics.

When it comes to children’s health, the costs of inadequate physical activity and poor eating habits are alarming. Inadequate physical activity and poor eating habits are major contributors to the increased rates of childhood obesity and overweight in the United States. Obese children are at least twice as likely to become obese adults. According to both a 2003 report by the American Academy of Pediatrics and a 2015 CDC, this puts obese children at greater risk for premature death and chronic diseases than their healthy-weight counterparts.


### THE 5 E’S OF SRTS PLANNING

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs are intended to improve the health and well-being of children by enabling and encouraging them to walk and bicycle to school. The recommendations outlined in this plan are based on the “5 E’s” of the National SRTS program, which include Education, Encouragement, Enforcement, Engineering, and Evaluation. An integrated approach, each one of the “5 E’s” is intended to complement one another. Below is a detailed description of the “5 E’s”.

#### EDUCATION

Programs focused on education can have long-lasting effects on students that continue into adulthood. Education programs that teach students safety skills for walking and bicycling also form the basis of good driving skills they may need in the future. Programs should also target parents and other drivers to inform them how to drive more safely around pedestrians and bicyclists. A few examples of possible education strategies are bicycle rodeos that teach safe bicycling skills, classroom lessons focused on traffic safety, take-home flyers informing parents the rules and regulations regarding student pick-up and drop-off at the school, the Minnesota Walk! Bike! Fun! program, and thoughtfully placed billboards with safety messages targeting drivers.

---

Figure 2: Bike MN instructors demonstrate to teachers how to do on-bike skill drills in a parking lot at the Rothsay, MN School.
ENCOURAGEMENT

Encouragement strategies are focused on getting students to try walking and bicycling to school and in turn to celebrate and reward students for their efforts. These strategies can be low cost, easy to implement, and fun for students. Examples of encouragement activities include walking school buses and organizing events such as “Walk to School Day” (in October) and “Bike to School Day” (in May) to encourage students to try walking and biking to school.

ENFORCEMENT

The primary goals of enforcement strategies are to help reduce unsafe behaviors by drivers, pedestrians and bicyclists; and to increase awareness of laws protecting children who are walking and bicycling. Enforcement strategies include students, parents and school personnel working in conjunction with law enforcement officers. Examples of enforcement activities include the installation of digital speed signs, adult or student safety patrol, crossing guards, and educational “stings” that inform motorists of the dangers of seemingly minor traffic infractions without issuing tickets.

ENGINEERING

Engineering involves the planning and implementation of physical improvements to the built environment that make it safer and more attractive for students to walk and bicycle to and from school. For example, providing a designated space for pedestrians, such as sidewalks, has been proven to reduce pedestrian crash risks. Up to an 88 percent reduction in ‘walking along the roadway’ pedestrian crashes has been seen with
the installation of sidewalks on both sides of the road. However, engineering projects are most successful when used in conjunction with education, encouragement and enforcement strategies. Partnering with engineers and planners is crucial to the successful implementation of projects. Examples of engineering strategies include adding bicycle racks, installing fully accessible crosswalks, sidewalks and multi-use trails, traffic calming, bicycle lanes, signs and signals, as well as other infrastructure.

Figure 4: This crosswalk is equipped with a pedestrian (push button) activated, solar-powered Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB). It is located in Frazee, MN and crosses County Road 12 near the north entrance into town. It is a prime example of an engineering SRTS solution. It was installed as part of a new trail that allows students to get to school in a more direct and safer manner. Once a pedestrian presses the button located on the sign posts, super-bright yellow LED lights flash in an eye-catching “wiggle” pattern under both signs and in both directions. Otherwise, the LED lights remain turned off as seen in this photo. Driver compliance rates for crosswalks with RRFBs are significantly higher than at crosswalks without them, and can be relatively inexpensive to install.

EVALUATION

In order to measure the progress of the program activities over time, consistent evaluation is necessary. Evaluation techniques include a combination of quantitative and qualitative information. Examples of evaluation strategies include a school walking audit, school observations, bicycle and pedestrian counts and parent surveys.

Figure 5: The cover page of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center, Walkability Checklist. A walk audit is one of the ways a community can perform a SRTS evaluation.

A 6TH E? - EQUITY

Recently the principle of Equity has begun to be added to the standard “5 Es” of SRTS planning. According to the MnDOT SRTS webpage:

*Equity is a needs-based approach to allocating resources that aims to achieve fairness in the distribution of benefits and costs. In transportation planning, discussion of equity acknowledges that some communities and populations may require additional resources in order to have the same opportunities as other communities.*

Equity is often confused with equality, when in fact they have different meanings. Equality assumes that all needs are the same. The result is that every community gets the exact same resources without regard to individual differences. Equality works only in circumstances where everyone starts from the same place and needs the same things. Equity allows resources to be provided on the basis of need. Communities disproportionally impacted by safety, health or transportation access inequities
are provided appropriate resources to address their individual needs. Therefore, resource allocation may differ between communities⁶.

![Diagram of Equity vs. Equality](image)

**Figure 6**: This is a common diagram used to illustrate the concept of Equity versus Equality.

Equality is demonstrated on the left, where six boxes (units of aid) are given equally to three people despite their differences in height (need). The two boxes are more than enough for the tall person to reach the fruit high in the tree (goal). Two boxes however is just enough for the person of medium height but still not enough for the short person (the one with the most need) to reach the high hanging fruit. When resources are distributed equally, some people may be given more assistance than they need, while others are still not given enough.

Equity is demonstrated on the right where the same six boxes (units of aid) are distributed to three people based on their differences in height (need). The tall person is given just one box as that is all (the aid) that person needs. The person of medium height is again given two boxes as that remains the amount of boxes (aid) this person needs to reach the high hanging fruit (goal). Finally, the short person is given three boxes (units of aid) as this is the additional level of assistance that person needed to be able to reach the fruit in the tree (goal).

Source: Modified version of an image obtained from the Maine Office of Health Equity website.

The introduction of equity to the SRTS planning formula is an effort to better focus limited SRTS resources to communities and groups that have been often underserved, have greater needs and/or have been more negatively affected by transportation planning decisions of the past and the transportation infrastructure now found in their local community.

---

NATIONAL PHYSICAL ACTIVITY TRENDS IN CHILDREN

Children today are not attaining the recommended amounts of physical activity, contributing to the increasing rates of obesity and a variety of chronic diseases. Lack of physical activity along with poor nutrition is the second leading cause of preventable death, according to the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH). Physical activity not only prevents chronic diseases but also improves moods and helps with weight control. There is also increasing evidence that physical activity improves academic performance, attentiveness and concentration in the classroom.

There are many ways to promote physical activity among youth, and improving walking and biking to school is one of them. SRTS programs can increase students’ daily amount of physical activity and has the potential to decrease the prevalence of students becoming overweight or obese. It is recommended that children get sixty minutes of physical activity a day. Nationally, only 50 percent of high school students participated in any kind of physical activity that increased their heart rate for a total of 60 minutes on five or more days a week. A 15-minute walking or biking route to and from school can help students meet much of their recommended 60 minutes of physical activity per day. Walking and bicycling to school at a young age also has the potential to instill habits of an active lifestyle that children may take with them into adulthood.

---


SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

SRTS TEAM

Successful SRTS programs recognize each community as being unique and emphasize the importance of including a diverse range of community representation on the team. The Ashby SRTS team included representation from the Ashby Public School District, the City of Ashby, Grant County, Minnesota Department of Transportation - District 4, the Statewide Health Improvement Program (SHIP) and Lake Region Healthcare. The team members were directly involved in the planning process, with many having the knowledge and skills needed to implement the plan recommendations. After delivering the plan, WCI will continue to provide ongoing technical assistance to aid in plan implementation.

SRTS PLANNING PROCESS

The SRTS planning process got its start in July of 2009 with Val Martin, the former Ashby City Clerk, as part of her grassroots efforts of to improve the existing conditions within the community. However, it wasn’t until August of 2014 that the formal planning process began. With the assistance and expert staff at WCI, the SRTS team came together to review the school and community profiles, provide input on the barriers, outline the vision and goals, assist in data collection, and to develop and review the recommendations. As part of the planning and outreach process, the community was invited and encouraged to provide feedback on the community’s strengths, barriers and opportunities (a kind of SWOT Analysis tailored to planning).

In addition to gathering community input, the team conducted an assessment of the community’s current conditions and policies in order to identify opportunities to advance walking and bicycling to school or programs that support active transportation. The team conducted observations to understand how many students walk and bike to and from school, what routes are the most traveled, their behaviors as pedestrians and bicyclists, and the interactions between pedestrians and motorists. In addition, the team conducted a separate walk-audit of the entire community to survey its geography and infrastructure. During the walk-audit, the team recorded sidewalk conditions, child-friendly opportunities to cross streets, along with vehicle speeds, and potential trail and sidewalk connections.
Furthermore, the team helped administer the National Centers for Safe Routes to School (National Centers) student travel tally survey and a separate parent survey. The student travel tally form is used to count the number of students arriving to and departing from school by various modes. The parent survey collects information from parents of K-8th graders about how their children travel to and from school, their attitudes towards active transportation, and finally barriers that prevent their children from participating in active transportation modes of travel. The results were then entered into the National Centers’ database. These assessment tools illustrate the range of current barriers and opportunities, which is the foundation of the identified recommendations. These surveys are to be done yearly with continuing WCI assistance so that possible trends in student travel behavior and parent perceptions can be identified and recorded with the National Centers for Safe Routes to School database. Understanding the possible changes in student travel trends will give school, school district and WCI staff the information they need to be able to determine if the goal of getting more children to walk and bike to and from school is being met.

All of this information was then reviewed by the SRTS team and analyzed by the staff at WCI to provide a list of recommendations to improve walking and biking to and from school structured around the active transportation planning principles of the “5 E’s”.

**MNDOT WALK / BICYCLE ZONE CONCEPT**

Children are more likely to walk or bicycle to school if they live within the school “walk/bicycle zone.” MnDOT defines this as “the area within the school’s enrollment boundary from which students can realistically walk or bike to school.” MnDOT guidelines generally assume a distance of up to 0.5 miles for children in grades PreK-5, 1 mile for grades 6-8, and 1.5 miles for grades 9-12.

**STATUS OF STATE AND FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL**

A SRTS plan is not required to receive Minnesota state and/or federal SRTS infrastructure grants but is highly recommended. A school and/or community with a SRTS plan will be much better able to compete for limited funding and resources to implement the identified recommendations. Please be aware with likely future changes in federal and state transportation laws, the following funding sources are subject to change. Please contact WCI or MnDOT for updated funding information at any point in the future.

---

FEDERAL

In 2012, Congress passed a Federal transportation bill entitled Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) established under MAP-21 provides funding for a variety of alternative transportation projects, including Safe Routes to School. (Unlike previously, when the SRTS program was a separately funded category) TAP is funded from the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund at an amount equal to 2% of the total amount of federal-aid highways each fiscal year. Each state will develop their own program for soliciting projects to be funded by the TAP funds allocated to them.

Late in 2015, Congress passed a five-year transportation spending bill called the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), which was then signed into law by the President on December 4th. It is the first law enacted in over 10 years that provides long-term funding certainty for surface transportation. Overall, the FAST Act largely maintains current program structures and funding for SRTS. The only difference is that Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) which provides SRTS infrastructure funding has been renamed Transportation Alternatives (TA). The FAST Act does include two modest funding increases (4% over the life of the Act) for TA/SRTS programs. WCI can assist communities and school districts that apply for federal TA and SRTS infrastructure funds.

STATE

In 2014, the Minnesota Legislature allocated $1 million from the general fund from that fiscal year’s budget to the SRTS Program as proclaimed by Minnesota Statute 174.40. MnDOT was tasked with administering the program and allocating the funding to communities. Under the 2014 state program, requested funds could be used only for construction costs, which must be clearly identified in the SRTS budget proposal. Applications could have been submitted for projects with a total cost as low as $50,000, which made them useful for spot improvements. Regardless, it was still recommended that the minimum project cost at least $100,000 to make efficient use of the funds and limited amount of administrative time at the local level.

It is uncertain if this program will receive funding again in the future.

Minnesota law allows parents whose children are Minnesota residents the choice to enroll their children in a regular public school district other than the one in which they reside. While not required to provide transportation, school districts will often send buses into the immediate neighboring districts with the practical and alluring promise of front-door pickups. To compete, local school districts have then felt compelled to offer equivalent transportation services, even for students living within immediate proximity of the local school. This has had the unintended consequence of undermining many SRTS efforts. In prior communities in which WCI has done SRTS plans, the SRTS team had observed students being picked up by the local district bus only to be transported to the school a block away, a distance walked in no more than a minute.

---

CHAPTER 3: VISION AND GOALS

The SRTS team created a vision for Ashby by imagining what Ashby will look like in five to ten years after the successful and complete implementation of the Ashby SRTS Plan. In order to make the vision a reality, the team set goals to attain and barriers to overcome in pursuit of opportunities to increase walking and bicycling to and from school. The goals outlined below are that of the SRTS team. Most of these goals are attainable through the Action Plan Recommendations found in Chapter 9. However those recommendations were not developed to address these goals as an itemized list.

VISION

We envision a community connected by sidewalks and crosswalks, where it is safe for children to walk and bicycle to school, and where community members are educated and aware of pedestrian and bicyclist traffic.

GOALS

1. Establish at least two education programs a year to foster and teach pedestrian safety within the community.
2. Explore strategies to promote walking and bicycling through the identification of safe routes, organizing events, rewarding participation and educating adults.
3. Address traffic and safety concerns by identifying and implementing enforcement measures within the school walk and bike zones.
4. Improve the existing infrastructure within the City of Ashby to ensure active transportation is encouraged and made safe.
5. Evaluate the effectiveness of programming by tracking baseline data and in addition, actively work to improve, based on the results.
6. Work to ensure all City and School policies and ordinances are supportive of active transportation.
7. Create partnerships with local businesses and organizations to increase support and encouragement of active transportation.
COMMUNITY PROFILE

The City of Ashby is located in Grant County lake country in west central Minnesota. It is 153 miles northwest of the state capitol in Saint Paul and approximately halfway between Fergus Falls (17.5 miles NW) and Alexandria (25.5 SE). It is located 4 miles north of Interstate Highway 94 Exit 77, at the junction of State Trunk Highway 78 and County State Aid Highway 82.

Ashby is a scenic rural community surrounded by large expanses of agricultural land and a number of picturesque glacial lakes in the immediate vicinity; most notable of which are Pelican Lake (1.5 miles S) and Lake Christina (2 miles E). Both lakes are a mile and more across in size. The Central Lakes Trail, a paved multi-use non-motorized Summer trail (snowmobile trail in Winter), passes along the northeastern side of Ashby. It is built on an abandoned Burlington Northern Railroad corridor and begins in Fergus Falls, passes through town, continues to Alexandria and terminates in Osakis. In Osakis, one can make a direct connection to the Lake Wobegon Trail and continue 50 more miles to the City of Saint Joseph just northwest of Saint Cloud.

Figure 7: Ashby’s location in Minnesota relative to major landmarks.
According to the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau, the community is populated by 446 residents, in 197 households, and comprises .59 square miles giving it a population density of 756 residents per square mile. The primary local industries are agriculture and tourism.

Figure 8: The City of Ashby city limits and school location.
SCHOOL AND DISTRICT PROFILE

The Ashby Public School is located at 300 Birch Ave in Ashby, MN which is on the western edge of town but within the city limits (Figure 8). The school serves grades PreK-12 with a school enrollment of 292 (2014-2015). The breakdown of students per grade is shown in Table 1 with 48 percent of students are eligible for free and reduced costs meals. The school district itself is much larger than the City of Ashby, reaching out into a number of townships in both Grant and Otter Tail Counties, as much as 13 miles away from the school. Approximately a quarter of the school district land area lies southwest of Interstate 94 (Figure 11).

![Image](image-url)

Figure 9: A granite sign out in front of the school stating "Ashby Public School: Home of the Arrows. Established 1916."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Number of Students per Grade (School Year 2014-2015)
Figure 10: A close-up of the Ashby School, grounds and athletic fields and its immediate surroundings.
Figure 11: The Ashby School District, city limits, school location and concentric radii from the school location.
ASHBY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT MISSION

Ashby School is committed to providing a well-rounded education in a challenging learning environment that prepares students for success in their local, national, and global communities through opportunities in academics, arts, and leadership activities.

Source - [www.ashby.k12.mn.us](http://www.ashby.k12.mn.us).

REWARD SCHOOL – 2013-2014

The Ashby Public School District is a leader in school performance. In both 2013 and 2014, the school was designated as a Reward School. This designation means the Ashby Public School is in the top 15% of all schools in the state according to the MMR rating (Multiple Measurement Rating) from the Minnesota Department of Education. The rating is a 1 to 100% for all schools in the state and includes data on proficiency, growth, achievement gap reduction, and graduation rates. In 2014, Ashby had an MMR of 80.90 percent.

ASHBY SCHOOL DISTRICT BUS AND TRANSPORTATION SAFETY POLICIES

Bus

“The Ashby School District’s busing policy is as follows: All students living outside the city limits are provided the option to be bused to school, whereas all students living within city limits are not provided this option.”

Transportation

The purpose of the Student Transportation Safety Policy, adopted in 2005, “is to provide safe transportation for students and to educate students on safety issues and the responsibilities of school bus ridership.”

Lunch Policy

Ashby Public School has an open-lunch policy for high school students, which allows students to travel outside of the campus for lunch.

The complete Ashby School District Transportation Safety Policy can be found in Appendix G.
ASHBY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT WELLNESS POLICY

The Ashby School District adopted a wellness policy in September of 2006 and revised the document in 2008. The policy is overseen by the school’s health and wellness committee. The purpose of the policy is "assure the school environment promotes health through the support of regular physical activity and balanced nutrition." More specifically, the guidelines outlined for physical activity are as follows:

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."

With the adoption of the physical activity guidelines noted above, the Ashby public school district recognizes the health and academic benefits of being physically active. While the policy does not directly outline walking and biking to and from school as a means to attain students’ physical activity needs, the aforementioned policy should be amended to include walking and biking to school once the SRTS plan is adopted by the School Board.

The complete Ashby School District Wellness Policy can be found in Appendix H.

ASHBY CITY SIDEWALK REGULATIONS

The city’s regulations for sidewalks require the owners of any private property within the city abutting a sidewalk to keep the sidewalk in repair and safe. In regard to maintenance, the regulation states, "All snow, ice, dirt and rubbish remaining on a public sidewalk more than 24 hours after its deposit thereon is a public nuisance. The owner and the occupant of any property adjacent to a public sidewalk shall use diligence to keep such walk safe for pedestrians." The sidewalk regulations can be found at, www.ashbyminnesota.org.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy recommendations to improve SRTS can be found in Chapter 9 in the Encouragement section with further policy recommendations found in Appendices E and F.
CHAPTER 5: STRENGTHS – BARRIERS – OPPORTUNITIES ANALYSIS

A strengths, barriers, and opportunities analysis of existing policies and programs related to walking and bicycling to school was also performed. This is similar to a SWOT Analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) but tailored for use in SRTS planning. The comments in the following tables are not edited and are not listed in any priority order.

STRENGTHS

The primary existing strengths within the community are the use of programming, stakeholders, infrastructure, as well as the school's location contiguous with the City of Ashby. These strengths that enhance and support the opportunity for children to safely walk and bicycle to school are listed in greater detail in Table 2 below. Recommendations to improve SRTS in this report are built off of these strengths. Recommendations to improve SRTS found in Chapter 9 of this report are built off of many of these strengths.

Table 2: Community and School District Strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1   Key stakeholders are involved in the planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   In the past, the school principal has been proactive in developing education and encouragement activities at school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   Children can more safely cross the intersection of Main Street and Birch Street due to the presence of bump-outs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   The school is located within Ashby city limits and contiguous with built up parts of the city. This makes the school readily accessible from all neighborhoods in Ashby for those on foot and by bike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   The Central Lakes Trail (CLT) is utilized as a route to school by many students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6   The City of Ashby has a dedicated Police Department to assist with enforcement, education and encouragement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7   A large percentage of the sidewalks in downtown Ashby are in acceptable condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8   The Country View Estates subdivision is connected to downtown Ashby via the Central Lakes Trail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A prime example of these strengths, stakeholders such as local law enforcement and the school principal are key players in developing programs related to pedestrian safety. These educational programs provide children the opportunity to learn the skills and confidence necessary to safely walk and bicycle to school. Working off this strength, a recommendation may be to further current educational programs and develop new programs such as a bicycle rodeo.

**BARRIERS**

To successfully develop and implement SRTS activities and programs, it is important for the SRTS Team, with aid from members of the community, to identify and understand the existing barriers within the community preventing children from walking and bicycling to school. These barriers, listed in greater detail in Table 3 below, are an accumulation of information received from the SRTS team and community members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Community and School District Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Barriers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The location of the stop sign at the intersection of Main and Birch Street creates visibility issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Entering Ashby from the west on CSAH 4, the speed limit does not drop down to 30 mph until 360 feet after the beginning of school grounds on the south side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A connection between the Central Lakes Trail and downtown Ashby has not been defined or made easily accessible to users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 On Larson, Cedar and Iverson Aves (to name a few) the sidewalks are either in poor condition with no buffer strip or nonexistent (see Figure 12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CSAH 82 and its high-trafic volumes (Figure 13) cause difficulty and create safety hazards for children who live north of CSAH 82 to walk or bike to the Ashby School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Multiple intersections near the school site are poorly lit, which decreases both vehicle and pedestrian visibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Despite good crosswalk and sidewalk connectivity between the school and the T&amp;B’s Short Stop, students that walk from school to T&amp;B’s during lunch and after school exhibited poor pedestrian behavior by randomly walking in the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Poor pedestrian crossing at CSAH 82 at the intersection of Norge St and Birch Ave and at CSAH 82 and the intersection Birch Ave near the lumber yard. Pedestrian access and safety on Birch Ave north of CSAH 82 is compromised by the heavy equipment and trucking activities associated with business at the lumber yard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The location of on-street vehicle parking near the school reduces visibility for moving vehicles, walkers, bikers and especially bus drivers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Barriers

10 The intersection of County Road 82 and Main Street (CSAH 4) is confusing which induces poor driver actions.

11 In Winter, snow storage on the side of roads and at intersections decreases vehicle and pedestrian visibility.

12 The average vehicle speed on Melby Avenue are 5 to 8 mph greater than the posted speed limit of 30 mph.

OPPORTUNITIES

The SRTS Team, also with aid from members of the community, identified opportunities to improve walking and bicycling to school that are not currently being acted upon, as well as programs that support and encourage these behaviors. The list of opportunities in Table 4 is not exhaustive but is an accumulation of ideas and action steps to help achieve the overall vision.

Table 4: Community and School District Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Install a school speed zone on CSAH 4 to help decrease traffic speeds and create a safer environment for children to cross.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Partner with the agencies working on the future County Road 82 reconstruction in order to ensure curb cuts will be improved to ADA compliant standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Identify if student crossing guards are a feasible option to help with enforcement. In the past both teacher-aids and students served as crossing guards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Create opportunities to educate student, parent and teacher drivers, as well as pedestrians, bicyclists and skateboarders, on the rules of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Enhance crosswalk lighting at intersections near the school to provide advanced warning to drivers that they are approaching a point of potential conflict with crossing pedestrians and bicyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 In order to increase the number of vehicles that yield at crosswalks, consider the installation of engineering improvements such as a rectangular rapid flashing beacon at a crosswalk near the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Update and maintain the crosswalks on Main Street and Cedar Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Consider a school policy that revokes the open-lunch privilege of any students found violating good pedestrian behaviors when leaving school grounds during lunch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On Monday, October 27, 2015 from 6-8 p.m., the Ashby SRTS Team, under the guidance of Emily Ambrosy of WCI, held a community SRTS open house meeting in the Ashby City Hall. Available to the community members at the open house were the results from the strengths, barriers, and opportunities analysis seen in the previous chapter. Unfortunately there were no records of members of the public attending this meeting and neither were there any records of comments.
CHAPTER 7: EXISTING CONDITIONS AND FINDINGS

The SRTS team conducted school observations, a community walking audit, and a neighborhood assessment in order to identify the existing conditions in Ashby. Traffic volume and crash data were also retrieved from MnDOT’s databases for the roads in and around Ashby. A strengths, barriers, and opportunities analysis of existing policies and programs related to walking and bicycling to school was also performed. And while the SRTS team is a core group of individuals, most of whom are at the forefront of planning, broader community input was gathered to create a comprehensive list of existing conditions. To do this, a community open house was held on October 27, 2014 to collect additional community input (See Chapter 6). Having information on existing conditions is critical in making strategic decisions that support wise and fiscally sound future SRTS programming and activities.

ASHBY WALK / BICYCLE ZONES

As discussed in Chapter 2, MnDOT defines this as “the area within the school’s enrollment boundary from which students can realistically walk or bike to school.” MnDOT guidelines generally assume a distance of up to 0.5 miles for children in grades PreK-5, 1 mile for grades 6-8, and 1.5 miles for grades 9-12. These zones, are shown in Figure 12, and are measured here by bee-line radii from the center of the school. Almost all of Ashby fell within the 0.5 mile walk / bike zone. Actual walking and biking distance are likely greater due to direct route limitations imposed by the street network.

Approximately 40 percent of students live within two miles from school and four students outside of the City are not eligible for busing.

WALK AUDIT

A walk-audit of the community was conducted on Wednesday, September 10, 2014, to gather data related to major streets, intersections and sidewalk conditions impeding or facilitating pedestrian and bicyclist safety. Factors that were documented include sidewalk width and condition, traffic volume, terrain, threatening features (dogs, perception of criminal activity, highways, and busy intersections), trash, speed limits, and general safety. The audit provided an opportunity for the team to identify where the community is walkable and where there are opportunities for improvement. The major street and intersection observations from the walk-audit are described in Table 5.
The walkability audit revealed a high volume of truck traffic, vehicle driver speeding, and a low rate of vehicle drivers yielding to pedestrians. The design of the intersection at Birch Avenue, County Road 82, and Norge Street is somewhat unusual and believed to be confusing for those traversing it, regardless of mode. Due to its immediate proximity to the school, there are concerns that traffic conditions and driver behavior may interfere with bicycle and pedestrian safety at the intersection of Main Street (CSAH 4) and Birch Avenue, particularly when students are arriving and leaving school.

### Table 5: Major Street and Intersection Conditions in Ashby, MN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street or Intersection</th>
<th>Posted Speed Limit</th>
<th>Conditions Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Birch Avenue</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Street with low number of driveways intersecting roadway. Dead-End.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Avenue &amp; County Road 82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Intersection where drivers do not yield to pedestrians. High volume of truck traffic. Crossing of 82 is positioned by a blind incline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Street with high volume of truck traffic. Not pedestrian friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Avenue &amp; Main Street</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Intersection with a high percentage of turning movements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norge Street</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Low volume of traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson Street</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Street with large number of driveways intersecting roadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melby Avenue</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Traffic speeds perceived to be higher than posted speed limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iverson Street</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Narrow street with low volume.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Birch Avenue</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>High traffic volumes, high percent of turning movements and intersections where vehicles do not yield to pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lakes Trail &amp; County Road 82</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Off road trail that would provide an alternate route for students to get to school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12: Ashby Public School Vicinity Map (1/2 and 1 mile walk / bike radii) with existing sidewalk and trail inventory.
OBSERVATION RESULTS

To gain a better understanding about the current conditions at and around the Ashby School, on Wednesday, September 10, 2014, the SRTS Team conducted field observations of students’ travel behaviors, patterns and mode choices during morning arrival and afternoon departure. Team members were strategically positioned around the school and in the City of Ashby. They counted the number of pedestrians and bicyclists accessing school grounds and which routes the students took. They also observed whether students were using good techniques when crossing the street and how motorists behaved in relation to pedestrians and bicyclists on the streets and on school grounds.

The weather that day was cold, and windy with drizzling rain, which may have had a negative impact of the number of students walking and biking to and from school. Approximately 31 students walked and six biked to school during the morning commute. Likewise, approximately 20 students walked and three biked from school during the afternoon departure. 22 students were seen walking and five bicycling to school during the morning commute. Of the 22 pedestrians, 59 percent did not use the crosswalk or the sidewalks. Of the five bicyclists, one bicyclist rode his bike on the wrong side of the road (facing traffic instead of riding with traffic).

Ashby Public School has an open-lunch policy for high school students, which allows students to travel off of the campus for lunch. The T&B Short Stop located on Country Road 82 is a frequented establishment during the lunch hour. The team observed the travel behaviors of over 20 students to and from school during the lunch hour. Of the students traveling to and from school, only four students utilized the crosswalks.

Note – The numbers of pedestrians and bicyclists observed during Observation Day are inconsistent with the results of the Parent Survey and Student Travel Tally. There was not a systematic attempt during Observation Day to survey the exact number of students walking and biking to school. For more accurate bicycle and pedestrian mode share numbers, please refer to the results of the Parent Survey and Student Travel Tally.
TRAFFIC VOLUME DATA

While speed limits/traffic speed, street form (street width, number of lanes, lane width, presence of street trees, etc.) and the presence of sidewalks can have an impact on the safety of a street for pedestrians and bicyclists, traffic volume is also a highly important factor. It goes without saying that streets with heavy traffic are often more dangerous for bicyclists and pedestrians due to increased exposure to potential conflicts. Traffic volumes are also the ultimate factor with regard to the stress experienced due to passing motor traffic while walking or biking (No traffic. No stress). Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) is a relatively new term in the active transportation field, which looks to replace or supplement the often-criticized Level of Service (LOS) measure of facilitation for bicycles and pedestrians. High traffic stress environments can dissuade people from walking and biking despite the presence of facilities that have a high LOS. This report however does not attempt to measure LTS but provides traffic volumes to help understand current conditions and justify and prioritize future investments.

A common measure of traffic volume is “Annual Average Daily Traffic”, abbreviated AADT. According to MnDOT, AADT “is the theoretical estimate of the total number of vehicles using a specific segment of roadway (in both directions) on any given day of the year. This estimate represents the total number of cars per year divided by 365 and is developed using factors to adjust for season, day of the week, and vehicle type.” “Heavy Commercial Annual Average Daily Traffic” (HCAADT) is a subset of AADT of just heavy commercial truck traffic. MnDOT defines “Heavy Commercial Traffic” as “traffic from all trucks with at least 2 axles and 6 tires.” It is important to have a measure of HCAADT when available because heavy commercial vehicles are more cumbersome to operate and the increased mass of these vehicles is likely to cause more serious injuries and/or fatalities when involved in any type of crash. Heavy commercial traffic also has a greater impact on LTS per vehicle observed.

Fortunately, being a rural community, Ashby is not burdened by heavy traffic volumes. Figures 13 and 14 are maps of the AADT and HCAADT from data collected by MnDOT of the more significant roads in the immediate vicinity of Ashby. Table 6 is breakdown of both AADT and HCAADT (where available) within an approximate 2 mile radius of the Ashby School. It should be noted that high HCAADT volumes were observed during the time of the walk audit but are either absent or not well-defined in the MnDOT data.
Figure 13: Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) for more significant roads in and around Ashby.
Figure 14: Heavy Commercial Average Annual Daily Traffic (HCAADT) for more significant roads in and around Ashby.
Table 6: Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) for state system highways in and around Ashby and Heavy Commercial Average Annual Daily Traffic (HCAADT) on select highways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Name and Location</th>
<th>Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)</th>
<th>Heavy Commercial AADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MN TH 78 south of CSAH 10 (Melby)</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN TH 78 north of CSAH 10 (Melby)</td>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 82 north of T-105</td>
<td>910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 82 between T-105 &amp; Melby</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 82 between Melby &amp; CSAH 10</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 82 between CSAH 10 &amp; MN TH 78</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 82 south of MN TH 78</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 10 north of E Main</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 10 between E Main &amp; CSAH 82 (Main)</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 10 (Melby) between Main &amp; Nelson</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 10 (Melby) between Nelson &amp; MN TH 78</td>
<td>640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 10 between MN TH 78 &amp; Pelican Heights</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 10 south of Pelican Heights</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 4 East of CSAH 82 (Main)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Main between CSAH 10 &amp; MN TH 78</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN TH 78 south of CSAH 10 (Melby)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN TH 78 north of CSAH 10 (Melby)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRASH DATA

Crash data with the greatest proximal significance to walking and biking to the Ashby School was gathered using the online Minnesota Crash Mapping Analysis Tool (http://www.dot.state.mn.us/stateaid/crashmapping.html) (MCMAT). The MCMAT data for Ashby was accessed March 7, 2016. As of that date, the dataset included crash reports from January 1st 2005 through June 1st 2015, all of which were included in this analysis. According to the MCMAT homepage, the lag time between crash occurrence and data entry into the MCMAT database can last approximately 2-3 months and the data is updated four times per year (approximately quarterly).

The staff at WCI felt that collecting crash data within a one-mile radius of the intersection of CSAH 4 and CSAH 82, between Cedar and Larson Aves, would provide the most utility. This center point is approximately in the center of Ashby, around 550 feet east of the edge of school property that sits at the far western edge of city limits. From that center point, a one-mile radius includes all of Ashby’s city limits and all residences that are within the walk / bike zone of the Ashby School plus more for good measure.

A one-mile radius from the above-mentioned center point returns 24 crash reports from the MCMAT dataset. Of those 24, 15 have been mapped (see Figure 15). It is not known why 9 of the crash sites are not shown on the MCMAT generated map. Of these 24 crashes there were no fatalities, one non-incapacitating injury, two possible injuries and 21 incidents of property damage (see Figure 16). Of the “Crash Types,” 14 of those crashes involved a collision with another motor vehicle in transport, two involved collisions with a parked motor vehicle, three involved collisions with deer, one involved a collision with a utility pole, one involved a collision with a sign pole, one involved a collision with a guardrail, one involved a collision with a bank, ditch or curb, and one involved an overturned vehicle or rollover (see Figure 17). On average, there are 2.29 crashes in the selected area per year. There was no noticeable correlation with time of day or day of the week, or an increase or decrease in the number of crashes.

Curiously missing from the listing of crash types, was a crash reported to have happened on February 9, 2010 at 7:41 am at the intersection of MN TH 78 and CSAH 82 that appeared to have involved a pedestrian. According to the information gleaned from Crash Report #100400144, a pedestrian failed to yield the right-of-way due to distraction, to the driver of a pickup truck (See Appendix G for complete report). It is suspected that there was some coding error as to the reason why this crash was not cataloged as involving a pedestrian in the data for “Crash Types.”

Also missing from this crash data but pertinent to this SRTS plan was the fatal Tuesday, January 21, 2010 snowmobile crash involving 16 year-old Ashby High School sophomore, Justin Carl Woldahl. According to news reports, Woldahl was traveling east on the Central Lakes snowmobile trail at 3:20 PM in Ashby when
he drove into the side of a semi-truck which was parked partially across the snowmobile trail unloading at a fertilizer plant (Source: http://www.inforum.com/content/ashby-teen-killed-snowmobile-crash).

Members of the Ashby SRTS Team said that Woldahl was riding his snowmobile home from school that day and that it is common and permitted for high school students to ride snowmobiles to and from school when conditions permit on the extensive network of snowmobile trails in and around Ashby.

A MCMAT-generated crash summary report of all the pertinent crash statistics for the selected area around Ashby can be found on the last page of this chapter. The field for pedestrian has been highlighted in the “Accident Type Summary” area noting the absence of any crashes coded to have involved a pedestrian, which seems contradictory to our more in-depth investigation of the provided data.
Figure 15: Map of the 15 out of 24 crash sites within a one-mile radius of the intersection of CSAH 4 and CSAH 82, between Cedar and Larson Aves. Mapped crash sites are shown as red dots; crashes involving pedestrians, turquoise blue.
Figure 16: Ashby Crash Severity - Severity Class and Number. Graph automatically generated online by MCMAT.

Figure 17: Ashby Crash Type and Number. Graph automatically generated online by MCMAT.
# Chapter 7: Existing Conditions and Findings

## Ashby Crash Type Summary Report


### Crash Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Number of Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - Incapacitating</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Non-Incapacitating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Possible</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N - Property Damage</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X - Not Reported</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscoded</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Surface Condition Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 - Dry</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - Wet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 - Snow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - Slush</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - Ice/Packed Snow</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Not Specified</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscoded</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diagram Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagram Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 - Sideswipe - Same Dir</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 - Left Turn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - Run Off Road - Left Side</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - Right Angle</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - Right Turn</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 - Run Off Road - Right Side</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 - Head On</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 - Sideswipe - Opposing Dir</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Not Stated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscoded</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Relation Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 - Not at Intersection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - T Intersection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 - Y Intersection</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - 4 Legged Intersection</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - 5 or more Leg Intersection</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - Roundabout/Traffic Circle</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 - Intersection Related</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 - Alley or Driveway</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 - School Crossing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - RR Crossing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Recreational Crossing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 22 - Interchange</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Not Stated</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscoded</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accident Type Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 - Motor Vehicle in Transport</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - Parked Vehicle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04 - Road Equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - Train</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - Bike</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 - Pedestrian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09 - Deer/Animal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 - Other/Unknown Collision</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-42 - Fixed Object</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - Overturn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-65 - Other Non-Collision</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Not Stated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscoded</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Light Condition Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 - Daylight</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - Before Sunrise</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 - After Sunset</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - Dark (Street Lights On)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - Dark (Street Lights Off)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - Dark (No Street Lights)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 - Dark (Unknown Lighting)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Not Stated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscoded</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selection Filter:**

- WORK AREA: COUNTY CODE (26) - SPATIAL FILTER APPLIED

**Analyst:** Andrew Besold
A take-home self-report parent survey and a teacher-administered in-class student travel tally were conducted in September 2014. These surveys and survey documents have been designed by the National Centers for Safe Routes to School (National Centers) (http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/). These surveys and survey forms are the national standard for reporting SRTS data in the United States and help the National Centers keep track of walking and biking rates. As per the National Centers’ guidelines, both of these surveys are administered to gather data from students in grades K-8. However since many school districts in rural Minnesota have only a K-12 school, some schools may have administered these surveys to students all the way up to grade 12. When this happens, it is WCI policy to enter the data as the individual surveys have a place to indicate what grade the student is in and it would be very easy to deselect data from students in grades 9-12 if so desired. The results from Ashby are for grades PreK-8.

The parent survey questionnaire is a two-page form that was taken home by students for parents to complete asking about their child’s school travel behaviors and the parent’s perceptions regarding whether walking and biking to school is appropriate and fitting for their child. Besides English, the parent survey is available from the National Centers in Spanish, Arabic, Armenian, Mandarin Chinese, Haitian Creole, Hmong, Korean, Russian, Somali, Ukrainian and Vietnamese. The parent survey can also be done online by parents themselves (English and Spanish only), saving administrative time doing data entry.

The student travel tally is administered by teachers and conducted over three days in one single school week throughout the entire school. Teachers record weather conditions on each particular day, in the morning and afternoon. Then the teachers ask about students’ travel modes to school that particular day and how they plan on going home.

Once the paper forms were completed and collected for both surveys, the data is entered on-line into National Centers’ database by staff at WCI (this is done to maintain data entry continuity and as a service to the school). After the survey data is entered, those with access to the National Centers’ database can produce automated individual reports from each school for both the parent survey and the student travel tally. These reports provide a breakdown of the basic statistics that first establish a baseline that progress can be measured against in the future and are the origin of most of the graphs and charts in this chapter and all those in Appendix A and B. The 2014 surveys will be used to establish baseline data for Ashby. Moving forward, the parent survey will be done once every two to three years and the teacher-administered student travel tally will be done at least once, but preferably twice per school year. Follow-up surveying,
with help from WCI, will be done so that local, state and national officials can monitor trends over time in the travel habits of students traveling to and from school.

**KEY FINDINGS – PARENT SURVEY**

Below are the more significant highlights gleaned from both the 2014 parent survey for students grades Pre-Kindergarten (PreK) through 8 (Please note that surveys were done of PreK students, which is not standard but admissible. Results discussed are that of all students PreK-8). The results provide valuable information about parental attitudes and opinions relevant to SRTS at the Ashby School and create a benchmarking baseline which future analysis can be compared against.

The 2014 survey of the parents of students at the Ashby Public School District found that 18 percent of children walked or biked to school and 26 percent walked or biked from school. These results aligned well with the results from the 2014 teacher-administered student travel tally, which showed 18 percent of children district-wide walked or biked to school and 25 percent walked or biked from school. When compared to national SRTS numbers from 2013 (17.4 percent in the morning and 20.2 percent in the afternoon), the percentages of students walking and bicycling to the Ashby School are above average.

Further WCI staff analysis of the parent survey data showed that 47 percent of children who live within one mile of the school already walk or bike to school in the morning. In the afternoon, that number increases to a sizable majority with 72 percent of children who live within one mile of the school, walking or biking home from school. These are excellent results and are some of the best seen by WCI in our region of Minnesota. It is in keeping with the Walk/Bike Zone concept as defined and promoted by MnDOT, which generally assumes a distance of up to a half mile for children in grades PreK-5, and one mile for grades 6-8 are appropriate for walking and biking. Other results included:

- Across grades PREK-8, the school bus was the most frequently used mode of travel to and from school.
- More students arrive by the family vehicle than leave by family vehicle in the afternoon (trips shift to riding the school bus or walking).
- Distance was the main reason parents do not allow their children to walk or bicycle to/from school, by parents who currently do not allow their children to walk or bicycle.

---

• Safety factors, such as traffic speed and volume were chosen more frequently as barriers to children walking or biking to school than crime or violence.
• Based on actual student trips, more students walk in the afternoon compared to the morning commute.
• The parent survey only captured results from 97 parents of a possible 218, which is only 44% of parents with children in grades PreK-8.

**PARENT SURVEY – HIGHLIGHTS**

(For Complete Parent Survey results see Appendix A)

The Ashby school district’s total school enrollment, grades PreK-12, is 292 students. Approximately 218 of those students are grades PreK-8. Only grades PreK-8 were included in the survey analysis. Out of a potential 218, only 97 parent surveys met the criteria for inclusion in this report.

**Question – Is the child who brought home this survey male or female?**

Approximately 55 percent of questionnaires were completed for male and 45 percent for female students.

![Sex of children for parents that provided information](image)

**Figure 18: Breakdown of male/female student representation in the parent survey.**
Question – What is the grade of the child who brought home this survey?

PreK and 5th grade had the highest number of responses, followed by 3rd, etc. (see Table 7). The percentages listed in the right column are not the percent of survey returns versus the total number of students in each grade. It is simply the percentage of surveys returned from that grade as part of the total returned 97 from the entire school. This is also what “percent” represents in all following survey questions. While a sample of 97 out of a school of 218 students may be enough to interpret parental attitudes from the school as a whole, the small number of returns of just three and four from some grades is likely not enough to draw accurate conclusion of parental attitudes in just those individual grade subsets. Returns from the middle school grades of 7th and 8th grades were conspicuously lower but that may just be a coincidence or a reflection of the total student population in those grades. The small number of survey returns from some grades may not be enough to draw statistically accurate conclusions of parental attitudes in those individual grade subsets.

Table 7: Ashby Public School grade levels of children represented in parent survey (Fall 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade in School</th>
<th>Responses per grade</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No response: 0
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Question – On most days, how does your child arrive and leave for school?

A comparison of a child’s typical travel mode of arrival at and departure from school, as reported by parents, is shown in Figure 19 and Table 8. The survey is structured so that parents can give an answer for both how their child arrives at school and then leaves from school. Based on the parent responses, the school bus was the most common mode of travel both to and from school at 44 percent and 51 percent, respectively. The second most frequently chosen mode for travel to school was the family vehicle at 35 percent, followed by walking at 16 percent. The modes of travel chosen for school departure were notably different than during arrival. The second most common mode in the afternoon was walking at 22 percent, followed by family vehicle at 21 percent, and bicycling at four percent.

![Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school](image)

Figure 19: Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school (Fall 2014)

A greater number of students use the school bus when departing school, compared to arriving. There is a notable decrease in the number of students traveling by family vehicle and an increase in those walking. Of all mode choices, carpooling and transit were chosen the least for both morning and afternoon travel.
Table 8: Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school (Fall 2014)

Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Trip</th>
<th>Number of Trips</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>Morning</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Response Morning: 0
No Response Afternoon: 0
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Question – How far does your child live from school?
Parents were asked to give the distance from their home to the school. This question is asked in a way so that parents likely estimate that distance. These results are shown in Table 9. This is recorded because what parents estimate will have an effect on their mode choice for their child. Often parents will overestimate that distance and drive their child to school when walking and/or biking is a viable, safe and timely alternative.

Table 9: Parent estimate of distance from the child’s home to school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance between home and school</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don’t know or No response: 3
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Cross-reference – Distance, by arrival and departure modes

These estimated distances are then cross-referenced with actual arrival and departure mode choice (Tables 10 and 11).

Table 10: Parent estimate of the distance from child’s home to school and mode choice to school (Fall 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</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>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Parent estimate of the distance from child’s home to school and mode choice from school (Fall 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</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>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those students living within both one-quarter and one-half miles of the school, the family vehicle makes up a sizable percentage of trips, particularly in the morning. Only one child is reported to travel the estimated one half to one mile to school and that child is driven in the family vehicle both to and from school. Again, only one child is reported to travel the estimated one to two miles to school and that child is driven in the family vehicle to school and then uses the bus in the afternoon to travel home. Over two miles, most students use a motorized travel mode to and from school. There would appear to be two students walking to school, and one walking from school at more than 2 miles. Without further investigation, this would seem to be a reporting error. There is also an unexplained discrepancy with the number of students at that distance, between arrivals (62) and departures (63).
However, further WCI staff analysis of the take home survey data shows that 47 percent of children who live within one mile of the school already walk and bike to school in the morning (Table 12). In the afternoon, that number increases to a sizable majority with 72 percent of children who live within one mile of the school, walking or biking home (Table 13). This is in keeping with the Walk / Bike Zone concept as defined and promoted by MnDOT which generally assumes a distance of up to a half mile for children in grades PreK-5, and one mile for grades 6-8 are walkable and/or bikeable. These are also some of the best walking and biking numbers within the walk/bike zone that the staff at WCI have seen for this region of Minnesota. For students living within one half mile of the school, parents’ use of a family vehicle to take their children to school is likely due to the convenience of parents dropping off students while headed to work, concerns of walking in the dark, and the cold of the early morning. The shift to walking and biking modes from school in the afternoon is likely due to parents being at work when children are dismissed, that the weather is typically warmer at that time, it is then fully daylight, and that the trip home after school is less time sensitive compared to getting to school.

Table 12: School arrival modes for PreK-8 students (raw numbers and percent) living within 1 mile of the Ashby School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</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>Less than ¼ mile</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12 (46%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>13 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ mile up to ½ mile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total within 1 mile</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13 (41%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17 (53%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Walk / Bike within 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15 (47%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Motorized Modes within 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17 (53%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question – What of the following issues affected your decision to allow, or not allow, your child to walk or bike to/from school?

Parents were asked to identify issues affecting their decision to allow, or not allow, their child to walk or bike to and from school. Parents were given a list of options to choose from, with the ability to select as many reasons they felt applied. The results from this question were then split by whether parents did allow their child to walk or bike to and from school, or did not.

Figure 20 illustrates the issues affecting parents’ decision to not allow their child to walk or bike both to and from school. For the 66 parents of children who do not walk or bike to/from school, the top four issues affecting their decision are distance (86 percent), weather or climate (62 percent), speed of traffic along route (61 percent), and amount of traffic along route (58 percent). The four least frequently cited issues are convenience of driving (23 percent), adults to bike/walk with (21 percent), child’s participation in after school programs (21 percent), and a lack of crossing guards (18 percent).
Figure 20: Issues reported to affect the decision to not allow a child to walk or bike to/from school by parents of children who do not walk or bike to/from school (Fall 2014).
Figure 21 shows the results of the three parent respondents who allow their children to walk or bicycle to/from school. The most commonly cited issues affecting their decision were distance (67 percent) and weather or climate (100 percent). The amount of traffic along the route and crossing guards were not an issue for these parents (0 percent) while the speed of traffic along route, time, safety of intersections and crossings, violence and crime, sidewalks or pathways, convenience of driving, adults to bike/walk with and child’s participation in after-school programs were all equally cited at 33 percent.

Note: Because of the low response rate from parents that do allow their children to walk and bike to school, the results from this question are not statistically significant, meaning they cannot be compared to the general parent population.
Question – In your opinion, how much does your child’s school encourage or discourage walking and biking to/from school?

Figure 22 shows the results of parents’ opinions about how much their child’s school encourages or discourages walking and biking to and from school. A vast majority (67 percent) feel that the Ashby School neither encourages nor discourages walking and biking. However, of the parents that had an opinion, a vast majority felt that the school encourages walking and biking to school (32 percent: combined encourages-26 and strongly encourages-six) versus a small minority (1 percent: discourages-zero and strongly discourages-one) that believe the school discourages it to some degree. Still, a vast majority of parents (68 percent) believe that the Ashby School neither supports nor actively encourages children from walking and biking to and from school which indicates that the message about SRTS is not getting out to the parents.

![Parents' opinions about how much their child's school encourages or discourages walking and biking to/from school](image)

Figure 22: Parents’ opinions about how much their child’s school encourages or discourages walking and biking to/from school.
Question – In your opinion, how much fun is walking or biking to/from school for your child?

Figure 23 shows the results of parents’ opinions about how much fun walking and biking to and from school is for their child. While majority (54 percent) have a neutral opinion, 32 percent believe it to be fun, 10 percent believe it to be very fun (42 percent combined). Two percent believe it to be boring and one percent believe it to be very boring (three percent combined). Of those parents that did have an opinion, 12 times as many thought walking or biking to and from school to be fun or very fun compared to those that thought it to be boring or very boring.

![Parents' opinions about how much fun walking and biking to/from school is for their child](image.png)

Figure 23: Parents’ opinions about how much fun walking and biking to/from school is for their child.
**Question – In your opinion, how healthy is walking or biking to/from school for your child?**

Figure 24 shows the results of parents’ opinions about how healthy walking and biking to and from school is for their child. Nearly three quarters (73 percent) believe it to be very healthy (39 percent) or healthy (34 percent) for their child. 28 percent had a neutral opinion and no one (zero percent) believed it to be unhealthy or very unhealthy. Again, 73 percent of parents felt that walking or biking to and from school was healthy in some degree for their child and no one felt it to be unhealthy.
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**Figure 24: Parents' opinions about how healthy walking and biking to and from school is for their child.**

**Parent Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1252910</td>
<td>My child walks to school in the fall but extremely high snow banks on corners in the winter make walking in town very dangerous as well as icy sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253036</td>
<td>This survey is difficult to convey meaningful answers when living a distance from city limits. You should include additional comment section so my answers are more meaningful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252794</td>
<td>We live 10 miles from school. That's why biking or walking is not an option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252859</td>
<td>The main reason I'm still driving the kids to school is because of the younger siblings that I don't feel comfortable allowing to walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252893</td>
<td>If we lived closer our children would 100% ride bike to school. They wish they could.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252837</td>
<td>While crime here appears quite low, the statistical probability for being targeted for human trafficking is higher in rural areas. Hard to know what to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252886</td>
<td>We live 16 miles from school - hard to get the exercise but sometimes the kids walk the 1/4 mile driveway to the bus stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253052</td>
<td>I'd have my kids walk all of the time except there aren't sidewalks all the way, so they walk in the street to keep their feet dry and free of mud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey ID</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252782</td>
<td>We live in Evansville so not an option to walk or bike to school. If we lived in town they would be able to walk or bike to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252802</td>
<td>Wish there were flashing lights at the school for a school zone so traffic would slow down from county rd 4 and from main st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252809</td>
<td>A safe way to get on the bike trail would be great to see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252816</td>
<td>My child walks with a group of neighbor kids so they are not alone. I do hear about some bullying along the way - it's a concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253034</td>
<td>We live too far away for our son to ride his bike to school or walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252778</td>
<td>We live in the country/rural. Biking and walking to school is not an option. Filled out as best I could.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252771</td>
<td>My answers would change if we didn't live so far from school or if my child wasn't four years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252786</td>
<td>We live in the country so this is hard to fill out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252787</td>
<td>Does not apply to us, we live in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252822</td>
<td>My kid can't bike or walk. To far away from school and I completed high school and I have my diploma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252769</td>
<td>Does not apply to us - we live in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252826</td>
<td>We live 20 minutes away from school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252854</td>
<td>We live too far away so this does not apply. However, if we did live in town I would not feel comfortable at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253055</td>
<td>My kids live about 10 miles from Ashby school. Walking or biking is not an option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT TRAVEL TALLY - HIGHLIGHTS

(For Complete Student Travel Tally results see Appendix B)

The student travel tally survey is used to quantify students’ travel both to and from school by travel mode. The tally form is administered in school, by teachers. The count is administered school-wide in one single school week. Doing the tally on all three mid-week days (Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday) is greatly preferred but two of three midweek days is acceptable. Monday and Friday are avoided as possible weekend plans and/or holidays are more likely to affect students’ regular travel behaviors on those two days. Students are asked by a show of hands how they arrived at school that day and then how they plan to leave for home after school. This survey also records weather conditions on each particular day, morning and afternoon separately, as inclement weather can have an obvious effect on children walking or biking to and from school.

The student travel tally counts represent the number of actual recorded student trips to (510) and from (470) school on three days in September, 2014. Differences in these numbers are likely due to teachers forgetting to record a morning and/or afternoon travel tally on one or more days.

Question – How did you arrive at school today? How do you plan to leave for home after school?

Travel mode results from the student travel tally match up well with the travel mode results from the parent survey. Figure 25 shows that riding the school bus and traveling in a family vehicle were the two most frequent travel modes. However, walking and biking to school both in the morning and the afternoon were also well represented.
There was a noticeable percentage shift in walking between morning and afternoon commutes, while there is a minimal difference in bicycling. Compared to the morning commute, a lower percentage of students departed from school in a family vehicle or school bus, which explains the shift in walking between morning and afternoon commutes and is in keeping with the results seen in the parent survey. As noted in the parent survey, the higher use of a family vehicle is likely due to the convenience of dropping off students while parents are headed to work, and possible concerns of walking in the dark and cold of morning. The mode shift to walking and biking in the afternoon is likely due to parents being at work.
when children are dismissed from school, warmer and brighter outdoor conditions, and that the trip home after school is less time sensitive compared to getting to school without being tardy.

Weather Conditions – Sunny, Rainy, Overcast, Snow

Arrival and departure modes were then cross-referenced based on weather conditions. The tally sheet allows for the recording of weather conditions each day, both in the morning and afternoon. Results between weather conditions were not noticeably different. The tally sheet allows for the recording of weather conditions both in the morning and afternoon. As shown in Figure 26, weather did not appear to have an effect on the mode choice of students. Based on the results, a larger percentage of students walked to school in sunny weather conditions compared to overcast conditions. Because the tally was conducted on only three days of one week in September, students’ trips were not counted for all possible weather conditions, including rain and snow. Since a limited number of weather conditions were observed on the dates tallied, conclusions about the influence of weather on the choice of travel modes for students at the Ashby School is limited at best.
Figure 26: Travel mode by weather conditions (Fall 2014).

Table 15: Travel mode by weather conditions (Fall 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather Condition</th>
<th>Number of Trips</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>871</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
DISCUSSION / COMPARISON

Results from both the parent surveys and student tallies are comparable and did not contradict one another. The similarities of the results between both data collection instruments reinforce the credibility and reliability of the final results.

Distance from home to the school appears to be the predominant factor as to whether students either walk or bike, or take a motorized mode to and from school. Distance was also the main barrier for parents who currently do not allow their children to walk or bicycle cite as to why they do not allow their child to walk or bicycle to and from school. This should not come as a surprise. After distance, safety factors such as traffic speed and volume were chosen more frequently as barriers to children walking or biking to school, more so than crime or violence. While parents’ real and/or perceived safety concerns with walking and biking to school should not be dismissed, for those that live within the Walk / Bike Zone of the Ashby School, those concerns are clearly not insurmountable barriers as a majority of children are already walking and biking to the Ashby School who live one mile of the school.

Additional findings indicate that walking and biking to school is already fairly common for the PreK-8 students that live within the one mile Walk / Bike Zone (33 percent of the student body, according to the survey), particularly after school. This suggests that there is a relatively easy opportunity to increase walking and bicycling to school for those students within one mile from school. Just one percent of students live one to two miles from the school with the other 66 percent of students living further than two miles from school. Almost all of the students living further than two miles from the school travel to and from school by motorized modes, which is to be expected.

While the results from the parent surveys and student travel tallies provide valuable baseline data, several limitations exist. The parent survey was self-reported information, which may self select and bias the results to a socially-desirable response. Furthermore, the three-day time frame for student travel tallies, taken only during one school week out of the entire year, limits the likelihood of collecting data in all weather conditions. Additional analysis, particularly a second student travel tally at a different time of the year would be helpful to better understand student travel behaviors and how the weather influences travel mode decisions.
CHAPTER 9: ACTION PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

EDUCATION

Goal: Establish at least two educational programs a year to foster and teach bicycle and pedestrian safety within the community.

1. Facilitate an annual bicycle rodeo event to teach bicycle skills and safety to students.

   Bicycle Rodeos are bicycle safety training events held over the period of several hours that teach bicycle safety lessons and on-bike skills, usually in a station format (e.g., bicycle safety check, helmet fitting, instruction about the rules of the road, on-bike obstacle course, on-bike skills drills, etc.). While geared towards children, many of the lessons can be appropriate for adults as well. Bicycles 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 rodeos, or they may be offered through the local police department. Key partners in implementing a bicycle rodeo event may (should) include teachers, League of American Bicyclists Cycling Instructors, and Horizon SHIP.

2. Educate students about the proper walking and bicycling etiquette through in-school and after-school bicycle and pedestrian safety education.
   a. If not existing, establish an after-school club.
   b. Utilize the Walk! Bike! Fun! curricula to help students understand the rules of the road.
   c. Identify the need for a bicycle fleet

Observation results indicate that a number of students do not know the proper walking and bicycling etiquette. Students were not utilizing crosswalks, did not look both ways before crossing the street, and finally rode their bicycles and walked on the wrong side of the street. After-school clubs can provide educational information across many subjects including hands-on training or environmental issues. With the current numbers of students walking and bicycling to and from school, it is advantageous for students to learn the skills to safely walk and bicycle to and from school. The Walk! Bike! Fun! Curriculum is an in-classroom and real-world (on foot, on bike) educational resource. Taught by specially trained school district teachers, this curriculum is intended for children ages five through thirteen. It teaches life-long skills related to traffic rules, potential hazards, and bike handling skills that enable students to walk and bike safely and comfortably to and from school along with other trips around their communities. The curriculum addresses a variety of walking and
bicycling topics and is endorsed by MnDOT. Finally, in order to engage students in the *Walk! Bike! Fun! Curriculum*, the Ashby School District should identify the need for a bicycle fleet, or identify a nearby fleet they may be able to borrow.

Figure 27: The Fergus Falls bike fleet is kept inside this towable trailer.

Figure 28: Some of the inspirational graphics painted onto the sides of the Fergus Falls bike fleet trailer.
3. Develop a school safety campaign to build awareness of students walking and bicycling to and from school, and to encourage safe driving behavior among parents and passersby.

A school safety campaign should be developed that builds awareness around students walking and bicycling to and from school. An effective safety campaign might utilize multiple forms of media to get the attention of parents, students and passersby. Primary outcomes are improved walking, bicycling and driver safety behaviors (particularly near the school), and youth empowerment.

4. Design a parent workshop to provide tools, resources, and support needed to encourage parents and other community members to begin walking and bicycling for transportation.

A parent workshop can provide the tools, resources and support needed for parents to overcome some of the common barriers noted by parents to now allow their children to walk or bicycle to and from school. While distance and weather were the top two barriers noted by parents, speed and amount of traffic were in the top five barriers noted. Topics such as how to be a responsible driver, starting a walking school bus, and launching a safety campaign can significantly impact the amount and speed of traffic along the school route.

5. Create a family-oriented educational training program that builds upon the school safety campaign (3#) such as a family biking class and/or family biking guide to teach basic bicycle maintenance, safety checks, etc.

Educational trainings teach students the skills necessary to walk and bicycle safely while encouraging them to try walking and bicycling on a regular basis. If held in conjunction with the school safety campaign, students and families have the opportunity to practice skills and gain confidence.

For more Education ideas see Minnesota SRTS Model Policies Tip Sheet (Appendix F).
ENCOURAGEMENT

Goal: Explore strategies to promote walking and bicycling through the identification of safe routes, organizing events, rewarding participation and educating adults.

1. **Edit the Ashby School District Transportation and Wellness Policies to included language that is not only supportive but actively promotes walking and biking to and from school as long as students routes are deemed safe and within a reasonable distance to the school as defined in the MnDOT Walk/Bike Zone concept.**

   A review of the Ashby Public School District Transportation and Wellness Policies (a Health and Safety Policy could not be found for review) (Appendices G, H) found no reference to walking or biking to and from school. One or more of these policies should have specific language that supports and actively promotes walking and biking to and from school for students so long as it has been found to be safe and those students live within an appropriate distance. A sample Wellness policy amendment specific to Minnesota and SRTS was produced by the Public Health Law Center at the William Mitchell College of Law and can be found can be found in Appendix E. An additional policy resource specific to Minnesota is the Minnesota SRTS Model Policies Tip Sheet which can be found can be found in Appendix F. Finally, the SRTS National Partnership in cooperation with ChangeLab Solutions (a multi-disciplinary, multi-government agency policy partnership) has developed an on-line SRTS District Policy Workbook. This resource is a comprehensive SRTS policy guide covering everything from general policies supporting SRTS to more advanced policies like “No Idling Policies” and “School Siting Policies.” This resource is best accessed on-line and can be found at: [http://www.changelabsolutions.org/safe-routes/welcome](http://www.changelabsolutions.org/safe-routes/welcome).

2. **Develop informational messages to be included in the monthly school newsletter or the Golden Arrow, encouraging students to walk or bike to school and highlighting associated health benefits.**

   Monthly informational messages can raise awareness about the positive health and academic benefits associated with increased physical activity, such as walking and bicycling. By providing this information in the Golden Arrow, students will have the opportunity to become engaged and learn tips from fellow students. To get information to parents, a short message could be included in the monthly school newsletter.
3. **Explore the development of a remote school bus drop site.** Explore / develop a competition or challenge to reward students by tracking the number of times they walk or bike to school (within one-half mile). Such a competition should also allow the children that also take the bus (over one-half mile) to participate in some way as well, preferably by having them do some sort of physical fitness activity like walking on school grounds, etc.

Competitions or challenges provide students with immediate, positive reinforcement. The possible competitions or challenges are endless and could target individuals, classrooms or the entire school.

4. **Participate in International Walk and Bike to School Days to encourage students and their families to try walking or biking to school.**

International Walk and Bike to School Day attracts millions of participants all over the world. The intent is to encourage students and their families to try walking or bicycling to school for one day. In some districts with high busing numbers, events on this day might include a walk around school grounds and throughout the town for all students, or a remote bus drop-off which would allow all students to walk to school from that location. Depending on the response rate, these events could be extended into the future and turn into ongoing designated walking and bicycling days. Key partners include law enforcement officials, high school students, teachers, parent advocates and Horizon SHIP. As a result, youth become empowered and more connected to health and their environment.
5. **Install a bicycle repair station near the front entrance of the school by the bicycle rack.**

Outdoor bicycle repair stations (Figure 29) are a great way to encourage bicycling, provide a way to make sure that bicycles are in good working order before students leave school for the day, make minor repairs that might otherwise leave a student stranded, all while teaching students basic mechanics and self-reliance. A typical station is equipped with a repair stand that holds the bike from the saddle, a heavy duty all-weather bicycle pump, and basic tools attached to the stand with theft resistant cables that allow a person to make most basic repairs.

6. **Investigate the need and/or feasibility of a walking school bus for students within one mile of school.**

A walking school bus is a group of students walking to and from school with chaperones (usually adult/parent volunteers). A walking school bus is a fun, healthy and easy opportunity for students to be physically active. A walking school bus usually provides front door pick-up and drop-off of students along the way, which can allay most parents’ fears. It can be done daily or just on certain days of the week and/or depending on weather conditions. However, with the PreK-8 students that live within one mile of the school, already 48 percent of students are walking or biking to school and 72 percent are walking or biking home. These are excellent numbers but a walking school bus could make them even better. The Ashby Public School District should investigate the desire for a walking school bus and see if parents or senior citizens are interested in taking turns walking students. If a walking school bus is explored, outreach to parents could be done via the parent newsletter. The hardest part to operating a walking school bus is finding enough dedicated volunteers to act as “drivers.”

For more Encouragement ideas see Minnesota SRTS Model Policies Tip Sheet (Appendix F).
ENFORCEMENT

Goal: Address traffic and safety concerns by identifying and implementing enforcement measures within the school walk and bike zone.

1. **Increase the prevalence of traffic law enforcement in strategic locations during student morning arrival and afternoon dismissal.**

   Increasing the prevalence of law enforcement officers near the school may help to reduce vehicle speeds, improve compliance with speed limits around the school and increase the likelihood of vehicles yielding to pedestrians. This is a short-term, easy-to-implement recommendation that can be low cost.

2. **Identify the most effective form of automated speed feedback sign and investigate the possible installation of such signs in Ashby and around the school in an effort to reduce driver speed.**

   Based on community input, vehicle speeds on Melby Avenue and Main Street are, or seem to be, high. WCI observations also found speeding to be a concern entering town from the west on CSAH 4. It is recommended that the City of Ashby identify the most effective form of automated speed feedback signs to be placed where appropriate, in order to reduce vehicle speeds and increase vehicle compliance with speed limits.

3. **Consider a school policy that revokes the open-lunch privilege of any students found violating good pedestrian behaviors when leaving school grounds during lunch.**

   Very few schools allow students to leave school grounds between arrival and dismissal. Being able to go out for lunch is a privilege, not a right of students. If students are seen not practicing safe and predictable walking behaviors at anytime walking to school in the morning, while traveling during lunch or leaving after school, administrators should investigate the possibility of restricting this lunch privilege on a case-by-case basis. If poor behaviors remain prevalent amongst a majority of students going to lunch, school administrators may need to consider changing this policy and discontinuing this privilege for all students.

   For more Enforcement ideas see Minnesota SRTS Model Policies Tip Sheet (Appendix F).
ENGINEERING

Goal: Improve the existing infrastructure within the City of Ashby to ensure active transportation is encouraged and made safe.

For a visual summary of most of the suggested Engineering proposals, please see Figure 30.

1. Prioritize sidewalk improvements, focusing on those locations that connect neighborhoods with the school. Where practical, set sidewalks as far back as possible from the roadway curb to create buffer between pedestrians and motor vehicle traffic. Such buffers can reduce traffic stress on pedestrians and make walking safer and more enjoyable. These buffers are even more important on busier roadways with higher traffic volumes, faster vehicle speeds, and/or significant heavy truck traffic.

2. Consider installing a 30 mph speed limit sign on westbound CSAH 4 / West Main Street at the city limit to remind drivers that they are not yet beyond the speed zone that continues almost to the end of school grounds another 850 feet to the west.

3. Investigate installing street lighting at the intersection of Main and Birch Street to improve visibility.

4. Align drain grates so that the metal bars are perpendicular to the road-way to mitigate the safety hazard for bicyclists.

5. Conduct a feasibility study to determine effectiveness of a school speed zone on CSAH 4 / West Main Street near school grounds. Work with Grant County and MnDOT to identify the feasibility of graduated speed limits or other anti-speeding strategies as vehicles enter Ashby from the west on CSAH 4 near Ashby School property.

6. Coordinate with Grant County to improve sidewalk curb ramps, width, continuity, crosswalk enhancements (crosswalk markings, yield signs, pedestrian signing) and buffer zones, etc. during future reconstruction, on CSAH 82.

7. Coordinate with Grant County to improve the downtown crosswalk on Main Street / CSAH 82 between Larson and Melby Avenues.
8. Coordinate with Grant County and/or conduct a feasibility study for long-term bicycle and pedestrian safety strategies and improvements at the intersection of CSAH 82, Birch Avenue and Norge Street.

9. Coordinate with Grant County when rebuilding sidewalks that curb ramps line up with the crosswalks and meet contemporary Americans with Disabilities Act standards, namely the Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG).  

10. Explore separating bus loading/unloading from the parent pick-up and drop-off area.

11. Explore a trail connection from Cedar Street to Birch Avenue in the area south of Hawkins Street.

12. Explore a connection from the Central Lakes Trail to downtown Ashby. This includes identifying the feasibility of a sidewalk on the south side of Main Street.

13. Explore a sidewalk connection between Iverson Street and Melby Avenue (near Ashby Living Center).


For more Engineering ideas, see Minnesota SRTS Model Policies Tip Sheet (Appendix F).

---

Figure 30: Ashby Safe Routes to School proposed engineering / walk and bike facility improvements.
EVALUATION

Goal: Evaluate the effectiveness of programming by tracking baseline data and, in addition, actively work on improvement, based on results.

1. Administer the student travel tallies at least once per year to track the number of students walking and bicycling in comparison to the 2014 baseline results.

   In order to track the results of implemented programming, it is recommended that the Ashby School District administer the student travel tallies at least annually. The results will indicate the number of students walking and bicycling, which in turn will identify the effectiveness of programs. If possible, try to conduct the student travel tallies more than once per year so it is possible to capture travel data during periods of inclement weather, particularly rain and snow, to see how that affects student travel mode choice. This data will also be useful when applying for non-infrastructure or infrastructure funding.

2. Administer a parent survey questionnaire once every two to three years to track and analyze school travel behaviors and parents’ perceptions.

   The parent survey tool tracks and analyzes student travel behaviors and parents’ perceptions of walking and bicycling. This survey should be conducted no more than biannually as attitudes are not likely to change that quickly and if done too frequently, parents may not be as inclined to fill them out. Results can then be compared to the baseline analysis completed in the Fall of 2014.

3. Explore establishing baseline health data (possibly already gathered) to evaluate possible health improvements over time, related to SRTS improvements.

   In order to track student health improvements over time, it is suggested that the Ashby Public School District collect baseline health data. It is likely that the school district is already collecting this data. As SRTS programs and improvements are implemented, the health of students can be tracked on a continual basis. Horizon SHIP may be able to help the school district organize this.

For more Evaluation ideas, see Minnesota SRTS Model Policies Tip Sheet (Appendix F).
Goal: Create partnerships with local businesses and organizations to increase support and encouragement of active transportation.

1. Identify opportunities or partners to fund bicycle helmets for educational events like bike rodeos and/or Walk! Bike! Fun! training events.

Goal: Work to ensure all City and School policies and ordinances are supportive of active transportation.

2. Modify Ordinance 94 – “An Ordinance Relating to the Establishment, Maintenance and Repair of Sidewalks and Alleys Within the City of Ashby” so that the city follows the best and latest accessibility design standards. Although not yet officially adopted as standards by the Department of Justice, the proposed Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) are the recommended Americans with Disabilities Act standards when planning, designing and constructing within the right-of-way.

3. In Ordinance 94 relating to the establishment, maintenance, and repair of sidewalks in the City of Ashby, remove the language in ‘Subd. 5 Removal without Replacement’ to guarantee all sidewalks are replaced (Appendix I).

4. Identify snow storage areas that do not impede walking and bicycling to school. This is particularly important at the corners of intersections.
CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSION

This Safe Routes to School (SRTS) plan is intended to guide the City of Ashby and the Ashby School District toward their collective goal of making it easier, safer and more fun for students to walk and bicycle to and from school. Where it is already safe, encourage students to walk and bicycle to school. Where it is less than ideally safe, improve the existing conditions to make it as safe as practically possible with an eye towards walking and bicycling comfort. When children get exercise on their way to and from school they:

1. Arrive more alert and able to focus,
2. Get a large portion of their recommended daily physical activity,
3. Are more likely to be a healthy weight,
4. Demonstrate improved test scores and
5. Are less likely to suffer from anxiety.

The SRTS recommendations address the “5 E’s” and were created to improve safety, reduce traffic congestion, encourage students to consider walking or bicycling and instill an active lifestyle. The recommendations in this report were formed based on examining the existing conditions around the school, community input and results from the parent surveys and student tallies. SRTS plans are the most successful when programs involve the entire community and when they are integrated into current and future policies. If at any time, the City and School District of Ashby have any questions of how to best enact the recommendations in this report, whether that be funding sources, best policies and practices, etc., they are encouraged to contact the staff at West Central Initiative and/or Horizon SHIP.
APPENDIX A: PARENT SURVEY RESULTS

Parent Survey Report: One School in One Data Collection Period

School Name: Ashby Public School
School Group: Ashby Safe Routes to School
School Enrollment: 292
% Range of Students Involved in SRTS: 51-75%
Number of Questionnaires Distributed: 175
Set ID: 12430
Month and Year Collected: September 2014
Date Report Generated: 12/02/2014
Tags:
Number of Questionnaires Analyzed for Report: 97

This report contains information from parents about their children’s trip to and from school. The report also reflects parents’ perceptions regarding whether walking and bicycling to school is appropriate for their child. The data used in this report were collected using the Survey about Walking and Biking to School for Parents form from the National Center for Safe Routes to School.

Sex of children for parents that provided information

[Graph showing sex distribution]

Male 45%
Female 55%
Grade levels of children represented in survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade in School</th>
<th>Responses per grade</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No response: 0
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Parent estimate of distance from child's home to school

Don't know or No response: 1
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance between home and school</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Trip</th>
<th>Number of Trips</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>Morning</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Response Morning: 0
No Response Afternoon: 1
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Typical mode of school arrival and departure by distance child lives from school.
Typical mode of school arrival and departure by distance child lives from school

### School Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</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>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 1
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

### School Departure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</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>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 2
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Percent of children who have asked for permission to walk or bike to/from school by distance they live from school

Don't know or No response: 7
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Issues reported to affect the decision to not allow a child to walk or bike to/from school by parents of children who do not walk or bike to/from school

- Distance
- Weather or climate
- Speed of Traffic Along Route
- Amount of Traffic Along Route
- Time
- Safety of Intersections and Crossings
- Violence or Crime
- Sidewalks or Pathways
- Convenience of Driving
- Adults to Bike/Walk With
- Child's Participation in After School Programs
- Crossing Guards

Issues reported to affect the decision to allow a child to walk or bike to/from school by parents of children who already walk or bike to/from school

- Distance
- Weather or climate
- Speed of Traffic Along Route
- Amount of Traffic Along Route
- Time
- Safety of Intersections and Crossings
- Violence or Crime
- Sidewalks or Pathways
- Convenience of Driving
- Adults to Bike/Walk With
- Child's Participation in After School Programs
- Crossing Guards
Issues reported to affect the decision to allow a child to walk or bike to/from school by parents of children who already walk or bike to/from school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Child does not walk/bike to school</th>
<th>Child walks/bikes to school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather or climate</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Intersections and Crossings</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence or Crime</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks or Pathways</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of Driving</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults to Bike/Walk With</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's Participation in After School Programs</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Guards</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Respondents per Category</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No response: 28

Note:

--Factors are listed from most to least influential for the 'Child does not walk/bike to school' group.
--Each column may sum to > 100% because respondent could select more than issue
--The calculation used to determine the percentage for each issue is based on the 'Number of Respondents per Category' within the respective columns (Child does not walk/bike to school and Child walks/bikes to school.) If comparing percentages between the two columns, please pay particular attention to each column's number of respondents because the two numbers can differ dramatically.
Parents' opinions about how much their child's school encourages or discourages walking and biking to/from school

67% Neither
26% Encourages
6% Strongly Encourages
0% Discourages
1% Strongly Discourages

Parents' opinions about how much fun walking and biking to/from school is for their child

54% Neutral
32% Fun
10% Very Fun
1% Very Boring
2% Boring
Parents’ opinions about how healthy walking and biking to/from school is for their child

- 39% Healthy
- 28% Neutral
- 34% Very Healthy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1252910</td>
<td>My child walks to school in the fall but extremely high snow banks on corners in the winter make walking in town very dangerous as well as icy sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253036</td>
<td>This survey is difficult to convey meaningful answers when living a distance from city limits. You should include additional comment section so my answers are more meaningful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252794</td>
<td>We live 10 miles from school. That's why biking or walking is not an option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252859</td>
<td>The main reason I'm still driving the kids to school is because of the younger siblings that I don't feel comfortable allowing to walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252893</td>
<td>If we lived closer our children would 100% ride bike to school. They wish they could.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252837</td>
<td>While crime here appears quite low, the statistical probability for being targeted for human trafficking is higher in rural areas. Hard to know what to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252886</td>
<td>We live 16 miles from school - hard to get the exercise but sometimes the kids walk the 1/4 mile driveway to the bus stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253052</td>
<td>I'd have my kids walk all of the time except there aren't sidewalks all the way, so they walk in the street to keep their feet dry and free of mud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252782</td>
<td>We live in Evansville so not an option to walk or bike to school. If we lived in town they would be able to walk or bike to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252802</td>
<td>Wish there were flashing lights at the school for a school zone so traffic would slow down from county rd 4 and from main st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252809</td>
<td>A safe way to get on the bike trail would be great to see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252816</td>
<td>My child walks with a group of neighbor kids so they are not alone. I do hear about some bullying along the way - it's a concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253034</td>
<td>We live too far away for our son to ride his bike to school or walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252778</td>
<td>We live in the country/rural. Biking and walking to school is not an option. Filled out as best I could.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252771</td>
<td>My answers would change if we didn't live so far from school or if my child wasn't four years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252786</td>
<td>We live in the country so this is hard to fill out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252787</td>
<td>Does not apply to us, we live in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252822</td>
<td>My kid can't bike or walk. To far away from school and I completed high school and I have my diploma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252769</td>
<td>Does not apply to us - we live in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252826</td>
<td>We live 20 minutes away from school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252854</td>
<td>We live too far away so this does not apply. However, if we did live in town I would not feel comfortable at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253055</td>
<td>My kids live about 10 miles from Ashby school. Walking or biking is not an option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Travel Tally Report: One School in One Data Collection Period

**School Name:** Ashby Public School  
**Set ID:** 15449  
**School Group:** Ashby Safe Routes to School  
**Month and Year Collected:** Sept. 2014  
**School Enrollment:** 292  
**Date Report Generated:** 12/02/2014  
**% of Students reached by SRTS activities:** 51-75%

**Tags:**
- Number of Classrooms Included in Report: 15

This report contains information from your school's classrooms about students' trip to and from school. The data used in this report were collected using the in-class Student Travel Tally questionnaire from the National Center for Safe Routes to School.

### Morning and Afternoon Travel Mode Comparison

![Graph showing morning and afternoon travel mode comparison](image-url)
## Morning and Afternoon Travel Mode Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Trips</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>Morning</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Morning and Afternoon Travel Mode Comparison by Day

Morning and Afternoon Travel Mode Comparison

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Trips</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>Tuesday AM</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday PM</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday AM</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday PM</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday AM</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday PM</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Travel Mode by Weather Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather Condition</th>
<th>Number of Trips</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>671</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
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 child attends. 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]

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrive at school</th>
<th>Leave from school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>Bike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>School Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family vehicle (only children in your family)</td>
<td>Family vehicle (only children in your family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool (Children from other families)</td>
<td>Carpool (Children from other families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit (city bus, subway, etc.)</td>
<td>Transit (city bus, subway, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (skateboard, scooter, in-line skates, etc.)</td>
<td>Other (skateboard, scooter, in-line skates, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel time to school</th>
<th>Travel time from school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 minutes</td>
<td>Less than 5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 minutes</td>
<td>5 – 10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 20 minutes</td>
<td>11 – 20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 minutes</td>
<td>More than 20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / Not sure</td>
<td>Don’t know / Not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ +
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

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.
Encuesta sobre ir caminando o andando en bicicleta a la escuela
- PARA PADRES -

Estimado Padre o Encargado,
La escuela donde su hijo/hija asiste desea saber sus opiniones sobre niños caminando y andando en bicicleta a la escuela. Esta encuesta tomará entre 5 y 10 minutos para completar. Le pedimos a las familias que completen sólo una encuesta por escuela a la que asisten sus niños. Si recibe más de un formulario de la misma escuela, por favor complete solo una encuesta, la del niño que cumple años en la fecha más próxima al día de hoy.

Después de completar esta encuesta, devuélvala a la escuela a través de su hijo o entréguesela a la maestra. Sus respuestas se mantendrán confidenciales y no se asociarán a su nombre ni el de su hijo a ningún resultado.

¡Gracias por participar en esta encuesta!

LETRA MAYÚSCULA SOLAMENTE USE TINTA AZUL O NEGRA

Nombre de la Escuela: ________________________________

1. ¿En qué grado está el niño que trajo esta encuesta al hogar? ______ Grado (PK, K,1, 2, 3,...)

2. ¿El niño que trajo a casa la encuesta es niño o niña? ______ Niño   ______ Niña

3. ¿Cuántos niños tiene usted entre Kindergarten y el 8vo grado? ______

4. ¿Cuál es la intersección más cerca de su casa? (el cruce de las dos calles)

5. ¿Cómo llenar este formulario?: Escriba en letras MAYÚSCULAS. Marque las cajas con "X"

   5. ¿A qué distancia vive su niño de la escuela?
   - [ ] Menos de 1/4 milla
   - [ ] media milla hasta 1 milla
   - [ ] Más de 2 millas
   - [ ] Entre 1/4 y 1/2 milla
   - [ ] Entre 1 y 2 millas
   - [ ] No lo sé

6. La mayoría de los días, ¿cómo va su niño a la escuela y cómo regresa a la casa después de la escuela?

   Llega a la escuela
   - [ ] Caminando
   - [ ] Bicicleta
   - [ ] Autobús escolar
   - [ ] Vehículo de la familia (solo con niños de la familia)
   - [ ] Compartiendo el viaje en auto con niños de otras familias
   - [ ] Tránsito (autobús de la ciudad, subterráneo, etc.)
   - [ ] Otro (patineta, monopatín, patines, etc.)

   Regresa a casa
   - [ ] Caminando
   - [ ] Bicicleta
   - [ ] Autobús escolar
   - [ ] Vehículo de la familia (solo con niños de la familia)
   - [ ] Compartiendo el viaje en auto con niños de otras familias
   - [ ] Tránsito (autobús de la ciudad, subterráneo, etc.)
   - [ ] Otro (patineta, monopatín, patines, etc.)

7. ¿Cuánto tiempo le toma a su niño para ir y regresar de la escuela? (una respuesta por columna con una "X" en la caja)

   Tiempo del recorrido a la escuela
   - [ ] Menos de 5 minutos
   - [ ] 5 a 10 minutos
   - [ ] 11 a 20 minutos
   - [ ] Más de 20 minutos
   - [ ] No lo sé / No estoy seguro/a

   Tiempo del recorrido para llegar a casa
   - [ ] Menos de 5 minutos
   - [ ] 5 a 10 minutos
   - [ ] 11 a 20 minutos
   - [ ] Más de 20 minutos
   - [ ] No lo sé / No estoy seguro/a
PARENT SURVEY: SPANISH – PAGE 2

A high-quality, printable original version of this document can be found at:
http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/sites/default/files/resources/Parent_Survey_Spanish.pdf
# STUDENT TRAVEL TALLY

## 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: (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></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 as a group the question “How did you arrive at school today?”
- Then, reread 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 for home after school?”
- You can conduct the counts once per day but during the count, 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).

### Step 1.
Fill in the weather conditions and number of students in each class.

### Step 2.
**AM – “How did you arrive at school today?”** Record the number of hands for each answer.
**PM – “How do you plan to leave for home after school?”** Record the number of hands for each answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<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></td>
<td>S = sunny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R = rainy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O = overcast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN = snow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number in class when count made</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Only with children from your family</td>
<td>Riding with children from other families</td>
<td>City bus, subway, etc.</td>
<td>Skate-board, scooter, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample AM**

| S | N | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 |

**Sample PM**

| R | 1 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 2 |

| Tues. AM | | | | | | | | | |
| Tues. PM | | | | | | | | | |
| Wed. AM | | | | | | | | | |
| Wed. PM | | | | | | | | | |
| Thurs. AM | | | | | | | | | |
| Thurs. PM | | | | | | | | | |

Please list any disruptions to these counts or any unusual travel conditions to/from the school on the days of the tally.
### Crash 1

**Crash ID:** 063150344  
**Date:** 07/15/2006  
**Time:** 02:41  
**Sys:** 04-CSAH  
**Route:** 26000010 014+80.810  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Property Damage</th>
<th>First Event</th>
<th>Private Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Type</td>
<td>2 Lanes Undiv 2 Way</td>
<td>To Junction</td>
<td>T-Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Char</td>
<td>Curve and Level</td>
<td>Traffic Device</td>
<td>STOP SIGN OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Type</td>
<td>Coll &amp; Utility Pole</td>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Cond</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Diagram</td>
<td>Bar Off Road - Right Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Cond</td>
<td>Dark - Street Lights On</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather 1</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather 2</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td># of Vehicles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Trav Dir | S |  |
| Veh Act | UNKNOWN |  |
| Veh Type | PASSENGER CAR |  |
| Age | 44 |  |
| Gender | M |  |
| Cond | Under the Influence |  |
| Cont Fact | Chemical Impairment |  |
| Cont Fact | Illegal Speed |  |

### Crash 2

**Crash ID:** 070410177  
**Date:** 02/10/2007  
**Time:** 00:22  
**Sys:** 04-CSAH  
**Route:** 26000082 008-00.320  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Non-Incapacitating Injury</th>
<th>First Event</th>
<th>Outside Right-of-Way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Type</td>
<td>Other Divided Highway</td>
<td>To Junction</td>
<td>T-Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Char</td>
<td>Straight and Grade</td>
<td>Traffic Device</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Type</td>
<td>Coll &amp; Bank/Ditch/Curb</td>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Cond</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Diagram</td>
<td>Bar Off Road - Right Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Cond</td>
<td>Dark - Unknown Lighting</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather 1</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather 2</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td># of Vehicles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Trav Dir | W |  |
| Veh Act | Straight Ahead |  |
| Veh Type | PICKUP TRUCK |  |
| Age | 18 |  |
| Gender | M |  |
| Cond | Normal |  |
| Cont Fact | Inexperience |  |
| Cont Fact | Over-Correcting |  |
### Appendix D: Ashby Crash Detail Report

#### Crash ID: 063940125  
**Date:** 09/18/2003  
**Time:** 23:00  
**Sys:** 03-PO  
**County:** GRANT  
**City:**  
**Route:** 00000078  
**Severity:** PROPERTY DAMAGE  
**Road Type:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**Road Char:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**Crash Type:** COLL W/DAM  
**Surf Cond:** DRY  
**Light Cond:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**Weather 1:** CLEAR  
**Weather 2:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**First Event:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**To Junction:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**Traffic Device:** OTHER  
**Speed Limit:** 55  
**Diagram:** OTHER  
**Officer:**  
**Reliability:** BEST GUESS  
**# of Vehicles:** 1.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Trav Dir:** S  
**Veh Act:** STRAIGHT AHEAD  
**Veh Type:** PASSENGER CAR  
**Age:** 37  
**Gender:** M  
**Cond:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**Cont Fact:** NOT SPECIFIED |
| | | |

---

#### Crash ID: 062540129  
**Date:** 07/08/2008  
**Time:** 21:45  
**Sys:** 03-MN  
**County:** GRANT  
**City:** ASHBY  
**Route:** 00000078  
**Severity:** PROPERTY DAMAGE  
**Road Type:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**Road Char:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**Crash Type:** COLL W/DAM  
**Surf Cond:** DRY  
**Light Cond:** DARK - NO STREET LIGHTS  
**Weather 1:** CLEAR  
**Weather 2:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**First Event:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**To Junction:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**Traffic Device:** NOT APPLICABLE  
**Speed Limit:** 40  
**Diagram:** HEAD ON  
**Officer:**  
**Reliability:** BEST GUESS  
**# of Vehicles:** 1.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Trav Dir:** N  
**Veh Act:** STRAIGHT AHEAD  
**Veh Type:** VAN OR MINIVAN  
**Age:** 57  
**Gender:** M  
**Cond:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**Cont Fact:** NOT SPECIFIED |
| | | |
### Appendix D: Ashby Crash Detail Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash ID:</th>
<th>02760004</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>10/03/2009</th>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>1759</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County:</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>City:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Event:</td>
<td>Off roadway on shoulder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Type:</td>
<td>2 LANE UNDIV 2 WAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Char:</td>
<td>STRAIGHT AND LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Type:</td>
<td>COLL W/STO M POLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Cond:</td>
<td>DRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Cond:</td>
<td>DAYLIGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather 1:</td>
<td>CLOUDY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather 2:</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagram:</td>
<td>LEFT TURN INTO TRAFFIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability:</td>
<td>CONFIDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Vehicles:</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit 1**
- Trav Dir: 2
- Veh Act: LEFT TURN
- Veh Type: SPORT UNTILITY VEHICLE
- Age: 32
- Gender: M
- Cond: NORMAL
- Cont Fact: IMPROPER TURN
- Cont Fact: NO IMPROPER DRIVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash ID:</th>
<th>004000144</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>03/05/2010</th>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>0741</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County:</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>City:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Event:</td>
<td>ON ROADWAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Type:</td>
<td>OTHER DIVIDED HIGHWAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Char:</td>
<td>STRAIGHT AND LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Type:</td>
<td>COLL W/VEH IN TRANSPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Cond:</td>
<td>ICE/PACKED SNOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Cond:</td>
<td>DAYLIGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather 1:</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather 2:</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagram:</td>
<td>RIGHT ANGLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability:</td>
<td>CONFIDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Vehicles:</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit 1**
- Trav Dir: SE
- Veh Act: FEL, FAIL TO YIELD R/W TO T
- Veh Type: PICKUP TRUCK
- Age: 37
- Gender: M
- Cond: NORMAL
- Cont Fact: FAIL TO YIELD R/W
- Cont Fact: DISTRACTION

**Unit 2**
- Trav Dir: NE
- Veh Act: STRAIGHT AHEAD
- Veh Type: PICKUP TRUCK
- Age: 69
- Gender: M
- Cond: NORMAL
- Cont Fact: NO IMPROPER DRIVING
- Cont Fact: NOT SPECIFIED
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#### Crash ID: 101820056  
Date: 05/06/2019  
Time: 1138  
Sys: 03-TC  
Route: 00000078  
04+00.572

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trav Dir:</strong> EAST</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veh Act:</strong> STRAIGHT AHEAD</td>
<td>STRAIGHT AHEAD</td>
<td>STRAIGHT AHEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veh Type:</strong> VAN OR MINIVAN</td>
<td>PASSENGER CAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong> 68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong> F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cond:</strong> NORMAL</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong> SLIDING INTO ROAD</td>
<td>NO IMPROPER DRIVING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong> NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Crash ID: 101500110  
Date: 05/06/2019  
Time: 1200  
Sys: 04-CHAK  
Route: 26060082  
061+00.800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trav Dir:</strong> EAST</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veh Act:</strong> STRAIGHT AHEAD</td>
<td>STRAIGHT AHEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veh Type:</strong> PASSENGER CAR</td>
<td>VAN OR MINIVAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong> 21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong> F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cond:</strong> NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong> NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong> NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**CRASH ID:** 102670146  
**DATE:** 09/19/2010  
**TIME:** 1243  
**SYST:** 03-MY  
**ROUTE:** 00000078  
**DIST:** 000+00.572

**SEVERITY:** PROPERTY DAMAGE  
**FIRST EVENT:** ON ROADWAY  
**ROAD TYPE:** 2 LANES UNDIV 2 WAY  
**ROAD CHAR:** STRAIGHT AND LEVEL  
**CRASH TYPE:** COLD W/MV IN TRANSPORT  
**SURF COND:** DRY  
**LIGHT COND:** DAYLIGHT  
**WEATHER 1:** CLOUDY  
**WEATHER 2:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**SYSTEM:** STOP SIGN OTHER  
**DIAGRAM:** RIGHT ANGLE  
**OFFICER:**  
**VEH ACT:** STRAIGHT AHEAD  
**VEH TYPE:** PASSENGER CAR  
**AGE:** 61  
**GENDER:** M  
**COND:** NORMAL  
**CONTEST FACT:** FAIL TO YIELD ROW  
**NO. VEHICLES:** 2.00  

---

**CRASH ID:** 110400149  
**DATE:** 01/07/2011  
**TIME:** 1450  
**SYST:** 16-M  
**ROUTE:** 011500001  
**DIST:** 000+00.110

**SEVERITY:** PROPERTY DAMAGE  
**FIRST EVENT:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**ROAD TYPE:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**ROAD CHAR:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**CRASH TYPE:** COLL W/MV IN TRANSPORT  
**SURF COND:** ICE/PACKED SNOW  
**LIGHT COND:** DAYLIGHT  
**WEATHER 1:** CLEAR  
**WEATHER 2:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**SYSTEM:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**DIAGRAM:** RIGHT ANGLE  
**OFFICER:**  
**VEH ACT:** STRAIGHT AHEAD  
**VEH TYPE:** PICKUP TRUCK  
**AGE:** 16  
**GENDER:** M  
**COND:** NORMAL  
**CONTEST FACT:** NO IMPROPER DRIVING  
**NO. VEHICLES:** 2.00  

---

**CRASH ID:** 110400149  
**DATE:** 01/07/2011  
**TIME:** 1450  
**SYST:** 16-M  
**ROUTE:** 011500001  
**DIST:** 000+00.110

**SEVERITY:** PROPERTY DAMAGE  
**FIRST EVENT:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**ROAD TYPE:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**ROAD CHAR:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**CRASH TYPE:** COLL W/MV IN TRANSPORT  
**SURF COND:** ICE/PACKED SNOW  
**LIGHT COND:** DAYLIGHT  
**WEATHER 1:** CLEAR  
**WEATHER 2:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**SYSTEM:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**DIAGRAM:** RIGHT ANGLE  
**OFFICER:**  
**VEH ACT:** STRAIGHT AHEAD  
**VEH TYPE:** PICKUP TRUCK  
**AGE:** 16  
**GENDER:** M  
**COND:** NORMAL  
**CONTEST FACT:** NO IMPROPER DRIVING  
**NO. VEHICLES:** 2.00  

---

**CRASH ID:** 110400149  
**DATE:** 01/07/2011  
**TIME:** 1450  
**SYST:** 16-M  
**ROUTE:** 011500001  
**DIST:** 000+00.110

**SEVERITY:** PROPERTY DAMAGE  
**FIRST EVENT:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**ROAD TYPE:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**ROAD CHAR:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**CRASH TYPE:** COLL W/MV IN TRANSPORT  
**SURF COND:** ICE/PACKED SNOW  
**LIGHT COND:** DAYLIGHT  
**WEATHER 1:** CLEAR  
**WEATHER 2:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**SYSTEM:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**DIAGRAM:** RIGHT ANGLE  
**OFFICER:**  
**VEH ACT:** STRAIGHT AHEAD  
**VEH TYPE:** PICKUP TRUCK  
**AGE:** 16  
**GENDER:** M  
**COND:** NORMAL  
**CONTEST FACT:** NO IMPROPER DRIVING  
**NO. VEHICLES:** 2.00  

---

**CRASH ID:** 110400149  
**DATE:** 01/07/2011  
**TIME:** 1450  
**SYST:** 16-M  
**ROUTE:** 011500001  
**DIST:** 000+00.110

**SEVERITY:** PROPERTY DAMAGE  
**FIRST EVENT:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**ROAD TYPE:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**ROAD CHAR:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**CRASH TYPE:** COLL W/MV IN TRANSPORT  
**SURF COND:** ICE/PACKED SNOW  
**LIGHT COND:** DAYLIGHT  
**WEATHER 1:** CLEAR  
**WEATHER 2:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**SYSTEM:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**DIAGRAM:** RIGHT ANGLE  
**OFFICER:**  
**VEH ACT:** STRAIGHT AHEAD  
**VEH TYPE:** PICKUP TRUCK  
**AGE:** 16  
**GENDER:** M  
**COND:** NORMAL  
**CONTEST FACT:** NO IMPROPER DRIVING  
**NO. VEHICLES:** 2.00  

---

**CRASH ID:** 110400149  
**DATE:** 01/07/2011  
**TIME:** 1450  
**SYST:** 16-M  
**ROUTE:** 011500001  
**DIST:** 000+00.110

**SEVERITY:** PROPERTY DAMAGE  
**FIRST EVENT:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**ROAD TYPE:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**ROAD CHAR:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**CRASH TYPE:** COLL W/MV IN TRANSPORT  
**SURF COND:** ICE/PACKED SNOW  
**LIGHT COND:** DAYLIGHT  
**WEATHER 1:** CLEAR  
**WEATHER 2:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**SYSTEM:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**DIAGRAM:** RIGHT ANGLE  
**OFFICER:**  
**VEH ACT:** STRAIGHT AHEAD  
**VEH TYPE:** PICKUP TRUCK  
**AGE:** 16  
**GENDER:** M  
**COND:** NORMAL  
**CONTEST FACT:** NO IMPROPER DRIVING  
**NO. VEHICLES:** 2.00  

---

**CRASH ID:** 110400149  
**DATE:** 01/07/2011  
**TIME:** 1450  
**SYST:** 16-M  
**ROUTE:** 011500001  
**DIST:** 000+00.110

**SEVERITY:** PROPERTY DAMAGE  
**FIRST EVENT:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**ROAD TYPE:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**ROAD CHAR:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**CRASH TYPE:** COLL W/MV IN TRANSPORT  
**SURF COND:** ICE/PACKED SNOW  
**LIGHT COND:** DAYLIGHT  
**WEATHER 1:** CLEAR  
**WEATHER 2:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**SYSTEM:** NOT SPECIFIED  
**DIAGRAM:** RIGHT ANGLE  
**OFFICER:**  
**VEH ACT:** STRAIGHT AHEAD  
**VEH TYPE:** PICKUP TRUCK  
**AGE:** 16  
**GENDER:** M  
**COND:** NORMAL  
**CONTEST FACT:** NO IMPROPER DRIVING  
**NO. VEHICLES:** 2.00
### Crash ID: 110790043
- **Date:** 02/08/2011
- **Time:** 1007
- **Sys:** 10-W
- **County:** GRANT
- **City:** ASHBY
- **Route:** 01150002 000+00.045

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>PROPERTY DAMAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Event</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Type</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Junction</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Char</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Device</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Type</td>
<td>COLL W/EXPED MY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Cond</td>
<td>ICE/PACKED SNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagram</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Cond</td>
<td>DAYLIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather1</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>BEST GUESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather2</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Vehicles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Unit 1 | | Unit 2 | | Unit 3 | |
|--------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Trac Dir | S | | | |
| Veh Act | BACKING | | | |
| Veh Type | PICKUP TRUCK | | | |
| Age | 81 | | | |
| Gender | M | | | |
| Cond | NOT SPECIFIED | | | |
| Cont Fact | NOT SPECIFIED | | | |
| Cont Fact | NOT SPECIFIED | | | |

### Crash ID: 112620118
- **Date:** 09/13/2011
- **Time:** 0642
- **Sys:** 04-CSAX
- **County:** GRANT
- **City:** ASHBY
- **Route:** 26000010 014+05.435

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>PROPERTY DAMAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Event</td>
<td>ON ROADWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Type</td>
<td>2 LANES UNDIV 2-WAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Junction</td>
<td>NON-JUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Char</td>
<td>STRAIGHT AND LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Device</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Type</td>
<td>COLL W/EXPED MY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Cond</td>
<td>DRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagram</td>
<td>REAR END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Cond</td>
<td>DARK - STREET LIGHTS ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather1</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather2</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Vehicles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Unit 1 | | Unit 2 | | Unit 3 | |
|--------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Trac Dir | S | | | |
| Veh Act | STRAIGHT AHEAD | | | |
| Veh Type | PASSENGER CAR | | | |
| Age | 21 | | | |
| Gender | F | | | |
| Cond | NORMAL | | | |
| Cont Fact | DISTRACTION | | | |
| Cont Fact | IMPROPER LANE | | | |
### Crash ID: 113270039
#### Date: 11/23/2011
#### Time: 0551
#### County: GRANT
#### City:
#### Sys: 04-CSAH
#### Route: 260000402 002+00.240

**Severity:** PROPERTY DAMAGE

**Road Type:** 2 LANES UNDIV 2 WAY

**Road Char:** CURVE AND GRADE

**Crash Type:** OVERTURN / ROLLOVER

**Surf Cond:** OTHER

**Light Cond:** DARK - NO STREET LIGHTS

**Weather 1:** FOG/SMOG/SMOKE

**Weather 2:** NOT SPECIFIED

**First Event:** ON ROADWAY

**To Junction:** T-INTERSECTION

**Traffic Device:** NOT APPLICABLE

**Speed Limit:** 55

**Diagram:** RAM OFF ROAD - RIGHT SIDE

**Officer:**

**Trav Dir:** IN

**Veh Act:** STRAIGHT AHEAD

**Veh Type:** PASSENGER CAR

**Age:** 32

**Gender:** F

**Cond:** NORMAL

**Cont Fact:** ILLEGAL SPEED

**Unit 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cont Fact</th>
<th>WEATHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Crash ID: 122440244
#### Date: 10/09/2012
#### Time: 1748
#### County: GRANT
#### City:
#### Sys: 05-MN
#### Route: 060000078 094+90.573

**Severity:** POSSIBLE INJURY

**Road Type:** 2 LANES UNDIV 2 WAY

**Road Char:** STRAIGHT AND LEVEL

**Crash Type:** COLL W/V/W IN TRANSPORT

**Surf Cond:** DRY

**Light Cond:** DAYLIGHT

**Weather 1:** CLOUDY

**Weather 2:** NOT SPECIFIED

**First Event:** ON ROADWAY

**To Junction:** 4-DRESSED INTERSECTION

**Traffic Device:** STOP SIGN OTHER

**Speed Limit:** 55

**Diagram:** RIGHT ANGLE

**Officer:**

**Trav Dir:** IN

**Veh Act:** STRAIGHT AHEAD

**Veh Type:** VAN OR MINIVAN

**Age:** 73

**Gender:** F

**Cond:** NORMAL

**Cont Fact:** NO IMPROPER DRIVING

**Cont Fact:** NOT SPECIFIED

**Unit 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cont Fact</th>
<th>WEATHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Unit 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Veh Act</th>
<th>STRAIGHT AHEAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veh Type</td>
<td>PICKUP TRUCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cond</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont Fact</td>
<td>FAIL TO YIELD ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont Fact</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit 3**
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**Crash ID:** 131070018  
**Date:** 03/15/2013  
**Time:** 13:30  
**Sys:** 04-CRASH  
**County:** GRANT  
**City:** ASHBY  
**Route:** 26000038  
**001+00.390**

- **Severity:** PROPERTY DAMAGE  
- **First Event:** NOT SPECIFIED  
- **Road Type:** NOT SPECIFIED  
- **To Junction:** NOT SPECIFIED  
- **Road Char:** NOT SPECIFIED  
- **Traffic Device:** OTHER  
- **Crash Type:** COLD W/HY IN TRANSIT  
- **Speed Limit:** 30  
- **Surf Cond:** WET  
- **Diagram:** RIGHT ANGLE  
- **Light Cond:** DAYLIGHT  
- **Officer:**  
- **Weather 1:** CLOUD  
- **Reliability:** CONFIDENT  
- **Weather 2:** NOT SPECIFIED  
- **# of Vehicles:** 2,00

**Unit 1**
- **Trav Dir:** N  
- **Veh Act:** BACKING  
- **Veh Type:** SPORT UTILITY VEHICLE  
- **Age:** 46  
- **Gender:** F  
- **Cond:** NOT SPECIFIED  
- **Cont Fact:** NOT SPECIFIED

**Unit 2**
- **Trav Dir:** S  
- **Veh Act:** STRAIGHT AHEAD  
- **Veh Type:** PICKUP TRUCK  
- **Age:** 23  
- **Gender:** M  
- **Cond:** NOT SPECIFIED  
- **Cont Fact:** NOT SPECIFIED

**Unit 3**
- **Trav Dir:**  
- **Veh Act:**  
- **Veh Type:**  
- **Age:**  
- **Gender:**  
- **Cond:**  
- **Cont Fact:**

**Crash ID:** 131140277  
**Date:** 04/18/2013  
**Time:** 15:43  
**Sys:** 05-CRASH  
**County:** GRANT  
**City:**  
**Route:** 00000078  
**004+50.638**

- **Severity:** PROPERTY DAMAGE  
- **First Event:** ON ROADWAY  
- **Road Type:** 2 LANES UNDIV 2 WAY  
- **To Junction:** NON-JUNCTION  
- **Road Char:** STRAIGHT AND LEVEL  
- **Traffic Device:** NOT APPLICABLE  
- **Crash Type:** COLD W/GUARDRAIL  
- **Speed Limit:** 55  
- **Surf Cond:** WET  
- **Diagram:** Ran Off Road - Left Side  
- **Light Cond:** DAYLIGHT  
- **Officer:**  
- **Weather 1:** SNOW  
- **Reliability:** BEST GUESS  
- **Weather 2:** SEVERE CROSS WINDS  
- **# of Vehicles:** 1.00

**Unit 1**
- **Trav Dir:** EAST  
- **Veh Act:** STRAIGHT AHEAD  
- **Veh Type:** PASSENGER CAR  
- **Age:** 27  
- **Gender:** N  
- **Cond:** NORMAL  
- **Cont Fact:** WEATHER  
- **Cont Fact:** SKIDDING

**Unit 2**
- **Trav Dir:**  
- **Veh Act:**  
- **Veh Type:**  
- **Age:**  
- **Gender:**  
- **Cond:**  
- **Cont Fact:**

**Unit 3**
- **Trav Dir:**  
- **Veh Act:**  
- **Veh Type:**  
- **Age:**  
- **Gender:**  
- **Cond:**  
- **Cont Fact:**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash ID: 233702469</th>
<th>Date: 12/02/2013</th>
<th>Time: 1055</th>
<th>Sys: 09-50</th>
<th>Route: 00000078 094+00.372</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County: GRANT</td>
<td>City:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Severity: PROPERTY DAMAGE  
#### First Event: ON ROADWAY  
#### Road Type: 2 LANES UNDIV 2-WAY  
#### To Junction: 4-LEGGED INTERSECTION  
#### Road Char: STRAIGHT AND LEVEL  
#### Traffic Device: STOP SIGN OTHER  
#### Crash Type: COLL W/W/IN TRANSPORT  
#### Speed Limit: 55  
#### Surf Cond: SNOW  
#### Diagram: RIGHT ANGLE  
#### Light Cond: DAYLIGHT  
#### Officer:  
#### Weather1: SNOW  
#### Reliability: CONFIDENT  
#### Weather2: NOT SPECIFIED  
#### # of Vehicles: 2.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trav Dir:</strong> W</td>
<td><strong>Trav Dir:</strong> N</td>
<td><strong>Trav Dir:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veh Act:</strong> SLOWING TRAFFIC</td>
<td><strong>Veh Act:</strong> STRAIGHT AHEAD</td>
<td><strong>Veh Act:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veh Type:</strong> PICKUP TRUCK</td>
<td><strong>Veh Type:</strong> PICKUP TRUCK</td>
<td><strong>Veh Type:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong> 19</td>
<td><strong>Age:</strong> 32</td>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong> F</td>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong> M</td>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cond:</strong> NORMAL</td>
<td><strong>Cond:</strong> NORMAL</td>
<td><strong>Cond:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong> FAIL TO YIELD ROW</td>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong> NO IMPROPER DRIVING</td>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong> WEATHER</td>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash ID: 23390116</th>
<th>Date: 05/29/2013</th>
<th>Time: 2001</th>
<th>Sys: 10-M</th>
<th>Route: 01150006 000+00.318</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County: GRANT</td>
<td>City: ASKBY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Severity: PROPERTY DAMAGE  
#### First Event: ON ROADWAY  
#### Road Type: 2 LANES UNDIV 2-WAY  
#### To Junction: NON-JUNCTION  
#### Road Char: STRAIGHT AND LEVEL  
#### Traffic Device: NOT APPLICABLE  
#### Crash Type: COLL W/W/IN TRANSPORT  
#### Speed Limit: 30  
#### Surf Cond: DRY  
#### Diagram: RIGHT ANGLE  
#### Light Cond: DAYLIGHT  
#### Officer:  
#### Weather1: CLOUDY  
#### Reliability: CONFIDENT  
#### Weather2: OTHER  
#### # of Vehicles: 2.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trav Dir:</strong> EAST</td>
<td><strong>Trav Dir:</strong> N</td>
<td><strong>Trav Dir:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veh Act:</strong> STRAIGHT AHEAD</td>
<td><strong>Veh Act:</strong> PARKED</td>
<td><strong>Veh Act:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veh Type:</strong> PICKUP TRUCK</td>
<td><strong>Veh Type:</strong> SPORT UTILITY VEHICLE</td>
<td><strong>Veh Type:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong> 24</td>
<td><strong>Age:</strong> 45</td>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong> M</td>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong> F</td>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cond:</strong> NORMAL</td>
<td><strong>Cond:</strong> NORMAL</td>
<td><strong>Cond:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong> NO IMPROPER DRIVING</td>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong> UNSAFE BACKING</td>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong> NO IMPROPER DRIVING</td>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong> FAIL TO YIELD ROW</td>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trav Dir:</strong></td>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veh Act:</strong></td>
<td>START TRAFFIC</td>
<td>STRAIGHT AHEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veh Type:</strong></td>
<td>SPORT UTILITY VEHICLE</td>
<td>TRUCK WITH 1 TRAILER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cond:</strong></td>
<td>UNDER THE INFLUENCE</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong></td>
<td>FAIL TO YIELD ROW</td>
<td>NO IMPROPER DRIVING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cont Fact:</strong></td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analyst:** Andrew Barlow
Promoting Health in Minnesota Schools:

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

As society becomes more aware of and concerned with children’s health issues, communities are turning to their schools to provide an environment that promotes both healthy eating and physical activity.¹ School policies supporting healthy eating and physical activity are an important component of school efforts to promote the health and wellbeing of school children. Good nutrition and physical activity help “contribute to improved academic performance, attendance rates, behavior, and lifelong health and well-being.”² Policies supporting Safe Routes to School can encourage children to be more physically active by encouraging active transportation to and from school through biking and walking.

What is Safe Routes to School?

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) is a movement focused on increasing the number of children who walk or bike to school.³ Safe Routes to School initiatives can include both policies and programs that support safe, efficient, and enjoyable opportunities for children to walk or bike to and from school.⁴

Local policies supporting SRTS may include:

- School wellness policies.
- Speed zone limits around schools.
- Local land use planning and zoning requirements that address school siting, crosswalks, and street design.
- Active School Day policies.
- Safe Routes to School plan.

A school’s SRTS programs may include:

- Walking and/or biking maps.
- Consolidated bus pick-up points.
- Remote pick-up and drop-off locations.
- Bike and pedestrian curriculum.
- Walking school bus.
- Safe Routes to School Day.

- Designated team of stakeholders.
- Bicycle parking.
- Hand tallies to assess usage of various modes of student transportation.
- Hazard or zero-mile busing to transport children past areas unsafe for walking or biking.
Safe Routes to School policies and programs are often designed to remove barriers that may prevent children from walking or biking to and from school, including:

- A lack of safe infrastructure (such as sidewalks, cross-walks, or crossing guards) and other safety issues.
- A lack of programs that promote walking and biking through education and encouragement programs aimed at children, parents, and the community.
- A lack of cooperation between local stakeholders (school districts, cities, counties, or townships).
- A general fear of “liability” for injuries or other unwanted incidents.

**Why is Safe Routes to School important?**

Safe Routes to School can play a critical role in reversing the nationwide trend of childhood inactivity. In addition, SRTS efforts can help relieve traffic congestion around school zones, improve air quality, reduce accidents, and help improve a community’s quality of life. Safe Routes to School initiatives benefit local neighborhoods by supporting the health and well-being of children, parents, neighbors, plants, animals, and the environment.

**Do any federal or Minnesota laws require a Safe Routes to School initiative?**

No. However, while neither federal nor Minnesota law require SRTS, both provide support for SRTS initiatives. Federal support for SRTS initiatives includes funding for state departments of transportation to develop SRTS programs. Financial assistance is then awarded to schools by a state department of transportation through a competitive grant program.

A separate Minnesota SRTS program was created to provide additional “assistance in capital investments for safe and appealing non-motorized transportation to and from a school.” Financial assistance from Minnesota’s SRTS Program is intended to supplement or replace aid for infrastructure projects funded through the federal program. This program is in development; it first received funding from the Minnesota bonding bill that was passed in May 2013. The Minnesota Department of Health also supports SRTS by providing funding through its Statewide Health Improvement Program (SHIP) Active Living Strategy. In the first three years of SHIP, 215 schools that serve 143,000 students created SRTS programs.

**Does the Minnesota School Boards Association (MSBA) Model Wellness Policy address Safe Routes to School?**

No, not specifically.

**Could existing MSBA policies be used to support the creation and management of Safe Routes to School?**

Yes. The MSBA has several model policies that could be used to support the creation and management of a Safe Routes to School program, such as:

- 707 (Transportation of Public School Students)
- 708 (Transportation of Nonpublic School Students)
- 709 (Student Transportation Safety Policy & Notification Forms)
- 710 (Extracurricular Transportation)
How can Minnesota schools incorporate Safe Routes to School into a school wellness policy?

The following language can be incorporated into a school board policy that follows the MSBA’s model. This language can also be individually tailored to fit into a school board policy that does not follow the MSBA model policy.

Addition to the MSBA School Wellness Policy

533. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL POLICY

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to provide the criteria that students, parents/guardians, and employees need to follow when biking, walking, or using other forms of active transportation to and from school. Biking, walking, and other forms of active transportation promote student and adult well-being by integrating more physical activity into a daily routine and provide active living skills and healthy habits that will last a lifetime.

In supporting active transportation to and from school:

- The district supports biking and walking as transportation as long as students and employees can do so safely.
- Students, parents/guardians, and employees have a responsibility to follow the laws and rules for safe walking, biking, and driving to ensure the safety of all road users - pedestrians, bikers, and motorists.
- The school district assumes no liability for injury or damage resulting from individuals biking or walking to school.

II. GUIDELINES

A. General

1. The school district will facilitate all schools developing a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) plan that incorporates action items from all “5 E’s” (evaluation, engineering, education, encouragement, and enforcement).16

2. The school district will integrate SRTS strategies into district-wide and individual school wellness policies.

3. The school district will assess and, to the extent possible, make any necessary improvements to make it safer and easier for students to walk and bike to and from school. When appropriate, the district will work together with local public works, public safety, and/or police departments in those efforts. The school district will explore the availability of federal and state funds to finance such improvements.

4. The school district will form a school-community planning team that includes students, parent-teacher organizations, local public health representatives, school administrators, law enforcement representatives, city and/or county transportation engineers, city and/or county planners, city and/or county elected officials, fire/EMS representatives, neighborhood association representatives, and parents or other community volunteers.

5. The school district will encourage health and wellness councils at the school district and school level to advance SRTS goals and support successful, ongoing implementation.

6. The school district will encourage walking and biking to and from school based on age-appropriate standards for students living within certain distances of the school.

7. The school district will provide parents with information on the health benefits of walking and biking to and from school.
8. The school district will work with the appropriate local government authorities to ensure that sidewalks and/or bike paths exist to provide connectivity among neighborhoods and to allow safe access to recreation centers, libraries, and other after-school destinations.

9. The school district assumes no responsibility to ensure that students are trained in pedestrian or bike safety. Parents and guardians are expected to teach students the traffic safety laws and school district rules outlined in this policy.

B. Biking

1. The school district supports students, parents/guardians, and employees using biking as transportation as long as the bikers live within a comfortable biking distance for their level of skill, follow traffic safety laws, and use appropriate safety equipment, including a properly fitted helmet.

2. Children in 3rd grade and below are unlikely to have the developmental and judgment skills for unsupervised biking. These children should be accompanied by an adult when biking to or from school.

3. While on school grounds with a bike, students must comply with traffic safety laws and the following rules:
   a. Bikers must exercise caution around motor vehicles and pedestrian students. Bikers must walk bikes on school sidewalks when others are present.
   b. Bikes must be parked in the racks provided.
   c. Students are encouraged to bring and use bike locks.
   d. Helmets must be stored in a locker or backpack, or locked to a bike.
   e. Students must respect the personal property of others and not interfere with other bikes. This includes stealing bikes or equipment, unlocking quick releases, touching helmets locked to bikes, or any other action that would damage property.

C. Walking

1. The school district supports students, parents/guardians, and employees walking to and from school, as long as the individuals live within a comfortable walking distance.

2. The school district recommends that students in 3rd grade and below walk with adult supervision.

3. Walkers must obey traffic safety laws and always use their common sense and good judgment.
   a. If available, students, parents/guardians, and employees should use cross walks where painted.
   b. Before crossing, look left, right, and left again to make sure the road is clear. Continue looking while you cross and listen for traffic.
   c. Walkers should not cross the street from between parked cars.

What other ways can schools support Safe Routes to School initiatives?

In Minnesota, the superintendent is responsible for implementing and enforcing school board policy. Superintendents issue protocols, procedures, and guidelines to help implement the school board’s policies. The following language can be incorporated into existing guidelines. However, as school boards and superintendents may adopt more specific or general guidelines based on their needs and goals, policy language can be interchangeable with the guidelines listed below.
**Safe Routes to School Guidelines**

- Students, faculty, and staff are encouraged and supported to safely walk or bike to and from school as often as possible.\(^{17}\)
- Elementary schools will provide crossing guards near the school.\(^{18}\)
- Schools will work with the community, including school board members, parents, and local public works, community planning, and public safety agencies, to create ways for students to walk, bike, rollerblade, or skateboard safely to and from school.\(^{19}\)
- All schools will provide biking and walking safety education to students, parents, and faculty.\(^{20}\)
- Basic biking and walking safety will be taught when bus safety is taught.
- The school district will participate in national activity campaigns, like Kids Walk to School, Screen-Free Week, Bike to School Day, and International Walk to School Day.
- All schools will provide bike racks on the school campus.\(^{21}\) Bikes must be locked to school-provided racks when left unattended.\(^{22}\)
- The school district will develop a walking school bus and remote drop-off program at the elementary level.
- All schools will provide maps showing safe routes for students to walk and bike to and from school.\(^{23}\)
- Elementary school students living less than ___ mile(s) away from the closest school in their district, and middle and high school students living less than ___ mile(s) from the closest school in their district, will be encouraged to walk or bike to and from school.\(^{24}\)
- Transportation or an adult escort will be provided to students whose route to school has been surveyed and determined not to be reasonably safe for walking or biking.\(^{25}\)
- All persons on school grounds riding a bike, other pedal-powered vehicle, scooter, or any other device associated with a significant risk of causing a head injury will wear a safety helmet that meets the standards of the federal Consumer Product Safety Commission.\(^{26}\)
- Health education and physical education curricula will include topics of pedestrian and biker safety and traffic rules at appropriate grade levels.\(^{27}\)
- Schools will conduct hand tallies to measure the number of students biking, walking, and arriving in motor vehicle transit for assessment purposes.

**Are there any other resources that may be helpful in implementing Safe Routes to School?**

Yes. Several resources are available that can assist with implementing an SRTS program. These include:

- **Public Health Law Center**
• Minnesota Department of Transportation, Safe Routes to School Program,
  http://www.dot.state.mn.us/saferoutes/

• Minnesota Department of Health, Safe Routes to School Program,
  http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/oshii/srts/

• National Center for Safe Routes to School
  • Plan the Event, http://www.walkbiketoschool.org/get-set/plan-the-event

• Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Walk-to-School Program,
  http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/kidswalk/pdf/kidswalk_programs_3_31_06.pdf

• Michigan Department of Transportation, Effectively Planning and Implementing Safe Routes to School for Students with Disabilities,
  http://saferoutesmichigan.org/userfiles/files/Resources/papers_and_presentations/sr2s_papers/EX_SUMMARY_SRTS_for_Students_with_Disabilities_FINAL.pdf

---

Last updated June 2013.
This publication was prepared by the Public Health Law Center at William Mitchell College of Law, St. Paul, Minnesota, made possible with funding from the Minnesota Department of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The Public Health Law Center provides information and technical assistance on issues related to public health. The Public Health Law Center does not provide legal representation or advice. This document should not be considered legal advice. For specific legal questions, consult with an attorney.
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**APPENDIX F: MINNESOTA SRTS MODEL POLICIES TIP SHEET**

## EDUCAATION

### EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEGINNER</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Safety Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our school requires a comprehensive education curriculum with a focus on traffic safety education and active transportation skills. The curriculum shall include:</td>
<td>In addition to the policy above, our school shall host a traffic safety education and active transportation skills workshop with the Bicycle Alliance of Minnesota at the beginning of each school year to train and educate teachers and school personnel on using the Minnesota Walk! Bike! Fun! Pedestrian and Bicycle Curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementing the Minnesota Walk! Bike! Fun! Pedestrian and Bicycle Curriculum for all students age 5-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conducting pedestrian safety workshops for all students in grades K-2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hosting bicycle skills and safety workshops for all students in 5th grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hosting ‘How to use public transit’ classes in 6th grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promoting safe-driving skills to 10th graders, with an emphasis on avoiding injuries to pedestrian and bicyclists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCAL EDUCATION SUCCESS:** The Arrowhead Regional Development Commission (ARDC) implemented the Helmet Hero program in 2007. 3rd grade students throughout northeast Minnesota receive 30-45 minutes of in-class instruction on bicycle safety, as well as receive a helmet at no charge. Rewards are then given to students seen using their helmets.
EVALUATION

Beginner

Establishing a School Team

Our school shall establish a Safe Routes to School Task Force to develop and implement strategies grounded in the "Five E's" that address Safe Routes to School planning, funding, and policies. Specifically, the Task Force shall:

- Evaluate current SRTS policies to determine 1) whether they are being fully implemented, 2) how to improve implementation, and 3) what is needed to improve the policies' success
- Ensure that Safe Routes to School resources are distributed equitably in the school
- Identify and pursue funding opportunities.

In the first year of its formation, the Task Force shall meet every two months. Thereafter, it shall meet quarterly.

Data Collection

The Task Force shall coordinate annual SRTS data collection. This collection process may include:

- SRTS Student Travel Mode Tallies
- SRTS Parent Surveys on Transportation Preferences and Concerns
- Walk Audits and Maps of Active Transportation Routes
- Plotting student addresses with assistance from local GIS departments
**ENCOURAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEGINNER</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Minimize Driving**
Because automobile collisions are a leading cause of death among school-aged children, we support efforts to increase traffic safety by minimizing driving to and from school. Decreasing the number of automobile trips, whether by engaging active transportation, taking public transportation, or carpooling, will reduce automobile congestion and create a safer environment for active transportation.

**Walking School Bus and Bike Trains**
Our school will establish and promote regular Walking School Bus or Bicycle Train programs. Such programs shall occur on a regular basis, at least once per week.

**Arrival and Dismissal**
Our school recognizes that promoting student safety is especially critical during arrival and dismissal times due to 1) increased automobile and bus traffic volume, and 2) the potential for conflicts between different modes of transportation. Accordingly, our school will separate active transportation from the other forms of transportation, to the extent possible. To achieve this end, one or more of the following strategies must be adopted:
- Remote drop-off locations
- Car-free zones
- Carpool lanes for drop-offs and pick-ups
- Early dismissal for active transporters

**Busing**
Our school acknowledges that busing may play a significant role in supporting student learning and meeting educational and equity objectives. However, we also support integrating active transportation into our existing busing policies. Options may include:
- Voluntary or mandatory remote drop-offs for buses
- Safe Routes to Bus Stops programs
- Training for bus drivers on how to drive safely on routes frequented by users of active transportation (e.g., biking, walking)

**LOCAL ENCOURAGEMENT SUCCESS:** Minneapolis Public Schools are encouraged to implement **Bus Stop & Walk programs**. With Bus Stop & Walk, school buses unload away from the school campus and walk along a designated route to school together to complete their trip. Learn about **Loring Community School’s** Bus Stop & Walk program here.

—
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ENFORCEMENT

BEGINNER INTERMEDIATE INTERMEDIATE

Law Enforcement Partnership
On an annual basis, our school provide our SRTS Plan and policies to our local public safety and police departments. Our school shall partner with these agencies to ensure that they 1) understand the details of this policy, 2) provide rigorous traffic safety enforcement in the vicinity of schools, and 3) understand the rights and responsibilities of those engaging in active transportation.

Crossing Guards
Our school, in partnership with the administrator of the crossing guard program, shall work together to implement an effective process for hiring, funding, training, locating, supervising, and properly equipping crossing guards. If the number of crossing guards at our school is insufficient, we shall, in partnership with the crossing guard agency, seek additional funding or resources to increase the number of crossing guards.

No Idling
Our school acknowledges that motor vehicles idling on or near campus increase air pollution, negatively affecting the health of everyone in the vicinity of the school. Accordingly, our school prohibits all motor vehicles from idling on campus. "No Idling" signs shall be posted on campus to alert drivers of this policy. In extreme weather, bus drivers will be allowed to wait in a temperature-controlled room until students are dismissed.

LOCAL ENFORCEMENT SUCCESS: The Minneapolis City Council adopted an Anti-Idling Vehicle Ordinance for the city in June 2008. The ordinance is enforced with educational warning tickets and flyers disseminated to families through the local schools. The local Metro Transit agency stated that the new ordinance will save the public transit buses nearly 66,000 gallons of gasoline each year.

LOCAL ENFORCEMENT SUCCESS: In 2008, The Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council (MIC) worked with the Duluth Police Department to conduct a training session for Duluth school staff on how to properly issue parking tickets to motor vehicles parked illegally in bus zones.
## ENGINEERING

### BEGINNER

**Assessing Routes**

Our school will perform an annual walk audit to:
1) assess traffic and safety conditions in the vicinity of the school,
2) identify safety conditions needing mitigation, and, based on those assessments,
3) begin to identify recommended active transportation routes to school. Findings will be shared with the appropriate entities to mitigate concerns and hazards. Maps will be produced that:
1) identify the hazards or travel conditions needing mitigation,
2) show recommended routes from surrounding neighborhoods.

### INTERMEDIATE

**Bike Parking**

Our school shall provide sufficient storage facilities for bicycles, scooters, skateboards, or similar devices to encourage active transportation. The quantity of storage facilities will increase in proportion to demand, and we will seek input from active transportation advocates to ensure that the quality and quantity of facilities is satisfactory.

To ensure convenience and protection from theft or vandalism, storage facilities shall be located in visible areas, near school entrances, and when deemed appropriate, in locked facilities. All storage facilities shall provide protection from the elements. Our school will also provide repair tools such as air pumps and other common tools to help students repair minor equipment failures.

### ADVANCED

**School Travel Plans**

Our school will adopt a School Travel Plan that addresses all modes of active transportation and related safety, access, and parking issues. The plans shall also include goals, strategies, and objectives for increasing active transportation among students and staff, including those with disabilities. At a minimum, the School Travel Plan shall contain a map identifying the school, streets surrounding the school, existing traffic controls, established pedestrian and bicycle routes, pedestrian crossings, school and municipal bus routes and bus stops, with the goal of minimizing risk of injury and maximizing safety and convenience for active transportation.

School travel plans shall be updated regularly with input from various stakeholders and should seek opportunities to incorporate the Travel Plan into local municipalities' comprehensive plans.

---

**LOCAL ENGINEERING SUCCESS:** In 2009, the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission (ARDC) worked with the Fond du Lac Reservation and the Ojibwe School to develop a SRTS Travel Plan. In 2010, the Fond du Lac Reservation incorporated the Travel Plan into their comprehensive plan, and secured funding for a multi-use path in 2013. According to Jason Hollinday, the Director of Planning at ARDC, the SRTS planning process was an important factor in being awarded the Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds to implement the trail project.

**LOCAL ENGINEERING SUCCESS:** In 2012, the City of Brooklyn Center received a grant to create a SRTS Plan. The Plan established prioritized routes and engineering recommendations. The City of Brooklyn Center incorporated some of the upgrades and improvements into plans for reconstruction projects. The City’s Public Works Director and City Engineer, Steve Lilkehaug, has since successfully used the Plan to receive Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding from the Metropolitan Council.

**Resources:**
- [www.changelabsolutions.org/safe-routes/welcome](http://www.changelabsolutions.org/safe-routes/welcome)
- [www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/pdf/EducatorsGuide.pdf](http://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/pdf/EducatorsGuide.pdf)
- [www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/373691](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/373691)
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709 STUDENT TRANSPORTATION SAFETY POLICY (Ashby Public School)

[Note: School districts are required by statute to have a policy addressing these issues.]

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to provide safe transportation for students and to educate students on safety issues and the responsibilities of school bus ridership.

II. PLAN FOR STUDENT TRANSPORTATION SAFETY TRAINING

A. School Bus Safety Week

The school district may designate a school bus safety week. The National School Bus Safety Week is the third week in October.

B. Student Training

1. The school district shall provide students enrolled in grades kindergarten (K) through 10 with age-appropriate school bus safety training of the following concepts:
   a. transportation by school bus is a privilege, not a right;
   b. school district policies for student conduct and school bus safety;
   c. appropriate conduct while on the bus;
   d. the danger zones surrounding a school bus;
   e. procedures for safely boarding and leaving a school bus;
   f. procedures for safe vehicle lane crossing; and
   g. school bus evacuation and other emergency procedures.

2. All students in grades K through 6 who are transported by school bus and are enrolled during the first or second week of school must receive the school bus safety training by the end of the third week of school. All students in grades 7 through 10 who are transported by school bus and are enrolled during the first or second week of school must receive the school bus safety...
training by the end of the sixth week of school, if they have not received school bus training in grades K through 6. Students in grades K through 10 who enroll in a school after the second week of school, are transported by school bus, and have not received training in their previous school districts shall undergo school bus safety training or receive bus safety instructional materials within four weeks of their first day of attendance.

3. The school district must provide students enrolled in grades K through 3 school bus safety training twice during the school year.

4. Students in grades 9 and 10 must receive training in the laws and proper procedures for operating a motor vehicle in the vicinity of a school bus.

5. The school district will make reasonable accommodations in training for students known to speak English as a second language and students with disabilities.

6. The school district may provide kindergarten students with school bus safety training before the first day of school.

7. The school district may provide student safety education for bicycling and pedestrian safety for students in grades K through 5.

8. The school district shall adopt and make available for public review a curriculum for transportation safety education.

9. Nonpublic school students transported by the school district will receive school bus safety training by their nonpublic school. The nonpublic schools may use the school district's school transportation safety education curriculum. Nonpublic schools must certify to the school district's transportation safety director that all students enrolled in grades K through 10 have received the appropriate training.

III. CONDUCT ON SCHOOL BUSES AND CONSEQUENCES FOR MISBEHAVIOR

A. Riding the school bus is a privilege, not a right. The school district's general student behavior rules are in effect for students on school buses.

B. Consequences for school bus/bus stop misconduct will be imposed by the school district under adopted administrative discipline procedures. In addition, all school bus/bus stop misconduct will be reported to the school district's transportation safety director. Serious misconduct may be reported to local law enforcement.

1. **School Bus and Bus Stop Rules.** The school district's school bus safety rules are to be posted on every bus. If these rules are broken, the school district's discipline procedures are to be followed. Consequences are progressive and may include suspension of bus privileges. It is the school bus driver's
responsibility to report unacceptable behavior to the school district's Transportation Office/School Office.

2. **Rules at the Bus Stop**
   
a. Get to your bus stop five minutes before your scheduled pick up time. The school bus driver will not wait for late students.

   b. Respect the property of others while waiting at your bus stop.
   
c. Keep your arms, legs and belongings to yourself.
   
d. Use appropriate language.
   
e. Stay away from the street, road or highway when waiting for the bus.
   
f. Wait until the bus stops before approaching the bus.
   
g. After getting off the bus, move away from the bus.
   
h. If you must cross the street, always cross in front of the bus where the driver can see you. Wait for the driver to signal to you before crossing the street.
   
i. No fighting, harassment, intimidation or horseplay.
   
j. No use of alcohol, tobacco or drugs.

3. **Rules on the Bus**
   
a. Immediately follow the directions of the driver.
   
b. Sit in your seat facing forward.
   
c. Talk quietly and use appropriate language.
   
d. Keep all parts of your body inside the bus.
   
e. Keep your arms, legs and belongings to yourself.
   
f. No fighting, harassment, intimidation or horseplay.
   
g. Do not throw any object.
   
h. No eating, chinking or use of tobacco or drugs.
   
i. Do not bring any weapons or dangerous objects on the school bus.
   
j. Do not damage the school bus.
4. **Consequences**

   a. Consequences for school bus/bus stop misconduct will apply to all regular and late routes. Decisions regarding a student's ability to ride the bus in connection with curricular and extracurricular events (for example, field trips or competitions) will be in the sole discretion of the school district. Parents or guardians will be notified of any suspension of bus privileges.

   (1) **Elementary (K-6)**

      1st offense - warning  
      2nd offense - 3 school-day suspension from riding the bus  
      3rd offense - 5 school-day suspension from riding the bus  
      4th offense - 10 school-day suspension from riding the bus/meeting with parent  

      Further offenses - individually considered. Students may be suspended for longer periods of time, including the remainder of the school year.

   (2) **Secondary (7-12)**

      1st offense - warning  
      2nd offense - 5 school-day suspension from riding the bus  
      3rd offense - 10 school-day suspension from riding the bus  
      4th offense - 20 school-day suspension from riding the bus/meeting with parent  
      5th offense - suspended from riding the bus for the remainder of the school year

   Note: When any student goes 60 transportation days without a report, the student's consequences may start over at the first offense.

   (3) **Other Discipline**

      Based on the severity of a student's conduct, more serious consequences may be imposed at any time. Depending on the nature of the offense, consequences such as suspension or expulsion from school also may result from school bus/bus stop misconduct.

   (4) **Records**

      Records of school bus/bus stop misconduct will be forwarded to the individual school building and will be retained in the same manner as other student discipline records. Reports of student misbehavior on a school bus or in a bus-loading or unloading area that causes an immediate and substantial danger to the student or
surrounding persons or property will be provided by the school district to the Department of Public Safety in accordance with state and federal law.

(5) **Vandalism/Bus Damage**

Students damaging school buses will be responsible for the damages. Failure to pay such damages (or make arrangements to pay) within two weeks may result in the loss of bus privileges until damages are paid.

(6) **Notice**

School bus and bus stop rules and consequences for violations of these rules will be reviewed with students annually and copies of these rules will be made available to students. School bus rules are to be posted on each school bus.

(7) **Criminal Conduct**

In cases involving criminal conduct (for example, assault, weapons, possession or vandalism), the appropriate school district personnel and local law enforcement officials will be informed.

**IV. PARENT AND GUARDIAN INVOLVEMENT**

A. **Parent and Guardian Notification**

The school district school bus and bus stop rules will be provided to each family. Parents and guardians are asked to review the rules with their children.

B. **Parents/Guardians Responsibilities for Transportation Safety**

Parents/Guardians are responsible to:

1. Become familiar with school district rules, policies, regulations, and the principles of school bus safety, and thoroughly review them with their children;

2. Support safe riding and walking practices, and recognize that students are responsible for their actions;
3. Communicate safety concerns to their school administrators;
4. Monitor bus stops, if possible;
5. Have their children to the bus stop five minutes before the bus arrives;
6. Have their children properly dressed for the weather; and
7. Have a plan in case the bus is late.

V. SCHOOL BUS DRIVER DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A. School bus drivers shall have a valid Class A, B, or C Minnesota driver's license with a school bus endorsement. A person possessing a valid driver's license, without a school bus endorsement, may drive a vehicle with a seating capacity of 10 or fewer persons used as a school bus, but not outwardly equipped or identified as a school bus as set forth in Section VII.B., below. Drivers with a valid Class D driver's license, without a school bus endorsement, may operate a "Type A" school bus as set forth in Section VII.C., below.

B. The school district shall conduct mandatory drug and alcohol testing of all school district bus drivers and bus driver applicants in accordance with state and federal law and school district policy.

VI. SCHOOL BUS DRIVER TRAINING

A. Training

All new school bus drivers shall be provided with pre-service training, including in-vehicle (actual driving) instruction before transporting students and shall meet the competency testing specified in the Minnesota Department of Public Safety Model School Bus Driver Training Manual. All school bus drivers shall receive in-service training annually. The school district shall retain on file an annual individual school bus driver "evaluation certification" form for each school district driver as contained in the Model School Bus Driver Training Manual.

[Note: The Model School Bus Driver Training Manual is available online through the Minnesota Department of Public Safety State Patrol webpage.]

B. Evaluation

School bus drivers with a Class D license will be evaluated annually and all other bus drivers will be assessed periodically for the following competencies:

1. Safely operate the type of school bus the driver will be driving;
2. Understand student behavior, including issues relating to students with disabilities;

3. Ensure orderly conduct of students on the bus and handling incidents of misconduct appropriately;

4. Know and understand relevant laws, rules of the road and local school bus safety policies;

5. Handle emergency situations; and

6. Safely load and unload students.

The evaluation must include completion of an individual "school bus driver evaluation form" (road test evaluation) as contained in the Model School Bus Driver Training Manual.

VII. OPERATING RULES AND PROCEDURES

A. General Operating Rules

1. School buses shall be operated in accordance with state traffic and school bus safety laws and the procedures contained in the Minnesota Department of Public Safety Model School Bus Driver Training Manual.

[Note: The Model School Bus Driver Training Manual is available online through the Minnesota Department of Public Safety State Patrol web page.]

2. Only students assigned to the school bus by the school district shall be transported. The number of students or other authorized passengers transported in a school bus shall not be more than the legal capacity for the bus. No person shall be allowed to stand when the bus is in motion.

3. The parent/guardian may designate, pursuant to school district policy, a day care facility, respite care facility, the residence of a relative or the residence of a person chosen by the parent or guardian as the address of the student for transportation purposes. The address must be in the attendance area of the assigned school and meet all other eligibility requirements.

4. Bus drivers must minimize, to the extent practical, the idling of school bus engines and exposure of children to diesel exhaust fumes.

5. Bus drivers must park and load school buses at a sufficient distance from school air-intake systems to avoid diesel fumes from being drawn into the systems.

[Note: A school district is not required to comply with Section VILA.5. if the school board determine that alternative locations block traffic, impair student safety, or are not cost effective.]

B. Type III Vehicles
1. Type III vehicles are restricted to passenger cars, station wagons, vans, and buses having a maximum manufacturer's rated seating capacity of 10 or fewer people including the driver and a gross vehicle weight rating of 10,000 pounds or less. A van or bus converted to a seating capacity of 10 or fewer and placed in service on or after August 1, 1999, must have been originally manufactured to comply with the passenger safety standards.

2. Type III vehicles must be painted a color other than national school bus yellow.

3. Type III vehicles shall be state inspected in accordance with legal requirements.

4. A Type III vehicle cannot be older than 12 years old unless excepted by state and federal law.

5. If a Type III vehicle is school district owned, the school district name will be clearly marked on the side of the vehicle. The Type III vehicle must not have the words "school bus" in any location on the exterior of the vehicle or in any interior location visible to a motorist.

6. A "Type III school bus" and "Type III Head Start bus" must not be outwardly equipped and identified as a Type A, B, C, or D bus.

7. Eight-lamp warning systems and stop arms must not be installed or used on Type III vehicles.

8. Type III vehicles must be equipped with mirrors as required by law.

9. Any Type III vehicle may not stop traffic and may not load or unload before making a complete stop and disengaging gears by shifting into neutral or park. Any Type III vehicle used to transport students must not load or unload so that a pupil has to cross the road, except where not possible or impractical, then the driver or assistant must escort a pupil across the road. If the driver escorts the student across the road, then the motor must be stopped, the ignition key removed, the brakes set, and the vehicle otherwise rendered immobile.

10. Any Type III vehicle used to transport students must carry emergency equipment including:

   a. Fire extinguisher. A minimum of one 10BC rated dry chemical type fire extinguisher is required. The extinguisher must be
mounted in a bracket, and must be located in the driver’s compartment and be readily accessible to the driver and passengers. A pressure indicator is required and must be easily read without removing the extinguisher from its mounted position.

b. First aid kit and body fluids cleanup kit. A minimum of a ten-unit first aid kit and a body fluids cleanup kit is required. They must be contained in removable, moisture- and dust-proof containers mounted in an accessible place within the driver's compartment and must be marked to indicate their identity and location.

c. A Type III bus must contain at least three red reflectorized triangle road warning devices. Liquid burning "pot type" flares are not allowed.

d. Passenger cars and station wagons may carry a fire extinguisher, a first aid kit, and warning triangles in the trunk or trunk area of the vehicle if a label in the driver and front passenger area clearly indicates the location of these items.

11. Students will not be regularly transported in private vehicles that are not state inspected as Type III vehicles. Only emergency, unscheduled transportation may be conducted in vehicles with a seating capacity of 10 or fewer without meeting the requirements for a Type III vehicle. The school district has no system of inspection for private vehicles.

12. All drivers of Type III vehicles will be licensed drivers and will be familiar with the use of required emergency equipment. The school district will not knowingly allow a person to operate a Type III vehicle if the person has been convicted of an offense that disqualifies the person from operating a school bus.

C. Type A-II "Activity" Buses Driven by Employees with Class D Driver's License

1. The holder of a Class D driver's license, without a school bus endorsement, may operate a Type A-II school bus under the following conditions:

a. The operator is an employee of the school district or an independent contractor with whom the school district contracts for the school bus and is not solely hired to provide transportation services under this paragraph.

b. The operator drives the school bus only from points of origin to points of destination, not including home-to-school trips to pick up or drop off students.
c. The operator is prohibited from using the eight-light system.

d. The operator has submitted to a background check and physical examination as required by Minn. Stat. § 171.321, Subd. 2.

e. The operator has a valid driver's license and has not sustained a conviction of a disqualifying offense as set forth in Minn. Stat. § 171.02, Subd. 2a(b).

f. The operator has been trained in the proper use of child safety restraints as set forth in the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's "Guideline for the Safe Transportation of Preschool Age Children in School Buses" in addition to the training required in Part VI., above.

2. The school district shall maintain annual certification of the requirements listed in this section for each Class D license operator.

3. A school bus operated under this section must bear a current certificate of inspection.

4. The word "School" on the front and rear of the bus must be covered by a sign that reads "Activities" when the bus is being operated under authority of this section.

VIII. SCHOOL DISTRICT EMERGENCY PROCEDURES

A. If possible, school bus drivers or their supervisors shall call "911" or the local emergency phone number in the event of a serious emergency.

B. School bus drivers shall meet the emergency training requirements contained in Unit III "Crash & Emergency Preparedness" of the Minnesota Department of Public Safety Model School Bus Driver Training Manual. This includes procedures in the event of a crash (accident).

[Note: The Model School Bus Driver Training Manual is available online through the Minnesota Department of Public Safety State Patrol webpage.]

C. School bus drivers and bus assistants for special education students requiring special transportation service because of their handicapping condition shall be trained in basic first aid procedures, shall within one month after the effective date of assignment participate in a program of in-service training on the proper methods for dealing with the specific needs and problems of pupils with disabilities, assist pupils with disabilities on and off the bus when necessary for their safe ingress and egress from the bus; and ensure that protective safety devices are in use and fastened properly.
D. Emergency Health Information shall be maintained on the school bus for students requiring special transportation service because of their handicapping condition. The information shall state:

1. the pupil's name and address;
2. the nature of the pupil's disabilities;
3. emergency health care information; and
4. the names and telephone numbers of the pupil's physician, parents, guardians, or custodians, and some person other than the pupil's parents or custodians who can be contacted in case of an emergency.

IX. SCHOOL DISTRICT VEHICLE MAINTENANCE STANDARDS

A. All school vehicles shall be maintained in safe operating conditions through a systematic preventive maintenance and inspection program adopted or approved by the school district.

B. All school vehicles shall be state inspected in accordance with legal requirements.

C. A copy of the current daily pre-trip inspection report must be carried in the bus. Daily pre-trip inspections shall be maintained on file in accordance with the school district's record retention schedule. Prompt reports of defects to be immediately corrected will be submitted.

D. Daily post-trip inspections shall be performed to check for filly children or lost items remaining on the bus and for vandalism.

X. SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY DIRECTOR

The school board has designated an individual to serve as the school district's school transportation safety director. The school transportation safety director shall have day-to-day responsibility for pupil transportation safety, including transportation of nonpublic school children when provided by the school district. The school transportation safety director will assure that this policy is periodically reviewed to ensure that it conforms to law. The school transportation safety director shall certify annually to the school board that each school bus driver meets the school bus driver training competencies required by Minn. Stat. § 171.321, Subd. 4. The transportation safety director also shall annually verify or ensure that the private contractor utilized by the school has verified the validity of the driver's license of each person who transports students for the school district with the National Driver's Register or the Department of Public Safety. The school transportation safety director also shall confirm annually to the superintendent that students have received school bus safety training in accordance with state law. The name, address and telephone number of the school transportation safety director are on file in the school district office. Any questions regarding student transportation or this policy may be addressed to the school transportation safety director.
**Legal References:**

Minn. Stat. § 123B.42 (Textbooks; Individual Instructor or Cooperative Learning Material; Standard Tests)
Minn. Stat. § 123B.885 (Diesel School Buses; Operation of Engine; Parking)
Minn. Stat. § 123B.90 (School Bus Safety Training)
Minn. Stat. § 123B.91 (School District Bus Safety Responsibilities) Minn. Stat. § 169.01, Subd. 6(5) (Definitions)
Minn. Stat. § 169.454 (Type III Vehicle Standards)
Minn. Stat. § 169.4582 (Reportable Offense on School Buses)
Minn. Stat. § 171.02, Subd. 2a (Licenses; Types, Endorsements, Restrictions)
Minn. Stat. § 171.321 (Qualifications of a School Bus Driver)
Minn. Rules Part 7470.1000-7470.1700 (School Bus Inspection)

**Cross References:**

MSBA/MASA Model Policy 416 (Drug and Alcohol Testing)
MSBA/MASA Model Policy 707 (Transportation of Public Students)
MSBA/MASA Model Policy 708 (Transportation of Nonpublic Students)
MSBA/MASA Model Policy 710 (Extracurricular Transportation)
I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to assure a school environment that promotes and protects students' health, well-being, and ability to learn by supporting healthy eating and physical activity.

II. GENERAL STATEMENT OF POLICY

A. The Ashby School Board recognizes that nutrition education and physical education are essential components of the educational process and that good health fosters student attendance and education.

B. The Ashby School environment should promote and protect students' health, well-being, and ability to learn by encouraging healthy eating and physical activity.

C. The Ashby 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.

D. Children need access to healthy foods and opportunities to be physically active in order to grow, learn, and thrive.

E. All students in grades K-12 will have opportunities, support, and encouragement to be physically active on a regular basis.

F. 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.

III. GUIDELINES

A. Foods and Beverages
1. The Ashby School District will encourage and support healthy eating by students and engage in nutrition promotion that is:

   a. offered as part of a comprehensive program designed to provide students with the knowledge and skills necessary to promote and protect their health;

   b. part of health education classes as well as classroom instruction in subjects such as math, science, language arts, social sciences, and elective subjects, where appropriate; and

   c. enjoyable, developmentally appropriate, culturally relevant, and includes participatory activities, such as contests, promotions, taste testing, and field trips.

2. The Ashby School District will encourage all students to make age appropriate, healthy selections of foods and beverages, including those sold individually outside the reimbursable school meal programs, such as through a la carte [snack] lines, vending machines, fundraising events, concession stands, and student stores.

3. Ashby Schools will not use foods or beverages as rewards for academic performance or good behavior (unless this practice is allowed by a student's individual education plan or behavior intervention plan) and will not withhold food or beverages as punishment.

D. Physical Activity

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.

E. Communications with Parents

1. The Ashby School District recognizes that parents and guardians have a primary and fundamental role in promoting and protecting their children's health and well-being.

2. The Ashby School District will support parents' efforts to provide a healthy diet and daily physical activity for their children.
APPENDIX I: CITY OF ASHBY SIDEWALK AND ALLEY ORDINANCE

City of Ashby, County of Grant, State of Minnesota

Ordinance 94
An Ordinance Relating to the Establishment, Maintenance and Repair of Sidewalks and Alleys Within the City of Ashby.

This Ordinance Shall Replace Ordinance #20 Second Series - AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OF SIDEWALKS IN THE CITY OF ASHBY THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUNK SIDEWALKS; ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, REPLACEMENT OR REPAIR OF SIDEWALKS; OTHERWISE PROVIDING REGULATION OF THE SIDEWALKS; PROVIDING FOR THE PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF THIS ORDINANCE

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that a substantial number of the sidewalks and alleys within Ashby are in need of maintenance and repair; and
WHEREAS, the City Council desires to provide long—term planning for the construction, repair, and maintenance of sidewalks; and
WHEREAS, Minnesota Statute 429.101 provides for the financing of sidewalk repair and maintenance through assessments to property.

Subd. 94.1. Purpose.
The City of Ashby intends to provide safe pedestrian walkways and alleyways throughout the community and, in particular, to provide for safe pedestrian traffic to and from schools and other services to the neighborhood and community.

Subd. 94.2. Definitions.
“SIDEWALK” means an improved area made of concrete designed for pedestrian traffic and located upon the public boulevards within the dedicated streets of the City of Ashby.

“EXISTING SIDEWALK” means sidewalks which are presently in place even though they do not conform to the specifications hereinafter provided for.

“TRUNK SIDEWALK” means specially designated sidewalks according to the provisions of this ordinance which are determined to be of greater importance by reason of the need of their use to gain access to various important locations within the City of Ashby, including but not limited to the downtown area, the school, and the churches within the community. Trunk sidewalks shall also provide for adequate handicap access where appropriate to be phased in according to a plan of implementation as
from time to time the City of Ashby is able to develop and pay for within its budget constraints.

“DEFECTIVE SIDEWALK” Defective sidewalk means any of the following:
1. Vertical separations of three-fourths (3/4) inch or more;
2. Horizontal separations of three-fourths (3/4) inch or more;
3. Holes or depressions of three (3) inches or more in diameter and three-fourths (3/4) inch or more in depth;
4. Spalling over fifty percent (50%) of a single six foot by six foot (6’ x 6’) square or panel of the sidewalk with one or more depressions of three-fourths (3/4) inch or more;
5. A single square or panel of sidewalk cracked in such a manner that no part thereof has a piece greater than one square foot or is cracked in such a manner that it constitutes a danger or a potential danger to the public;
6. A sidewalk with any part thereof missing to the full depth;
7. A deviation on the staked and constructed grade of three-fourths (3/4) inch or more as to any sidewalk newly constructed.

“PERSON(S)” means any natural person, firm, corporation, partnership, organization or legal entity whatsoever, including such entities that are acting through employees, servants, agents or others,

“SIDEWALKMASTER PLAN” “Sidewalk Master Plan” means a plan established by Resolution of the City Council which includes all sidewalks in the City which the City Council finds necessary or convenient for public pedestrian traffic.

Subd. 93.3. Repairs and Improvements

Inspection and Report. The owner of any private property within the City abutting a public alley, private alley, or sidewalk (whether or not such sidewalk is on the Sidewalk Master Plan) shall report any defective, unsafe, or broken sidewalk or unsafe alley to the Director of Public Works. The Director of Public Works shall cause inspections to be made throughout the City, at such times as are reasonably necessary, to determine whether public sidewalks, public alleys, and private alleys within the City are safe for pedestrians and/or vehicles.

Barricades and Signal Lights. Whenever any material of any kind is deposited on any alley when sidewalk improvements are being made, or when any sidewalk is in a dangerous condition, it is the duty of all persons having any interest in the property in front of or along which such material may be deposited, or where such dangerous condition exists, to put in conspicuous places at each end of such sidewalk and at each end of any pile of materials deposited in the street, a sufficient number of approved signal lights, and to keep them burning continuously to secure the same.
All Sidewalks. **Duty to repair.** The owner of any private property within the City abutting a sidewalk (whether or not such sidewalk is on the Sidewalk Master Plan) shall keep the sidewalk in repair and safe.

**Sidewalk Repair.** If the Director of Public Works finds that any sidewalk abutting on private property is unsafe, defective, or in need of repairs, he shall cause a notice to be served. The notice shall be served upon the recorded owner by personal service, or upon the recorded owner and occupant by registered or certified mail to their last known address if the owner does not reside **within** the City or cannot be found therein. The notice shall order the owner to have the sidewalk repaired and made safe within thirty (30) days, and state that if the owner fails to do so, the City Council may order the work to be done, that the expense thereof must be paid by the owner, and that if unpaid, it will be made a special assessment against the property concerned. If the sidewalk is not repaired within thirty (30) days after service of the notice, the Director of Public Works shall report the facts to the City Council. The City Council may, by resolution, order the construction or repairs to be made. If the City Council orders construction or repairs to be made, the Director of Public Works shall keep a record of the total cost of the repair attributable to each ‘Lot or parcel of property and report such information to the City Clerk. At any time during the year, the City Clerk shall list the total unpaid charge for each type of repair service against each separate lot or parcel to which they are attributable under this section. After notice and hearing as provided in Minnesota Statutes Section 429.061, the City Council may then spread the charges against the property benefited as a special assessment under Minnesota Statutes, Section 429.101 and other pertinent Statutes for certification to the County Auditor and collection along with current taxes the following year or in annual installments, not exceeding ten, as the City Council may determine in each case.

Alleys. **Duty to repair and Maintain.** The owner of any private property within the City abutting a public or private alley shall keep the alley in repair, safe and free of obstructions including snow.

**Alley Repair & Maintenance.** If the Director of Public Works finds that any alley abutting on private property is unsafe, defective, or in need of repairs, he shall cause a notice to be served. The notice shall be served upon the record owner by personal service, or upon the record owner and occupant by registered or certified mail to their last known address if the owner does not reside within the City or cannot be found therein. The notice shall order the owner to have the alley repaired and made safe within thirty (30) days, and state that if the owner fails to do so, the City Council may order the work to be done, that the expense thereof must be paid by the owner, and that if unpaid it will be made a special assessment against the property concerned.

If the alley is not repaired within thirty (30) days after service of the notice, the Director of Public Works shall report the facts to the City Council. The City Council, may, by resolution, order the construction or repairs to be made. If the City Council orders construction or repairs to be made, the Director of Public Works shall keep a record of the total cost of the repair attributable to each lot or parcel of property and report such information to the City Clerk.
At any time during the year, the City Clerk shall list the total unpaid charges for each type of repair service against separate lot or parcel to which they are attributable under this section. After notice and hearing as provided in Minnesota Statutes Section 429.061, the City Council may then spread the charges against the property benefited as a special assessment under Minnesota Statutes, Section 429.101 and other pertinent statutes for certification to the county auditor and collection along with current taxes the following year or in annual installments, not exceeding ten, as the City Council may determine in each case.

**Subd. 93.4. Repair and Construction Requirements**

*Permits Required.* No person shall make any sidewalk repair or improvement, or repair or improvement to a public or private alley, whether ordered by the City or not, until such person has submitted a plan, has obtained the required permits from the City, and has paid all applicable fees. The fee, if any, for permits, shall be established by Resolution of the City Council.

When the requirements of this subdivision have been met and the plan approved, the permit shall be issued, and a copy thereof shall be filed and preserved. The permit shall state when the work is to be commenced and when the work is to be completed.

*Specifications.* All repairs and improvements to sidewalks and alleys, whether undertaken by the owner of the abutting property or by the City, shall be performed under the supervision and inspection of the Director of Public Works and in accordance with the plans and specifications attached to this ordinance.

*Notice to Stop Work.* The Director of Public Works or the City Clerk may stop work at the site upon written notice served personally, or by registered or certified mail, to the property owner, the property owner’s agent; or to the contractor or party doing the work; for any of the following reasons:

1. Failure to obtain a permit.
2. Failure to perform work in accordance with the specifications established by Subd. 93.4 hereof.

When a property owner, agent of the property owner, contractor, or party performing work receives the notice, such person shall cause the work to stop. Work may resume when a permit is obtained or when the Director of Public Works or his designee has confirmed that corrections have been made to conform the work to the required specifications.
Subd. 5 Removal Without Replacement

Removal of a sidewalk designated on the Sidewalk Master Plan, without replacement, shall occur only by the following:

1. The owner of the abutting property petitions the City Council and the City Council determines by Resolution that it is in the interest of the public to remove the sidewalk without replacing it.

2. The City Council, on its own motion, seeks the removal of a sidewalk without replacement by Resolution, and the motion passes by a four-fifths vote.

Subd 93.6 Maintenance

All snow, ice, dirt and rubbish remaining on a public sidewalk more than 24 hours after its deposit thereon is a public nuisance. The owner and the occupant of any property adjacent to a public sidewalk shall use diligence to keep such walk safe for pedestrians. No such owner or occupant shall allow snow, ice, dirt or rubbish to remain on the walk longer than twenty-four (24) hours after its deposit thereon.

If the Director of Public Works finds that any snow, ice, dirt or rubbish has remained on a public sidewalk more than twenty-four (24) hours after its deposit thereon, he shall cause a notice to be served upon the record owner of the property by personal service, or upon the occupant if the owner does not reside within the City or cannot be found therein, ordering the owner or occupant to have the snow, ice, dirt or rubbish removed and made safe within 24 hours and stating that if the owner or occupant fails to do so, the Director of Public Works will do so on behalf of the City, that the expense thereof must be paid by the owner, and that if unpaid it will be made a special assessment against the property concerned.

If the snow, ice, dirt or rubbish is not removed within twenty-four (24) hours after service of the notice, the Director of Public Works shall cause the snow, ice, dirt or rubbish to be removed. The Director of Public Works shall keep a record of the total cost of the removal attributable to each lot or parcel of property and report such information to the City Clerk.

At any time during the year, the City Clerk shall list the total unpaid charges for each type of current service against each separate lot or parcel to which they are attributable under this ordinance. After notice and hearing as provided in Minnesota Statutes Section 429.061, the City Council may then spread the charges against the property benefited as a special assessment under Minnesota Statutes, Section 429.101 and other pertinent Statutes for certification to the County Auditor and collection along with current taxes the following year or in annual installments, not exceeding ten (10), as the City Council may determine in each case.
Passed by the Ashby City Council on this day: February 5, 2008

______________________________________________ Mayor

______________________________________________ Clerk/Treasurer
Attachment – Sidewalk Specifications

SECTION A-A THROUGH WALK

SECTION B-B THROUGH DRIVEWAY

1/2" PREFORMED JOINT FILLER MATERIAL - AASHTO M 213 (NOT REQUIRED WHEN CURB AND GUTTER OR WALK ARE ADJACENT TO BITUMINOUS PAVING).

1/2" EXPANSION JOINTS AT 50' (APPROX.) MAXIMUM INTERVALS.

SAME THICKNESS AS DRIVEWAY.

WITH SIDEWALK PAVE TO BACK EDGE OF SIDEWALK.

WITHOUT SIDEWALK PAVE TO PROPERTY LINE.

1/2" EXPANSION JOINT.

CONTRACTION JOINT (FORMED OR SAWED)

DRIVEWAY IS NOT TO BE Poured MONOLITHICALLY WITH CURB AND GUTTER. DRIVEWAYS MAY BE CONCRETE, ASPHALT OR GRAVEL.

CITY OF ASHBY
CONCRETE WALK, DRIVEWAYS & CURB RETURNS AT ENTRANCES

ADOPTED: CITY COUNCIL

REvised:

CITY OF ASHBY
SECTION A-A

1. Surface treatment - THIS TREATMENT SHALL CONSIST OF AN AGGREGATE SURFACE FINISH. THE CONTRACTOR,
after normal concrete finishing, shall embed aggregate, meeting the requirements of MACT SPEC.
3:1:7 CA-70 modified to 100% of the material 1/2" to 3/8" in size, in the green concrete. The embedded
aggregate shall protrude at least 3/8" above the concrete surface. The exposed aggregate may
be lightly rinsed to wash mortar off of it.

2. 6'-0" dimension will be increased to intersecting sidewalk or 12 ft., where feasible, to provide a
flatter slope.

CITY OF ASHBY
PEDESTRIAN CURB RAMP
FOR THE HANDICAPPED