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Executive Summary

The Safe Routes to School planning process began in September 2012 and ended in May 2013. During this time, a team was tasked with numerous responsibilities including school observations, conducting surveys and hosting a community meeting. Throughout the process, we learned that Battle Lake has a strong base of community support for walking/bicycling and an active life style. For them, this plan was about getting children safely to school and also about community connectivity. With multiple other projects happening in Battle Lake, it is essential to look at the community as a whole and tie these projects together to create a network that all residents can use to live a more active life. Overall, getting children to walk and bike to school requires a combination of adding additional infrastructure and improving safety, as well as education and encouragement efforts. These efforts can take many forms and are meant to be fun and enjoyable for kids. Safe Routes to School can bring people in the community together, help improve the health of children, ease congestion caused by drivers of motor vehicles and help make air quality around schools better by decreasing the amount of vehicle emissions. The goal of Safe Routes to School is get children walking and biking where it is safe to do and where it is not, the goal is to make it safe. To accomplish this goal, a list of recommendations was developed by the committee to address safety and create enthusiasm in the areas of engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation.
Safe Routes to School Program

Background and Overview

The following sections detailing the Safe Routes to School background and overview as well as the 5 E’s are taken from National Center for Safe Routes to School information. Please note that the data represented in these sections is national data and may or may not reflect conditions in Battle Lake.

(Source: National Center for Safe Routes to School, Fact Sheet)

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) is a national and international movement to create safe, convenient, and fun opportunities for children to bicycle and walk to and from schools. The program has been designed to reverse the decline in children walking and bicycling to schools. Safe Routes to School can also play a critical role in reversing the alarming nationwide trend toward childhood obesity and inactivity. In 1969, approximately 50% of children walked or bicycled to school, with approximately 87% of children living within one mile of school walking or bicycling. Today, fewer than 15% of schoolchildren walk or bicycle to school. As a result, kids today are less active, less independent, and less healthy. As much as 10 to 14% of morning traffic can be generated by parents driving their children to schools, and traffic-related crashes are the top cause of death and major injury for children in the U.S. ages 1 to 17. Concerned by the long-term health and traffic consequences of this trend, in 2005, the U.S. Congress approved $612 million in funding for five years of state implementation of SRTS programs in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. In 2012, funding changed under map 21 and lumped Safe Routes to School funding with 2 other programs in the same pot of money. This made funding more of a challenge. However, commitments have been made to continue funding of this program. Communities are using this funding to construct new bike lanes, pathways, and sidewalks, as well as to launch Safe Routes to School education, promotion and enforcement campaigns in K-8 schools. Safe Routes to School programs are built on collaborative partnerships among many stakeholders that include educators, parents, students, elected officials, engineers, city planners, business and community leaders, health officials, and bicycle and pedestrian advocates. The most successful SRTS programs incorporate the five E’s—evaluation, education, encouragement, engineering, and enforcement. The goal of Safe Routes to School is to get more children bicycling and walking to schools safely every day.
Helpful Statistics on Safe Routes to School

Traffic Congestion: Neighborhoods are becoming increasingly clogged by traffic. By boosting the number of children walking and bicycling, Safe Routes to School projects reduce traffic congestion.

- Within the span of one generation, the percentage of children walking or bicycling to school has dropped precipitously, from approximately 50% in 1969 to just 13% in 2009.
- While distance to school is the most commonly reported barrier to walking and bicycling, private vehicles still account for half of school trips between 1/4 and 1/2 mile—a distance easily covered on foot or bike.
- In 2009, American families drove 30 billion miles and made 6.5 billion vehicle trips to take their children to and from schools, representing 10-14 percent of traffic on the road during the morning commute.
- A California study showed that schools that received infrastructure improvements through the Safe Routes to School program yielded walking and bicycling increases in the range of 20 to 200 percent.

Safety: Safe Routes to School projects focus on infrastructure improvements, student traffic education, and driver enforcement that improve safety for children, many of whom already walk or bicycle in unsafe conditions.

- Pedestrians are more than twice as likely to be struck by a vehicle in locations without sidewalks.
- In 2009, approximately 23,000 children ages 5-15 were injured and more than 250 were killed while walking or bicycling in the United States.
- From 2000-2006, 30% of traffic deaths for children ages 5-15 occurred while walking or bicycling.
- The medical costs for treating children’s bicycle and pedestrian fatalities cost $839 million in 2005 and another $2.2 billion in lifetime lost wage costs.
- A safety analysis by the California Department of Transportation estimated that the safety benefit of the SRTS was up to a 49 percent decrease in the childhood bicycle and pedestrian collision rates.

Health and Obesity: Children today are simply not getting enough physical activity, contributing to growing rates of obesity and obesity-related health problems, such as diabetes. Safe Routes to School projects make it safer for more children to walk and bicycle to school, which will help address this obesity crisis among children by creating increases in physical activity.

- Over the past 40 years, rates of obesity have soared among children of all ages in the United States, and approximately 25 million children and adolescents—more than 33%—are now overweight or obese or at risk of becoming so.
- Kids are less active today, and 23% of children get no free time physical activity at all.
- The prevalence of obesity is so great that today’s generation of children may be the first in over 200 years to live less healthy and have a shorter lifespan than their parents.
Today, approximately one-quarter of health care costs in the United States are attributable to obesity, and health care costs just for childhood obesity are estimated at approximately $14 billion per year.

People living in auto-oriented suburbs drive more, walk less, and are more obese than people living in walkable communities. For each hour of driving per day, obesity increases 6 percent, but walking for transportation reduces the risk of obesity.

Walking one mile to and from school each day is two-thirds of the recommended sixty minutes of physical activity a day. Children who walk to school have higher levels of physical activity throughout the day.

**Environment:** Safe Routes to School projects increase the number of children walking and bicycling to school, which also cuts down on the number of cars. As cars emit pollutants for each mile traveled, reducing traffic can improve the quality of air that children breathe in and around their schools.

Children exposed to traffic pollution are more likely to have asthma, permanent lung deficits, and a higher risk of heart and lung problems as adults.

Over the last 25 years, among children ages 5 to 14, there has been a 74 percent increase in asthma cases. In addition, 14 million days of school are missed every year due to asthma.

One-third of schools are located in “air pollution danger zones.”

Schools that are designed so children can walk and bicycle have measurably better air quality.

A 5% increase in a neighborhood’s “walkability” reduces vehicle miles traveled by 6%.

Returning to 1969 levels of walking and bicycling to school, would save 3.2 billion vehicle miles, 1.5 million tons of carbon dioxide and 89,000 tons of other pollutants—equal to keeping more than 250,000 cars off the road for a year.

**Bus Transportation Costs:** Schools often make cutbacks in bus routes to save money—meaning that more children will be walking and bicycling in potentially unsafe conditions or more parents will drive their children, which increases traffic congestion and air quality concerns.

Approximately 55% of children are bused, and we spend $21.5 billion nationally each year on school bus transportation, an average of $854 per child transported per year.

Eliminating one bus route, based on average per-pupil expenditure and average number of pupils per bus, would save a school district approximately $45,000 per year.

Nationwide, approximately 22 percent of school districts made busing reductions during the 2010-2011 school year due to fuel price increases.
About the Safe Routes to School National Partnership

Launched in August 2005, the Safe Routes to School National Partnership is a fast-growing network of hundreds of organizations, government agencies and groups working to set goals, share best practices, secure funding, and provide educational materials to agencies that implement Safe Routes to School programs. The Safe Routes to School National Partnership’s mission is to serve a diverse national community of organizations that advocates for safe bicycling and walking to and from schools throughout the United States.

[www.saferoutespartnership.org](http://www.saferoutespartnership.org)

---

**Tips for Walking Safely to School**

Walking is fun, but you need to be safe while doing it. Follow these tips to make sure you get to and from school without any problems.

**Walk together**

Younger children should always walk with an adult. Tell your parents that walking is great exercise and a nice way to spend time together.

If your parents say that you can walk to school on your own, remember these tips:

- Walk with a friend when possible.
- Ask your parents to help you pick a safe route to school; one that avoids dangers.
- Stick to the route you picked with your parents. Don’t let friends talk you into shortcuts that are more dangerous.
- When you are near the street, don’t push, shove, or chase each other.
- Never hitchhike or take rides from people not arranged by your parents.
- Talk to your parents and teacher about any bullying that may happen during your walk.

**Be seen**

Remember, drivers may not be able to see you well. Always wear bright-colored clothes and if it is dark or hard to see, carry flashlights or wear reflective gear.

**Look for traffic**

Watch out for cars and trucks at every driveway and intersection on your walk to school. Look for drivers in parked cars. They may be getting ready to move.

**Cross the street safely**

1. Stop at the curb or edge of the street.
2. Look left, right, left and behind you and in front of you for traffic.
3. Wait until no traffic is coming and begin crossing.
4. Keep looking for traffic until you have finished crossing.
5. Walk, don’t run across the street.

**Obey traffic signs, signals and adult school crossing guards**
Ride Your Bike Safely

Bicycling can be a fun way to get to school. Review these safety points before you ride.

**Before riding your bike**

- **Talk with your parents.** Are you allowed to ride by yourself or with friends? What route will you ride to school?

- **Practice riding the route to school with your parents.** Doing so will help you know where to stop, signal, and walk your bike.

- **Dress to be seen.** Wear brightly colored clothes and reflective gear, such as a reflective vest, book bag tags, or pant leg straps. Remember, just because you can see a driver doesn’t mean the driver can see you.

- **Tie and tuck.** Loose laces and pant legs can get caught up in your bike and cause you to crash. Tie shoelaces and tuck the hanging ends into your shoe, and tie wide pant legs with a reflective strap or tuck them into socks.

- **Check your bike for safety.** Make sure the tires have enough air, the brakes and gears work, the chain isn’t loose, and the wheels and bolts are tight. You should also have reflective gear on your bicycle. Have your parents help you fix anything that’s not right.

- **Put on your helmet.** Make sure it’s properly adjusted, fitted, and buckled. See sidebar for instructions on checking helmet fit.

**While riding your bike**

- **Look and listen for traffic.** Also, look for things that could make you fall, like potholes and storm grates. Never use a cell phone or wear headphones.

- **Watch for vehicles going in and out of driveways.**

- **Keep both hands on the handlebars, except when signaling.** Carry books and other items in a backpack or bag designed to fit on a bicycle.

- **Stop before crossing the street, entering a road, or turning.** Look left, right, left, and behind you for traffic, including pedestrians, bicycles, and cars.

If you are allowed to ride in the street,

- **Ride single file and in the same direction as cars.**

- **Ride to the right side of the road,** but far enough from parked cars to avoid any car doors that suddenly open.

- **Obey traffic laws.** Follow all traffic signs, signals, and lane markings.

- **Be predictable.** Ride in a straight line, not in and out of cars. Use hand signals.

---

*These tips include concepts from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Safe Kids Worldwide and Bicycle Coalition of Maine.*
THE 5 E’s
(Source: National Center for Safe Routes to School)

**Engineering** strategies include planning and implementing physical improvements that make it safer and more attractive to walk and bicycle to school. Engaging planners and engineers is crucial to successfully implementing safety improvements. It’s also important to reach out to the community to educate neighbors about the benefits and importance of any proposed improvements.

- Completing a school walking and bicycling audit and a school travel plan
- Adding traffic calming, crosswalks, sidewalks, bicycle lanes or other infrastructure that improves safety for walking and bicycling
- Installing bike racks at schools

**Education** about SRTS helps build support among kids, parents, teachers and community members. To craft education messages, first identify your goals and audiences. Do people need to know more about the benefits of walking or bicycling? Would maps of routes to the school help more people walk or bicycle? Would walking or bicycling safety information get kids and parents more excited about walking and bicycling?

- SRTS maps that show suggested routes to walk and bicycle to school
- School bicycle rodeo that teaches safe bicycling skills
- Curriculum focused on the benefits of walking and bicycling
- Seminars or events that educate parents about the benefits of walking and bicycling
- Traffic safety education
- Public education for safety improvements

**Encouragement** is closely tied to education strategies, but is more focused on getting people to try walking and bicycling to school and celebrating and rewarding people for their efforts. Encouragement activities are more effective if the physical environment works for walking and bicycling to school.

- Organizing events such as “Walk and Bike to School Day” to encourage families to try walking & bicycling to school
- Creating walking school buses that allow kids to walk together with adult volunteers
- Utilizing contests or incentives to encourage walking and bicycling to school

**Enforcement** strategies help reduce unsafe behaviors by drivers, pedestrians and bicyclists and encourage all road users to obey traffic laws and share the road safely. Enforcement can be expensive, so it is best used strategically in conjunction with the other strategies.

- Partnership with law enforcement to target problem intersections for enforcement
- Educational “stings” that teach motorists about laws regarding yielding to pedestrians
- Installation of digital speed signs that display travel speed of passing vehicles

**Evaluation** is very important to a successful SRTS initiative and should be considered from the very beginning of planning. Ask yourself, how do we define success for our efforts and how can
we measure or document our progress? Evaluation will likely include a combination of quantitative information, such as counts of how many children are walking and bicycling, and more qualitative information, such as success stories from families who have chosen to walk and bicycle more.

- A school walking and bicycling audit and a school travel plan that includes specific goals
- Bicycle and pedestrian counts that show bicycling and walking rates over time
- Data about vehicle crashes near the school, traffic speeds or traffic volumes
Battle Lake Background and Overview

Current Condition

Safe Routes to School in the City of Battle Lake is more than just a stand-alone program to get children walking and biking to school. It is part of a larger community vision to improve the vitality of the community. Walking and biking in town is seen as an attraction for tourists, as well as an asset that is going to help the current population live a more active and healthy life. In addition to the health benefits of walking and biking, the City is interested in the economic benefits of a walkable/bikable community. More information about the economic benefits is available at: http://www.bikesbelong.org/resources/stats-and-research/statistics/economic-statistics/. This report will explore the community of Battle Lake as it applies to Safe Routes to School and helping children and the community be better connected.

Population and the surrounding area

According to figures from the United States Census Bureau the population in Battle Lake has remained relatively stable over the past 100 years, with a slight decline from 1970 to 2000. In contrast, the surrounding townships of Everts and Clitherall have grown at rates averaging 18 to 22% over the last 30 years. This inconsistency in population growth between the City and its surrounding townships is not surprising considering that Battle Lake is almost fully developed, while the rural townships have large expanses of undeveloped area that allow for a greater number of new homes. If growth rates in the area continue over the next 30 years, another 1,092 people will move to the Battle Lake area by 2030, and increase the population by 50%.

The Battle Lake area is not only growing, it is aging. The median age in Battle Lake is 48, 56 in Everts Township, and 45 in Clitherall Township. These numbers differ dramatically from the median age in Otter Tail County of 41, and the state-wide median age of 35. Although the number of children under 18 represents a small percentage of the area’s population, this population has grown dramatically over the last decade.

History of Collaboration between the City and School District #542

The City of Battle Lake applied for SRTS planning assistance funding in April of 2012. The purpose of this application according to the Safe Routes to School Response Document was to “contemplate school routing, policies, bike and pedestrian trail integration, signage, and safety amenities for student and citizen access to the resources at Independent School District #542.”

The Battle Lake School and extra-curricular activities supported by the fine arts auditorium and the athletic fields not only benefit the students but also serve as a center for the community. It is important to maintain these institutions through support activities, such as booster clubs and a parent and teacher association, in order to ensure the quality of these institutions.

Safe Routes to School and the Comprehensive Plan

Safe Routes to School aligns with the vision and goals put forth in the Battle Lake Comprehensive Plan. The plan mentions in detail the need to “create a more pedestrian/bicycle friendly destination environment” as well as “Develop a new sidewalk/trail plan, similar to the pavement plan. The plan should improve the safety of the sidewalks and trails within the City.
Sidewalks should be constructed on both sides of the street.” These types of activities not only create the vision for the City of Battle Lake as a vibrant pedestrian and bike oriented community, but they also support the vision laid forth by Safe Routes to School as a place where it is safe for children to walk to school and thrive within their community.

Local Support
The Glendalough Bike and Pedestrian Trail is one example of a project that garnered significant public support. This trail concept has emerged as a 12-mile bike and pedestrian trail from the City of Battle Lake through Glendalough State Park. This trail concept -involving five trail segments, four of which are new – was coordinated by citizen volunteers with the support of the City of Battle Lake, Everts Township, the Otter Tail County Highway Department, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT), the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR), and the Minnesota Legislature.

All new segments of the trail will be completed by the summer of 2013. Three segments were funded through the Federal Transportation Enhancement program, . The fourth will be funded by $350,000 of Minnesota Bonding Legislation which was written and submitted by local volunteer citizens. Local philanthropy has contributed more than $125,000 to the trail concept.

Current Condition
The City of Battle Lake is a vibrant tourism destination at the juncture of Minnesota State Highways 78 and 210. Hwy 78 runs through downtown Battle Lake and essentially splits the City east and west.

Currently the City of Battle Lake has sidewalks on the north side of Summit Avenue leading to the school as well as along Hwy 78. Several years ago Battle Lake removed sidewalks from all areas of town due to their dilapidated state. These sidewalks posed a safety concern and the funding was not available for repair.

Hwy 78, although an important asset to the region, is a safety concern for students and the growing population of senior citizens. Aside from the sidewalks there it is in need of additional pedestrian safety enhancements. Many ISD #542 students, and much of the City’s residential development, reside on the east side of Hwy 78 and northeast along North Shore Drive. The school is located several blocks to the west of Hwy 78. This creates a condition where all students biking or walking to school from the east or northeast must cross a state trunk highway to reach to school.

During the summer of 2013, the Minnesota Department of Transportation will complete a bituminous overlay of Hwy 78. The project will include a Complete Streets element. The new design should alleviate some safety concerns by making the highway safer for pedestrians to cross.
Existing Typical Section

Proposed Typical Section
Existing Policies
The Battle Lake City Council approved a Complete Streets Resolution on June 14th, 2011 that calls for consideration of Minnesota’s guidelines for bike and pedestrian activity and amenities in transportation development. Battle Lake is reportedly the smallest municipality in America to develop such a resolution and was featured twice in Mn/DOT Commissioner Thomas Sorel’s Legislative Report on Complete Streets dated January 25th, 2012.

With this resolution, City Council support and community support in mind, the City desires sidewalks, signage, policies, ordinances, and public communications in cooperation with the school to integrate safety with the many transportation enhancements coming to the area.

The City of Battle Lake’s Comprehensive Plan makes reference to pedestrian, bicycle and handicapped accessibility on city streets and sidewalks in the future.

Capital Improvement Plan
In 2012, the City of Battle Lake established a Capital Improvement Plan consisting of an inventory/evaluation of existing infrastructure components, as well as those purchases and/or improvements projected to occur within the next 10 years. The plan also addresses funding for maintenance and replacement as necessary. In addition, the City had previously developed a Pavement Management Plan to provide for ongoing preventative maintenance and upkeep on its
streets and improved alleys. There are plans to combine these two documents and include data on trails, pathways and sidewalks projects currently in process and those projected for construction within the next 10 years. This will ensure ongoing funding for upkeep and preservation of grant funded improvements as well.

**Support**
The primary indicator of support resides around the fact that several related projects are already approved and underway. Simply said, a Safe Routes to School planning initiative “is not an independent planning initiative.” In fact, it is fundamental to ensure safe access and use of several transportation assets.

As mentioned, the primary policy support that can be cited is the commitment by the City Council to the comprehensive nature of a Complete Streets community.

Safe routing and access to the school will be imperative. ISD #542 is a cornerstone in the small community of Battle Lake, not only for students in the City proper and those along North Shore Drive, but also for the growing population of senior citizens in the Good Samaritan complex that are increasingly attending events at the school facilities.

Again, once safety measures are in place, greater communications and encouragement for physical activity can commence, and programs developed to support it.

The Battle Lake School District is directly involved in the process. They currently know by grade level, how many students walk to school and will be able to monitor walking and bicycle use by survey. The metrics to gauge a successful project will be determined during the planning phase.
School Background and Overview

Current Condition

Battle Lake Public School ISD #542 is located on the west side of Battle Lake and is home to 465 students grades K-12. This is a unique school in that it is located within the community and houses all its students in one building. Both of these attributes are strengths from a Safe Routes to School perspective and special attention should be given to preserving them.

The Battle Lake Public school stands out on an academic level. The district has been recognized by the Minnesota Academic Excellence Foundation for the past three years, listed among U.S. News & World Report as one of “America’s Best High Schools” and commended by the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals as a “Star of Innovation.” The elementary school has been selected as a National Blue Ribbon School for 2011. The high school was named a “Reward School” as one of Minnesota's top 15% for academic achievement. As part of completing this compelling Vision and Strategic Planning process that was undertaken at ISD #542, in 2008 30 faculty, parents and students crafted a five year vision of their school and the tactical plan to bring it to fruition.

School officials remark that the secret to their success has been great cooperation and support from parents, students, and the community. This support has also been evident in the Safe Routes to School planning process.

However, the school is several blocks removed from access to the trail assets mentioned in the Battle Lake Background and Overview section above (which begins on the east side of Hwy 78). Access to the trail system from the school would entail crossing several streets and State Hwy 78.

A considerable number of students also reside on North Shore Drive along West Battle Lake on the City’s northeast border. The traffic counts on that residential road during the spring and early fall during tourism season are significant, making walking and biking increasingly dangerous for students. Little signage and safe routing to the school is in place for bike and foot traffic.

School Policies

Busing policy: The school does not have a busing policy as it relates to a zone where they would or would not bus in town.

Wellness Policy: Battle Lake Public School has an adopted wellness policy. 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.”
SRTS Planning Process

Safe Routes to School Vision
Battle Lake envisions a community connected by trails and sidewalks. Taking into account the different needs of its population and keeping safety as a paramount concern, we look for a plan that is forward thinking and can help our students be active and mobile with increased options for walking and biking. We also envision that this plan will be a piece in the larger puzzle of complete streets within Battle Lake.

Safe Routes to School Goals
1. Determination of new potential bike and pedestrian trails within the city to create safer access to and from school
2. Recommendations for amenities related to Highway 78 Complete Streets project and the new bike and pedestrian trail access to ensure student safety
3. Recommendations for effective bike and pedestrian ordinances and policies
4. Improve existing infrastructure (sidewalks, signage, striping, crosswalks) for safety and ease of use
5. Increase education and encouragement to create a culture that supports walking and biking to school
6. Leverage community assets to help accomplish our goals
7. Create recommendations for adding additional infrastructure with a focus on safety and ease of use

Planning Process – Kick-off Meeting
On Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 a Kick-off Meeting was held. It was attended by 9 persons who form the core of the Safe Routes Planning Team. At this meeting, the team discussed the purpose of Safe Routes to School, shared strengths, discussed initial issues, and identified some “quick wins.”

Strengths/Opportunities
- Gym open to students
- Complete Streets Policy
- Viewed as safe community
- Active stakeholders
- Highway 78/Other trail and road projects
- In town residentially-located school
- K-12 in a single building
- Numerous parks as destinations
- Summit Street is a one-way in front of the school
- Bike safety program/Bike rodeo held yearly
- Good Samaritan Senior Living
- Community activists
- Tourism draw
- Economic development

**Concerns/ Issues**

- Making existing routes safer
  - Specific examples of streets were given
- Better striping, signage, and crosswalks
- Increase the number of sidewalks and trails

**Quick Wins**

- Identify and apply for infrastructure project
- Annual bike rodeo “supercharge”
- High school participation
- Contest x versus x
- Walking school bus
- Bike rental program
- MNDOT widening shoulder on road
- Glendalough bike trail
- Oct 3rd International walk to school day
- Walk-a-thon being held Sept 28th
- Add bike racks
- Look at lower speeds in several areas where children walk/bike

**Planning Process – School Observation**

School observation was held on Wednesday, Oct 10th, 2012. On this day, volunteers observed students arriving to school in the morning and leaving in the afternoon. Volunteers were placed at several locations around the school in order to observe students who were truly walking and biking to school and not just walking to a vehicle. The conditions on this day, according to weather.com, were partly sunny with a high of 50°F and a low of 21°F. On this day, we observed a number of walkers, bikers, and even one child on a scooter. There were a number of kids who walked down the existing sidewalk on Summit Ave and a large number of children used the street/grass along Roosevelt Ave to walk or bike. Overall, it was encouraging to see a number of kids walking and biking. There did not seem to be any conflicts with the buses, at least within the immediate area around the school. For the most part, parents who picked up or dropped off kids caused minimal conflict as well. Although there were a few who countered the natural flow of traffic, in the future this may be something the school chooses to observe more. For the purposes of Safe Routes to School, no immediate changes are recommended, other than to continue to observe and make changes where needed.
As part of our observations, it is recommended that the crosswalks at the corner of McKinley Ave N and Summit St W be repainted in all directions.

Data Collection Process

One of the important steps in this process was getting input from parents about the concerns or barriers they felt needed to be improved to help encourage kids walking and biking to school. To do this, a survey was sent home with students in Grades K-8. We also asked teachers to conduct a “tally survey” using the form provided on the National Safe Routes to School website. In the tally survey, students were asked to raise their hand indicating how they arrived and departed from school each day. A total of 3 consecutive days was preferred, however the majority of the teachers completed it a 2-consecutive day period. A summary of the results is located in the Findings and Data subsection below, as well as a complete report of the data located in the Attachments section.

Crash and Ticket Data

Safe Routes to School is more than just building new sidewalks. We wanted to look into current safety conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists within the city of Battle Lake. An inquiry to the local police department revealed that they were not aware of any pedestrian or/bike vehicle accidents in the last 5 years.

Mark Fenton Visit

As part of the Safe Routes to School planning initiative in the State of Minnesota, several state agencies arranged for national walking and active living expert, Mark Fenton, to visit our area and speak on the topic of Safe Routes to School. We chose to host him in Battle Lake. As part of his visit, Mr. Fenton hosted a 2-day workshop at the school in Battle Lake. Day one was a small group visit with the local Safe Routes Team (listed in the acknowledgements section of this plan). On this day, Mark listened to the proposed projects in Battle Lake, discussed the progress the community had made on SRTS, and the community vision. This was followed by a walking tour of the community. Day two was open to the public and those in attendance discussed why SRTS is important from healthy living to community connections. Another walking tour of Battle Lake was also conducted. The day ended with brainstorming ideas for the next steps in the Safe Routes process. The notes from this brainstorming session provided by Mark Fenton, along with Jill Chamberlin from Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Minnesota, are as follows:

- Evaluation: Incorporate survey questions in the parent/teacher conference process
- Encouragement: International walk to school day, done in 8 districts. Roll this out to more schools with student ambassador teams
- Education: You sell the kids first, and they will pester the parents. Focus on selling the kids
- Engineering: Far out suggestion: a pedestrian and bicycle art bridge across Hwy 78
- Build a trail from the back side of the school to Halverson Park
- Crosswalk and more signage at Olaf Ave. and Holdt St./County Hwy 83

Note: Have students (upper classmen) run a comprehensive SRTS planning exercise

**Planning Process - Team Meetings**

Throughout this process, team meetings were held on a nearly-monthly basis. The input of the team was paramount in the formation of this plan. At the meetings, the team discussed visioning, proposed projects, next steps, and priorities for Safe Routes to School in the community of Battle Lake.

**Project Meeting (Sidewalk Stakeholders)**

During the planning process, an opportunity presented itself to apply for federal SRTS infrastructure funding. Based on the observations and work done thus far, two routes were identified. The first priority was identified as a route along Olaf Avenue with safe crossing updates at the corner of Olaf Ave. and Holdt St./CR 83. This route serves a large portion of town and connects to a mobile home community with a high student population, as well as other residential neighborhoods. The second priority was a trail running from the school to Halverson Park. This route provides a location for remote drops and as a secondary benefit, connects the elderly population at the Good Samaritan Center to the school. It also is important as a community connection piece because of its access to other trails. See attachments for the full SRTS infrastructure grant application.
Community Meeting

On Monday, January 14th, 2013 a SRTS community input meeting was held. The purpose of this meeting was to receive community input related to the SRTS planning effort and hear what types of improvements the residents of Battle Lake would like made. At this meeting, a short presentation was given explaining Safe Routes to School and the participants were divided into small groups. Each group was provided a map to discuss the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges they saw in Battle Lake. There were several main themes heard throughout this meeting.

1) Lack of crosswalks on busy streets
   a) Olaf Avenue and County Hwy 83
   b) Multiple locations on Lake Avenue/Hwy 78
2) Additional sidewalks to improve community connectedness
   a) Sections east of Lake Avenue were identified, specifically Bowman and Summit
   b) Needed sidewalks in multiple locations around Battle Lake were discussed
3) A trail running along the south side of Front Street and looping to Summit Street
4) Discussed needed education to make sure the new facilities were being well used
5) Community busing (as opposed to door to door) to the school was discussed for children within x distance of the school.
6) Payment management plan updated to include sidewalks
7) Use Hwy 78 reconstruction as an opportunity to improve crossings
8) Make sure safety is addressed in multiple areas
   a) Sidewalks
   b) Lighting
   c) Crossings
   d) Community watch
   e) Education for safe behaviors both pedestrians and motorists
9) Improve the community connection to trails
10) Formalize a snow removal policy
Findings and Data

Analysis of the Parent Survey Data

In October 2012, two types of data collection surveys were completed for children in grades K-8. The first was a student tally where students were asked to raise their hands to indicate how they arrived to school that morning and also how they planned to get home that evening. This was done for 2-3 consecutive days. As part of this tally, the weather on each of those days was noted. The findings from the student tally and a copy of the form used can be found in the Attachments section.

In addition to the student tally, a survey was also sent home for the parents to complete. More detailed results of the survey, as well as the form used, can be found in the Attachments section. Responses were received from 98 of a total of 275 students in grades K-8.

Here is a summary of the findings:

Getting to and from school:

- Students most often get to school by motorized vehicle:
  - bus (73%)
  - car (20%)
  - walk (6%)
  - bicycle (1%)

- Students most often get home from school by motorized vehicle:
  - bus (76%)
  - car (15%)
  - walk (8%)
  - bicycle (1%)

- Top barriers to walking or riding bicycle to school: (Parents were allowed to select more than one)
  - Distance - too far from school (83%)
  - Speed of Traffic Along Route (39%)
  - Weather – too cold in winter (36%)
  - Amount of Traffic Along Route (33%)
  - Safety of Intersections and Crossings (32%)
  - Time (22%)
  - Lack of Sidewalks or Pathways (17%)
  - Violence or Crime (17%)
  - Convenience of Driving (12%)
  - Child’s Participation in After School Programs (10%)
  - Lack of Crossing Guards (9%)
  - Lack of Adults to Bike/Walk with (6%)

- Typical mode of school arrival and departure by distance child lives from school
  - Less than 2 miles
    - School Bus (56%)
    - Family vehicle (20%)
- Walk (20.25%)
- Bike (4.25%)
  - More than 2 miles
    - School Bus (80%)
    - Family vehicle (20%)
    - All other methods (0%)

- Top things that would help students walk or ride bicycle more often:
  - Nothing, I live too far from school (72% of those who responded live more than 2 miles from school)
    - 83% indicated distance as a barrier
  - Traffic conditions (72% indicated either Speed or Amount of traffic along the route was a barrier)
  - Safety improvements to infrastructure (49% indicated either unsafe intersections and crossings or lack of sidewalks/pathways as a barrier)
    - Improvements such as enhanced crossings or separate pedestrian facilities could be useful in correcting this
  - Slower traffic speeds (39% indicated it was a barrier)
  - Weather (36% indicated it was a barrier)
    - This is an issue of perception and should be addressed with Education and Encouragement
    - If this is also related to parents not being able to provide their child with warm clothing then steps should be taken to assist with this

Additionally consult the 5E’s and recommendations listed in the Recommendations section as a guide.
Recommendations

The 5 E’s
(Engineering, Education, Encouragement, Enforcement, Evaluation)

As funding becomes available, the City of Battle Lake is positioned to implement strategies from all areas of the 5 E’s. Battle Lake has done the proper policy work ahead of time; this includes passing a complete streets policy and budgeting for city maintenance of new and existing sidewalks and trails that are an important part of this program. This has laid the groundwork for the addition of new sidewalks and trails as well as education and encouragement efforts. The Safe Routes to School team has discussed the strategies they believe will be most beneficial for the community of Battle Lake. The team also strongly considered the opinions brought forth at the public meeting conducted as part of the SRTS planning effort. Although considerable thought went into these recommendations, it is understood that situations change as do funding sources and flexibility may be necessary when choosing projects to implement in the future.

It should also be noted that these recommendations are not at an engineering level and each location should be evaluated by a qualified person to recommend specific improvements and engineering treatments.

For the purposes of this plan, items labeled long and short term refer to the relative ease and resources needed to make a specific project happen. It doesn’t necessarily indicate a specific timeline in which these items should be completed.
Engineering

Engineering strategies including planning and implementing physical improvements that make it safer and more attractive to walk and bicycle to school. Engaging planners and engineers is crucial to successfully implementing safety improvements. It’s also important to reach out to the community to educate neighbors about the benefits and importance of any proposed improvements.

Objective 1: Examine current city ordinances and school policies

- Discuss the current bussing policy for children in Battle Lake (Short-term)
  - Establishing a minimum distance from the school bus pick-up will encourage more students to walk and bike to school
- Include sidewalks and trails in the 5-year CIP plan/pavement management plan (Long-term)
- Formalize a snow removal policy (Short-term)
- This is a unique school in that it is located within the community and houses all its students in one building. Both of these attributes are strengths from a Safe Routes to School perspective and special consideration should be given to preserving them. (Long-term)

Objective 2: Identify and modify infrastructure to improve safety

- Identify key intersections and create pedestrian enhancements. Some recommendations include but are not limited to:  (Short-term)
  - Stop or yield sign at corner of Bowman and McKinley Ave
  - Crosswalk at corner of Holdt St/County Hwy 83 and Olaf Ave
  - Improved lighting, signage or additional safety measures at corner of Holdt St/County Hwy 83 and Olaf Ave
  - Crosswalks at the corner of McKinley Ave N & Summit St W be repainted in all directions
  - Improvements to multiple crossings on Lake Avenue (this is being completed as part of the Hwy 78 project)
  - Make improvements to other locations as identified

- Identify key routes and add pedestrian/bike infrastructure (sidewalks/trails/bike racks/other) as funding becomes available. Some recommendations include but are not limited to:
  - The route project identified in the 2013 Safe Routes to School infrastructure solicitation  (Long-term)
    - Sidewalk/trail from the school along Roosevelt and continuing along Olaf Avenue to Moen Drive
    - Sidewalk along Main Street from Roosevelt Avenue to Lincoln Avenue
    - Enhanced Crossing at Olaf Avenue and Holdt Street/County Hwy 83
    - See attachments for grant application
  - Sidewalk/Trail along Roosevelt Ave  (Long-term)
- Sidewalk/Trail along N McKinley Ave (Long-term)
- Sidewalk/Trail along Olaf Ave (Long-term)
- Sidewalk/Trail along Bowman St (Long-term)
- Sidewalk/Trail along South side of Summit St (Long-term)
- Discuss making Roosevelt a 1-way for car traffic (Short-term)
- Discuss traffic calming measures on Holdt St/County Hwy 83 (Short-term)
- Consider adding Share the Road signage along Holdt St/County Hwy 83 (Short-term)
- Trail running along the south side of Front St, looping to Summit St (Long-term)
- Add bike shelters at key locations (Long-term)
  - Could have students build in shop class
  - An example of some of the many designs
- Participate in the PartnerSHIP 4 Health bike rack program to add more bike racks around town (Short-term)
- Make improvements to other locations as identified. Battle Lake will change with time and so will the funding sources available. As a result this list is not meant to be a comprehensive list of projects. It is a guide of projects identified throughout this process.
Pedestrian Enhancement Considerations
Several of the recommendations above suggest pedestrian enhancements at certain locations. The specific type of enhancement should be evaluated per project and designed with maximum safety in mind. Some examples of pedestrian enhancements include:

- Pedestrian activated lights at crossings (Long-term)
- Crosswalks (Short-term)
- Bump-outs, also known as curb extensions (Long-term)
- ADA curb cuts (Long-term)
- Pedestrian islands (Long-term)
- Narrowing road widths (Long-term)
- Parking set backs from crosswalks (Short-term)
- Advance yield markings (Short-term)
  - These show vehicles where to stop if a pedestrian is in the crosswalk
  - Stopping further back allows other vehicles to see the pedestrian as well
- Crossing guards (Short-term)
- Solar Powered Pedestrian Crossing lights (Long-term)
  - Flashing LED

- Make sure safety is addressed in multiple areas
  - Sidewalks
  - Lighting
  - Crossings
  - Community watch
  - Education for safe behaviors both pedestrians and motorists
Community Impact Considerations

A sidewalk can be a way to increase safety for pedestrians of all ages. When sidewalks are in place, children are less likely to walk/bike on the street. This is of particular concern wherever parked vehicles are present because children entering the street from between parked vehicles are often obscured from the vision of drivers. Additionally, sidewalks tend to result in pedestrian crossing activity that is more predictable. When this occurs, more effective signing and pavement marking strategies can be implemented. Further, crossing activity is often more focused to key locations resulting in greater visibility to drivers.

Sidewalks also can help encourage people to be more active within their community. This activity can have a positive health impact on the individual as well as a community building impact on the neighborhood.

When taking on an infrastructure project that involves sidewalks, understand that while some residents may be excited others may be opposed. Some of the things to consider when siting a sidewalk are:

- Impacts on trees and landscaping
- Maintenance responsibilities
- Right of way and set backs
- Perceived lack of need
- Cost burden

When considering construction of a new sidewalk, stakeholders affected by the improvements should be notified and solicited for input in the process.

A suggestion is to accommodate stakeholders by allowing the sidewalk location to vary within the right of way; hopefully avoiding some of the unwanted impacts mentioned above.
Education

Education about SRTS helps build support among kids, parents, teachers and community members. To craft education messages, first identify your goals and audiences. Do people need to know more about the benefits of walking or bicycling? Would maps of routes to the school help more people walk or bicycle? Would walking or bicycling safety information get kids and parents more excited about walking and bicycling?

Objective 1. Review the suggestions below and complete as time/funding allows.

- Host a bike safety 101 course (Short-term)
- Teach safe walking and biking to kids at a level appropriate for their age (Short-term)
- Put SRTS info on school and city websites (Short-term)
  - Links to national SRTS
- Create a SRTS Facebook page or a city healthy living page (Short-term)
  - Could be run by HS student
- Start a walking school bus (Short-term)
- Engage wellness speakers that talk to kids about healthy habits (Short-term)
- Encourage the use of smart phone apps and technology programs that promote health and active living (Short-term)
- Consider creating a task force or utilizing an existing committee for implementation (Short-term)
- Continue to host an annual bike rodeo (Short-term)
Encouragement

Encouragement is closely tied to education strategies, but is more focused on getting people to try walking and bicycling to school and celebrating and rewarding people for their efforts.

**Objective 1. Review the suggestions below and complete as time/funding allows.**

- Host a community bicycle ride (Short-term)
- SRTS logo contest (Short-term)
  - Have all the students design a logo and then pick a winner and have t-shirts printed with this logo
- Punch card program for kids who walk or bike to school (Short-term)
  - Class by class competitions; kids can walk at lunch time, but also at special opportunities (e.g. walk to school day). Drawings for big prizes
- Start a bike rental program (Short-term)
  - Might be something a local business would take on during the summer
- Host a walk-a-thon (Short-term)
  - Use new sidewalks and trails
- Prizes for most bikes in the bike racks (Short-term)
  - Attach them to the bikes once kids are inside
  - Maybe just for the first month of school or specified period of time
- Host a bike/walk contest or challenge (Short-term)
  - Challenge kids from a rival school district
- Have a remote drop-off day one day a month (for all students) (Short-term)
  - Increase frequency with time
- Host a family shopping night once a month where businesses stay open late (Short-term)
  - Have local bands and celebrate your new walkable downtown
  - Could have a different theme each month
    - Bring your furry family (dogs) (businesses provide water dishes and treats)
  - Classic Car night- come shop the local businesses and check out really cool classic cars
Enforcement

Enforcement strategies help reduce unsafe behaviors by drivers, pedestrians and bicyclists and encourage all road users to obey traffic laws and share the road safely. Enforcement can be expensive, so it is best used strategically in conjunction with the other strategies.

Objective 1: Review the suggestions below and complete as time/funding allows.

- Enforcement around yielding to pedestrians (Short-term)
- Focus on lower speeds (Short-term)
  - e.g. South Silver Lake Rd
- Teach pedestrian safety course to HS drivers (Short-term)
Evaluation Plan

Evaluation planning is very important to a successful SRTS initiative and should be considered from the very beginning of the planning process. Questions for the community to consider could include: how do we define success for our efforts and how can we measure or document our progress? Evaluation will likely include a combination of quantitative information, such as counts of how many children are walking and bicycling, and more qualitative information, such as success stories from families who have chosen to walk and bicycle more.

Objective 1. Review list of suggestions below and work on these projects or similar Evaluation projects.

- Implement this list of recommended activities
  - Complete tally forms for grades K-8 (min) each year (Short-term)
  - Complete parent survey forms for grades K-8 annually (Short-term)
  - Annually review and make updates as necessary to the Safe Routes to School plan (Long/Short-term)
  - Continue to regularly meet as a Safe Routes to School team (Short-term)
    - At least quarterly
    - Alternatively, a group such as the Wellness Committee or other community group could be tasked with this

- These tasks are important in the evaluation of Safe Routes to School, consider adding them to the evaluation of Safe Routes to School as time allows
  - Have community members conduct walk audits (Short-term)
  - Conduct bike/pedestrian counts (Short-term)
    - Can be done anywhere, by school or trails, etc.
    - Refer to Mn/DOT for instructions and counting form

- Key informant interviews with community members and business owners to find out what they are interested in (Short-term)
  - Work with PartnerSHIP 4 Health (Short-term)
    - To help complete tallies and surveys
  - To accomplish other objectives as identified
Quick Wins

The quick wins section is for those tasks which we have identified that can be completed in the near future or anywhere from this summer to around one year out. Having quick wins are just as vital to the success of the program as new sidewalks and trails. These are efforts that can keep the community engaged and also help with health and wellness efforts.

Battle Lake can complete these activities easily with little, no, or currently available funding. They should also be chosen for maximum impact in order to generate support and enthusiasm around the Safe Routes to School Program.

- Apply for future SRTS funding as it becomes available
- Seek out other sources of funding for SRTS projects
- Continue hosting annual bike rodeos
- Identify key routes city-wide for sidewalk installation as funds become available
- Work with PartnerSHIP 4 Health to add additional bike racks
- Discuss with local businesses the possibility of the addition of bike rental
- Integrate walking/biking education into school activities
- Continue to host an annual International Bike/Walk to School Day event
Next Steps

Safe Routes to School planning is meant to identify strategies that Battle Lake can use to continue this work towards creating a community where walking and biking to school is a viable and safe choice. It is important that this work be ongoing in order to help create a cultural shift in the community to more fully embrace walking and biking to school. Where it is safe, we want to encourage children to walk/bike and where it is not safe we want to make it safe.

Objective 1: Some recommendations for moving forward with this program are as follows:

- Seek out appropriate funding sources to complete the engineering improvements outlined above (Long-term)
  - Safe Routes to Schools funds
  - Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Funds
  - Minnesota State Hwy Funds
  - DNR trail funding
  - Funding from organizations such as Bikes Belong
  - Local Funds
- Identify projects that the school would like to take on in an effort to encourage a healthy active lifestyle and increase walking/biking (Short-term)
- View bike/pedestrian infrastructure as an integrated part of Battle Lake’s transportation system (Long/Short-term)
- Continue meeting as a SRTS team or task another team to complete non-infrastructure projects related to SRTS Long/Short-term)
- Look into creating a paid position at the school (Long-term)
  - Apply for SRTS non-infrastructure implementation to help fund
Attachment A

Parent Survey

(Report of Findings)
Parent Survey Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name:</th>
<th>Battle Lake SRTS</th>
<th>Month and Year Collected:</th>
<th>October 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Name:</td>
<td>Battle Lake Public</td>
<td>Set ID:</td>
<td>8861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Enrollment:</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>Date Report Generated:</td>
<td>11/05/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment within Grades Targeted by SRTS Program:</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Number of Questionnaires Analyzed for Report:</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Questionnaires Distributed:</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Male
- Female

47% Male, 53% Female
Grade levels of children represented in survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade in School</th>
<th>Responses per grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</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

<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>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 1
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school

| Time of Trip | Number of Trips | Walk (Morning) | Walk (Afternoon) | Bike (Morning) | Bike (Afternoon) | School Bus (Morning) | School Bus (Afternoon) | Family Vehicle (Morning) | Family Vehicle (Afternoon) | Carpool (Morning) | Carpool (Afternoon) | Transit (Morning) | Transit (Afternoon) | Other (Morning) | Other (Afternoon) |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Morning      | 96             | 6%             | 1%               | 73%           | 20%             | 0%                  | 0%                   | 0%                     | 0%                         | 0%             | 0%             | 0%              | 0%             | 0%            |
| Afternoon    | 93             | 8%             | 1%               | 75%           | 15%             | 0%                  | 0%                   | 0%                     | 0%                         | 0%             | 0%             | 0%              | 0%             | 0%            |

No Response Morning: 2
No Response Afternoon: 5
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Typical mode of school arrival and departure by distance child lives from school

[Charts showing percentage of students using different modes of transportation for arrival and departure, categorized by distance.]

Walk, Bike, School Bus, Family Vehicle, Carpool, Transit, Other.
Typical mode of school arrival and departure by distance child lives from 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 1/4 mile</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</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>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don’t know or No response: 2
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

<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>7</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</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>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don’t know or No response: 5
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asked Permission?</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Less than 1/4 mile</th>
<th>1/4 to 1/2 mile</th>
<th>1/2 to 1 mile</th>
<th>1 mile up to 1 1/2 miles</th>
<th>More than 2 miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 3
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather or climate</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Intersections and Crossings</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks or Pathways</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence or Crime</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of Driving</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Participation in After School Programs</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Guards</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults to Bike/Walk With</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather or climate</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Intersections and Crossings</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks or Pathways</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence or Crime</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of Driving</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Participation in After School Programs</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Guards</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults to Bike/Walk With</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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/bike to school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather or climate</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Intersections and Crossings</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks or Pathways</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence or Crime</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of Driving</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's Participation in After School Programs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Guards</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults to Bike/Walk With</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents per Category</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No response: 24

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 respondents 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/bike 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

- 20% Encourages
- 9% Strongly Encourages
- 9% Discourages
- 3% Strongly Discourages
- 75% Neither

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

- 28% Fun
- 11% Very Fun
- 11% Somewhat
- 82% Neutral
Parents' opinions about how healthy walking and biking to/from school is for their child:

- 32% Very Healthy
- 35% Healthy
- 20% Neutral
- 2% Unhealthy
- 1% Very Unhealthy
## Comments Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SurveyID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>617208</td>
<td>#12 in 9 years of my kids going to school here there has only been one time of encouraging walking that I can remember and that was last month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917516</td>
<td>We live 9 miles from school and it’s too far to walk. Otherwise, we would encourage walking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917540</td>
<td>The intersection of Hwy 78 and Summit Street is my biggest concern. It’s very hard to cross there, hard to see cars coming over hill, parked cars. Needs a four-way stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917776</td>
<td>We live 17 miles from school, but not sure I would let my girls walk to school alone with the sad and horrific things that can happen so quickly in our world today!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917515</td>
<td>We currently live outside the town where the school is located by several miles. This honestly doesn’t apply to very many children in this area due to the small rural area and open enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917562</td>
<td>We live 8 miles from town, so my kids ride the bus. My kids, on occasion, walk to Open Door or a friend’s house after school. I was comfortable with a 3rd grader walking wolder brother, older friend. I think EL is a safe place to walk. Crossing guards might be nice, but then too, there are always parents walking wchildren, so not sure that is necessary either.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917799</td>
<td>Comment on question 10: “I am not moving.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917779</td>
<td>We live 5 miles from school-too far for him to walk or bike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917797</td>
<td>We live 12 miles from school so biking won’t be an option-unless in high school. Even then it’s a BiG maybe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917489</td>
<td>We live in the country. However, if we lived closer to town, I would love to see my children walking/biking if some of the above-mentioned safety issues were resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917510</td>
<td>Live in the country, so walking is not an option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917514</td>
<td>None at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917229</td>
<td>I have noticed that more than the highschool kids driving its the parents running late and speeding down summit to get their kids to school that are the problem! My son had to wait for 7 cars to pass before 1 stopped!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917509</td>
<td>We live about 9 miles from school. This make it hard to suggest this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917577</td>
<td>We live 12 miles from EL school. Biking or walking is not an option for many reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917775</td>
<td>My child must cross a county highway that has no crosswalk. There are also no sidewalks at all and the icy roads get narrow with snowbanks on each side of the road during the winter months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917502</td>
<td>We live 8 miles from the school. Walking or riding bike is not an option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917580</td>
<td>I will NOT let my child walk or bike to school, ever. Due to possibility of injury or abduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917782</td>
<td>We live 13 miles away. If we were to live within a mile or two, I would let my children walk/ride.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917498</td>
<td>If there were no buses to the Battle Lake School, we would send our kids to Ashby, Parkers Prairie or Underwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917777</td>
<td>If there were no buses to the Battle Lake School, we would send our kids to Ashby, Parkers Prairie or Underwood. Other comments: Over 14 miles from school and takes 75 minutes to commute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917517</td>
<td>If Battle Lake School did not offer bus transportation to and from school each day, then we would send our children to Ashby, Parkers Prairie or Underwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917581</td>
<td>The first question should be, “would distance between home and school permit the choice of walking/biking to school?”. Then the rest of the questionnaire becomes irrelevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B

Parent Survey Form

(Form Used)
Parent Survey About Walking and Biking to School

Dear Parent or Caregiver,

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

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

Thank you for participating in this survey!

**School Name:**

1. What is the grade of the child who brought home this survey? 
   - Grade (PK, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   **Travel time from school**
   - Less than 5 minutes
   - 5 - 10 minutes
   - 11 - 20 minutes
   - More than 20 minutes
   - Don’t know / Not sure
8. Has your child asked you for permission to walk or bike to/from school in the last year?  
   ![Radio button options: 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, 1, 2, 3..)  
   ![Radio button options: Grade, Not Sure]

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)  
    ![Radio button options: Yes, No, Not Sure]

    - 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

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)  
    ![Radio button options: Yes, No, Not Sure]

   - My child already walks or bikes to/from school

12. In your opinion, how much does your child’s school encourage or discourage walking and biking to/from school?  
    ![Radio button options: Strongly Encourages, Encourages, Neither, Discourages, Strongly Discourages]

13. How much fun is walking or biking to/from school for your child?  
    ![Radio button options: Very Fun, Fun, Neutral, Boring, Very Boring]

14. How healthy is walking or biking to/from school for your child?  
    ![Radio button options: Very Healthy, Healthy, Neutral, Unhealthy, Very Unhealthy]

15. What is the highest grade or year of school you completed?  
    ![Radio button options: 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.  
   ![Text box for comments]
Attachment C

Student Tally

(Report of Findings)
Tally Report Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name:</th>
<th>Battle Lake SRTS</th>
<th>Month and Year Collected:</th>
<th>October 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Name:</td>
<td>Battle Lake Public</td>
<td>Set ID:</td>
<td>10675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Enrollment:</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>Date Report Generated:</td>
<td>04/16/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment within Grades Targeted by SRTS Program:</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Number of Classrooms Included in Report:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Classrooms in School:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report contains information from parents about their children’s 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Vehicle</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### Tuesday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Vehicle</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Wednesday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Vehicle</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Thursday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Vehicle</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Morning and Afternoon Travel Mode Comparison by Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</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>144</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday PM</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday AM</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday PM</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday AM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday PM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Travel Mode by Weather Condition

<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>144</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.7%</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.
Attachment D

Student Tally

(Form Used)
Safe Routes to School Students Arrival and Departure Tally Sheet

+ CAPITAL LETTERS ONLY – BLUE OR BLACK INK ONLY +

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade: (PK, K, 1, 2, 3...)</th>
<th>Monday’s Date (Week count was conducted)</th>
<th>Number of Students Enrolled in Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M M D D Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 2</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>N= overcast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R= rainy</td>
<td>S= snow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number in</td>
<td>class when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>count made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample AM

| 5 | N | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 |

Sample PM

| R | 1 | 9 | 3 | 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.
Attachment E

SRTS Community Meeting Invite & Agenda
Safe Routes to School
community input meeting

Monday, Jan. 14, 2014
6-8 pm
Battle Lake City Hall

- Meet the Battle Lake SRTS team
- Learn more about SRTS
- Share ways to create a safer, healthier community through SRTS

For more information, contact Kayla Rossiter at
West Central Initiative, 800-735-2239, kayla@wcif.org
SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL COMMUNITY MEETING AGENDA

6pm – 6:30 Open House  
This is a time to have an informal visit with your local SRTS team and community leaders.

6:30-7:10 Presentation  
Introductions- Why are you attending tonight?  
Introduction of local SRTS Team  
SRTS Presentation  
SRTS Video  
Overview of Planning Process

7:10-7:55 Small Group  
Strengths, Weakness, Opportunity Challenges  
Visioning- What would you like your community to look like

7:55- 8:00 Wrap up

End at 8pm Sharp  
The SRTS team will be available after the meeting to answer any questions.
1A. Local Project Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanda</td>
<td>Berg-Vorgert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Battle Lake</td>
<td>Treasurer/Clerk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Battle Lake, 108 Main St. East, P.O. Box 386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Lake</td>
<td>Minn</td>
<td>56515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(218) 864-0424</td>
<td>Wanda Berg-Vorgert <a href="mailto:city@city.com">city@city.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1B. Sponsor (if different from Local Project Manager above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otter Tail County</td>
<td>Otter Tail County Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Administration, South Court Building, 505 South Court Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fergus Falls</td>
<td>Minn</td>
<td>56537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(218) 998-8470</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rwest@co.otter-tail.minn.us">rwest@co.otter-tail.minn.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1C. MPO (required for projects within an MPO area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Organization | Title |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2A. Project Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Mn/DOT District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Lake</td>
<td>056 OTTER TAIL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2B. Project Type

- ☒ Sidewalk
- ☐ Median refuge
- ☐ Traffic control devices (signals, flashing beacons, hawks)
- ☐ Crosswalk improvements
- ☐ Signage & pavement marking
- ☐ Other

Project title/short description: Battle Lake SRTS & Connections Project

2C. School(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Students to Benefit</th>
<th>School Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Lake Schools</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>Jeff Drake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2D. Roadway Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Name</th>
<th>Road Authority (town, city, county, state)</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olaf Avenue</td>
<td>City of Battle Lake</td>
<td>Steve Seufert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St.</td>
<td>City of Battle Lake</td>
<td>Steve Seufert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt &amp; McKinley</td>
<td>City of Battle Lake</td>
<td>Steve Seufert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Highway #83</td>
<td>Otter Tail County</td>
<td>Rick West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3A. Identify any existing plan that the proposed infrastructure project is stemming from:

- ☒ SRTS Plan  ☐ Ped/Bicycle Plan  ☒ Other (specify) City Complete Streets  ☐ NA

### 3B. Describe the current condition and tools used to assess the student travel modes and problems. Attach required maps and baseline results of the Student Travel Tally survey and Parent survey.

Several surveys were conducted to assess student travel modes and problems. The first survey was conducted by a team of observers on October 10th, 2012. This involved observation of traffic and pedestrian activity at various locations near the school and intersections leading to the school site. Observers visually noted travel modes, traffic patterns at the drop off site, and made note of safety concerns. One of the most significant observations is that students walked to school in the streets due to the absence of sidewalks. On November 29th and 30th, the Battle Lake School District hosted both a local and a regional Safe Routes to Schools meeting with keynote speaker, Mark Fenton, a national public health, planning and transportation expert. Mr. Fenton divided the attendees into teams and they walked the most commonly traveled routes to the Battle Lake School. The group stopped frequently to evaluate sidewalks, crosswalks and traffic patterns. Both issues and potential solutions were discussed. In the large group format, we also examined the negative trends in student health linked to sedentary lifestyles and childhood obesity. Our local planning team also utilized a parent survey that was conducted in October 2012. The survey was distributed to parents of students in grades kindergarten through 8th grade. Out of a total of 275 questionnaires distributed, 98 were returned.

### 3C. Summarize the results of the assessment tools and supporting data used in 3B and describe the infrastructure problem(s) identified through this evaluation.

1. The largest safety concern for student pedestrian travel to school is the lack of sidewalks. The safety risk is augmented by the fact that the paved surfaces of the city streets are relatively narrow, allowing for two-way traffic only. There is little to no shoulder. This creates an environment where students are literally walking down the middle of the streets to get to school.

2. The risk is even more pronounced during the winter months as rising snow banks create significant visibility issues at intersections. There is also the added risk of making an already narrow corridor more hazardous with the prevalence of compacted snow and ice on city streets.

3. The survey revealed some beliefs and barriers that this plan will help to overcome. Survey results indicate that parents rely heavily on the school busing as the preferred transportation method for students even within a quarter mile of the school. Parents cite the speed of traffic, amount of traffic, concerns with intersections and crossings, and the lack of sidewalks as reasons why their children do not walk to school. Please see attached questionnaire for complete survey results.

### 3D. Describe the public involvement process for the development of this project with school members, parents, law enforcement, road authorities and other community members impacted by this project.

1. The city/school hosted public meetings with the planning team and city/school officials, police chief and public works director. Each meeting had presentation, question and answer and input phases and a comprehensive Safe Routes to School plan was presented. A neighborhood meeting was held 01/07/13 at the school. Notices were sent to residents most affected by the plan. The meeting was well-attended and the feedback was extremely positive. Feedback indicated improvements were needed and necessary. A meeting on 1/14/13 at city hall drew feedback from others in the community. Results were shared with the city council/school board. Project plans appeared in the local newspaper and city website. Short-term plans addressed dangerous conditions for student travel reflecting the need for students to walk in streets on the way to school due to lack of sidewalks. It also addressed a dangerous intersection between Opal Ave. and City 883 where a student travelling on a bicycle was struck by a car. The plan provides safe access to the school's emergency relocation site. Presently, students must walk down the street. Plans also include a multi-use path from the school to a park adjacent to a senior living facility allowing easy access to the school for volunteers. The park serves as a drop-off point for Walk to School Day and provides a link to a bike trail system extending to a nearby state park. The long-term plan would connect the east/west sides of the city through a multi-use path providing safe crossing of Hwy #78 and provide a link to the school and bike trail hub.
4A. Describe the proposed infrastructure project. Attach plan view layout of the project and typical sections.

The project would involve several infrastructure improvements. A five-foot wide sidewalk would be constructed along Olaf Ave and Main Street sections as indicated by the map attachments. Painted crosswalks with lighted signage would be placed at the intersections of Olaf Ave and Main Street. Painted crosswalks with lighted signage would also be utilized on Olaf Ave in the Moo Drive vicinity at the trailer park and additionally at Olaf Street crossing at County Road #83. Additional signage will be utilized along County Highway #83 to indicate an upcoming crosswalk. Pedestrian ramps will be incorporated into the sidewalks to ensure accessibility. The trail piece to Halverson Park would be ten-feet wide with two foot shoulders. The trail portion would be a multi-use path linking the school students residing in the north end of town and serve as a remote drop off site for walk to school initiatives. This path would run adjacent to a senior living facility allowing residents easy access to school functions, school volunteer opportunities and possibly walking school bus initiatives. This project is not expected to impact any environmentally sensitive areas.

4B. Explain how the project will address the problem(s) in question 3C. Include guidance or research to support its implementation for the problem(s) identified.

The Olaf Ave sidewalk and crosswalk at Cty Hwy #83 will provide a safe route for pedestrian traffic. Several conditions currently exist that make this area a safety concern: 1. The city Hwy was recently improved which has resulted in higher traffic speeds. 2. Road grades create visibility issues for both pedestrian traffic and vehicles. 3. The shoulder was widened making it more difficult to cross. The intersection was the site of an accident between a car and a bicycle a couple of years ago. The school emergency evacuation site is located at 1st Lutheran Church which is just off Olaf Ave. The sidewalk and crosswalk would provide a much safer route for nearly 500 students and staff to travel in the event of an emergency. Past drills have forced us to walk in the streets. Two remote drop-off sites (Halverson Park & 1st Lutheran Church) would be created for walking school bus or walk to school initiatives. This would also provide opportunities for a safe route for student travel on both the north and south ends of the district. A recent Missouri study showed that more than half of residents increased their walking patterns when a nearby trail opened. A 2007 North Carolina study also showed increased physical activity among residents.

4C. Explain and demonstrate how the project will be ready for construction in 2014 and describe how it will be maintained and by whom.

The Battle Lake City Engineer will create the plans and specifications so that the city can place the project up for bids should funding for the project be secured. The city has passed a resolution stating that it will be responsible for continued maintenance including snow removal of the sidewalks and trails.

Both the sidewalks and trails would be incorporated into the city's pavement management plan and budgeted for accordingly.

The city owns the right of way/easement on the property that would be affected by the infrastructure project, however, great care has been taken to inform all community members and property owners along the proposed project of its scope and impact.

5A. List events, activities, or programs at the school or in the community that supports Safe Routes to School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>Event Date</th>
<th>Event Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Ski Rodeo</td>
<td>April/May each year</td>
<td>Kathy Kensinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to School Day</td>
<td>Fall each year</td>
<td>Jeff Drake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Safety Training</td>
<td>September each year</td>
<td>Jeff Drake/Kent Kortlever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Up to Play 60</td>
<td>Bi-Annually</td>
<td>Steve Bradsteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jump Rope/HoopsHeart</td>
<td>Spring - Annually</td>
<td>Steve Bradsteen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5B. Describe how the 5 E’s of the SRTS program are incorporated.

Education: The school district has successful partnerships with the city and civic groups such as the Lion’s Club. Together, we put on an annual bike rodeo to stress bicycle safety. If the project is funded we will run various campaigns aimed at students, parents, and community members encouraging the use of the new paths and promoting the benefits of exercise. Encouragement: We participated in the Walk to School Day and plan to continue working with this program. Enforcement: The Chief of Police has been involved in our planning process and intends to be a partner to reduce unsafe driver and pedestrian behavior. A K-12 grade bus safety training is held each year by the chief of police. Evaluation: We will conduct a follow-up audit, student and parent surveys, and compare data on enforcement activities. Evaluation will be ongoing as we plan and implement additional infrastructure projects in the future. Engineering: The city engineer inspected and approved the proposed route. The plan addresses crosswalks and signage to improve safety.

6. Provide a cost breakdown of project components listed. Attach a detailed engineer’s estimate for the construction project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Construction</th>
<th>Local/Other sources</th>
<th>Requested SRTS</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Local/Other sources</th>
<th>Requested SRTS</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct Engineering</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26,000.00</td>
<td>26,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost</td>
<td>260,000.00</td>
<td>260,000.00</td>
<td>260,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Local/Other sources</th>
<th>Requested SRTS</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>260,000.00</td>
<td>260,000.00</td>
<td>260,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2012 SRTS Application Form is a Formatta form and is designed to be completed on your local workstation. The procedure is to download the form and instructions from the Mn/DOT Safe Routes To School website http://www.dot.state.mn.us/saferoutes/index.html and save it to your local system. You will also need a small, free application called 'Filler' that allows you to open and complete the form. Filler is available here: http://www.dot.state.mn.us/stateaid/formatta/FillerSetupNR.exe. As you download Filler, accept the License Agreement. Accept the Default Destination Location. After the software installs a blank Registration form appears. Ignore this form by clicking the X to close. You will only need to downloaded and installed filler once for each workstation.

Please try to be brief and concise when completing the application. Do not include non-relevant information or attachments.

When the electronic application is completed please ensure that you have saved it to your local drive or server. Send the completed electronic application attached to an e-mail to SafeRoutes.DOT@state.mn.us.

Use the US mail to send 5 copies of the printed application, maps, plan sheets, typical section surveys, letters of concurrence, letters of support and other relevant attachments to:

Mao Yang  
Mn/DOT State Aid Division  
395 John Ireland Blvd, Mail Stop 500  
St. Paul, MN 55155

Electronic and paper copies of the applications are due to Mn/DOT State Aid Division by February 15, 2013 at 12pm.

If you have questions about the program or application please submit them to: SafeRoutes.DOT@state.mn.us or call 651-366-3027
ATTACHMENTS:

1. ENGINEER’S ESTIMATES (3).

2. TYPICAL SECTIONS (SIDEWALK AND PATHWAY)

3. PROPOSED PROJECT MAP

4. CITY OF BATTLE LAKE RESOLUTION

5. OTTER TAIL COUNTY RESOLUTION

6. OBSERVATION DATA
   a. PARENT SURVEY SUMMARY
   b. TALLY REPORT SUMMARY

7. LETTERS OF CONCURRENCE
   a. ENGINEER, JEREMY ANDERSON (DESIGN TREE ENGINEERING)
   b. BATTLE LAKE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR STEVE SEUFERT
   c. BATTLE LAKE SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT/PRINCIPAL JEFF DRAKE
   d. CLITHERALL TOWNSHIP BOARD CHAIR DALLAS GREWE
   e. OTTER TAIL COUNTY ENGINEER RICK WEST

8. LETTERS OF SUPPORT
   a. BL TRAIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIR DAN MALMSTROM
   b. PARTNERSHIP 4 HEALTH - PATRICK HOLLISTER
   c. MARK FENTON, NATIONAL HEALTH CONSULTANT AND AUTHOR
   d. BATTLE LAKE POLICE CHIEF KENT KORTLEVER
   e. LAKE REGION HEALTHCARE – JED LAPLANTE
   f. WEST CENTRAL INITIATIVE PRESIDENT NANCY STRAW
   g. BL GOOD SAMARITAN SOCIETY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR JAMES WOLF

9. RELATED PICTURES, DOCUMENTS
## OPINION OF PROBABLE COST - STREET IMPROVEMENTS
### CITY OF BATTLE LAKE

**SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL - MOEN DR. TO SCHOOL**
January 22, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON EXCAVATION</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGREGATE BASE</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$1,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&quot; CONCRETE CURB &amp; GUTTER</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$30,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&quot; CONCRETE WALK</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>9990</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$59,940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN RAMP</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNAGE</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURF ESTABLISHMENT</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSSWALKS - PAINT</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$3,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL**                      | $109,200.00

**CONTINGENCY (10%)**             | $10,920.00

**CONSTRUCTION TOTAL**            | $120,120.00

**ENGINEERING**                   | $12,010.00

**STREET TOTAL**                  | $132,130.00
## OPINION OF PROBABLE COST - STREET IMPROVEMENTS
### CITY OF BATTLE LAKE

**SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL - MAIN ST. FROM LINCOLN TO OLAF**

January 22, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON EXCavATION</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGREGATE BASE</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&quot; CONCRETE WALK</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5450</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$32,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN RAMP</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURF ESTABLISHMENT</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSSWALKS - PAINT</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$24,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** $45,600.00

CONTINGENCY (10%) $5,000.00

CONSTRUCTION TOTAL $50,600.00

ENGINEERING $5,000.00

STREET TOTAL $55,600.00

## OPINION OF PROBABLE COST - STREET IMPROVEMENTS
### CITY OF BATTLE LAKE

**SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL - HALVERSON PARK TO SCHOOL**

January 22, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEARING &amp; GRUBBING</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON EXCAVATION</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGREGATE BASE</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE SP 9.5 WEARING COURSE MIXTURE (3,0)</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$51,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNAGE</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURF ESTABLISHMENT</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** $77,500.00

CONTINGENCY (10%) $7,800.00

CONSTRUCTION TOTAL $85,300.00

ENGINEERING $8,500.00

STREET TOTAL $93,800.00
RESOLUTION NO. 01-08-2013A

REQUESTING OTTER TAIL COUNTY ACT AS SPONSOR
FOR A SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROJECT IDENTIFIED AS
THE OLAF AVENUE/Main STREET AND THE PARK-TO-SCHOOL TRAILS

WHEREAS, the City of Battle Lake has determined that it is in the best interests of the community to support and promote active transportation for all residents and particularly for school children; and

WHEREAS, we believe the construction of sidewalks and/or multi-use paved pathways in certain areas within the City will expand community connectivity and enhance the health and well-being of community residents; and

WHEREAS, the City of Battle Lake is working with the Battle Lake School and the Safe Routes to School planning team to develop a project consisting of a sidewalk or multi-use pathway adjacent to Olaf Avenue from Moen Drive to the school’s south parking lot and adjacent to Main Street from Lincoln Avenue to Roosevelt Avenue and another section from Halverson Park southwest to the school’s property; and

WHEREAS, the City of Battle Lake agrees to assume full responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the proposed improvements related to the above described project; and

WHEREAS, we intend to apply for Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Grant funds for funding of this project; and

WHEREAS, the Safe Routes to School grant program requires cities that are not State Aid cities, be sponsored by their county;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Battle Lake City Council requests the Otter Tail County Board of Commissioners agree to act as project sponsor for the Safe Routes to School project identified as the Olaf Avenue and Park-to-School trails.

PASSED by the Battle Lake City Council this 8th day of January, 2013.

Charles M Reeve, Mayor

ATTEST:

Wanda Berg-Vorgert, Clerk-Treasurer
OTTER TAIL COUNTY RESOLUTION
Safe Routes to School Project

Resolution No. 2013-15

BE IT RESOLVED, that the County of Otter Tail act as sponsoring agency for the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Project within the City of Battle Lake and acknowledges herewith that it is willing to be the project sponsor knowing full well that such sponsorship includes a willingness to secure and guarantee the local share of costs associated with this project and responsibility for seeing this project through to its completion, with compliance of all applicable laws, rules and regulations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Richard K. West, County Engineer, is hereby authorized to act as agent on behalf of this applicant.

AGREEMENT TO MAINTAIN FACILITY

WHEREAS, The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requires that states agree to design, construct, operate and maintain facilities constructed with federal transportation funds for the useful life of the improvement and not change the use of right of way required without prior approval from the FHWA; and

WHEREAS, SRTS projects receive federal funding from the reauthorization of the Surface Transportation Program (STP) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) of 2005; and

WHEREAS, The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) has determined that for projects implemented with SRTS funds, this requirement should be applied to the project sponsor; and

WHEREAS, The County of Otter Tail is the project sponsor for the SRTS project within the City of Battle Lake.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Project Sponsor hereby agrees to assume full responsibility for the design, construction, operation and maintenance of property and facilities related to the aforementioned SRTS project.

Adopted at Fergus Falls, Minnesota, this 5th day of February, 2013.

OTTER TAIL COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

By: [Signature]
Doug Hutsch, County Board Chair

Attest: [Signature]
Larry Krohn, Clerk

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF OTTER TAIL

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly passed, adopted and approved by the County Board of said County on February 5, 2013.

(SEAL)

Larry Krohn, County Board Clerk
February 4, 2013

To whom it may concern:

As engineer for the City of Battle Lake, I am confirming my concurrence with the City of Battle Lake’s application for a Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Grant. I believe that this proposed infrastructure project adequately addresses the issues of pedestrian safety, active living and community connectivity. I believe that the plan and grant application reflects the efforts of the City of Battle Lake, Battle Lake School and of Safe Routes to School.

Regarding the grant application development, I was personally involved in the following:

- Assessing the current conditions of existing infrastructure
- Evaluating routes for the proposed sidewalks and pathway
- Creating an estimate of the project costs for each segment

If the proposed project is selected for funding, I will be involved in designing the improvements, acquiring the necessary permits and inspection while the project is underway and also at completion.

I look forward to assisting the City of Battle Lake with the implementation of this plan to help improve pedestrian safety, promote active living and increase community connectivity.

Sincerely,

DESIGN TREE ENGINEERING, INCORPORATED

Jeremy E. Anderson, P.E., LEED AP
Vice President
February 1, 2013

To whom it may concern:

The City of Battle Lake Public Works Department believes the Safe Routes to School project is a cooperative effort between the City and the School to create a safe way for our children to travel between their homes and school. We hope to promote healthy physical activity in our community for all residents as well.

As Public Works director for the City of Battle Lake, I have been involved in the planning process for this project and am confirming my concurrence with this application for a Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Grant. I believe this proposed project adequately addresses the issues of pedestrian safety, active living and community connectivity and reflects the efforts of the City of Battle Lake, Battle Lake School and of Safe Routes to School.

If the proposed project is selected for funding, I will work with the City engineer to design, bid and construct the improvements. The Public Works Department will also be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the proposed sidewalks and pathway.

If you have questions or need further information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Steve Seufert
Public Works Director
February 7, 2013

Minnesota Department of Transportation
Division of State Aid
Attn.: Mao Yang
395 John Ireland Blvd, Mail Stop 300
St. Paul, MN 55155

Subject: Letter of Concurrence for the City of Battle Lake/Battle Lake Independent School District #542 SRTS infrastructure grant application.

Dear Ms. Yang,

Battle Lake Public Schools fully supports the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) infrastructure project as outlined in the application. The development of this comprehensive plan demonstrates the very best in small town collaboration and the proposal has received strong support from our community.

The plan addresses significant safety hazards that are present for students who wish to walk to school. Foremost, is the absence of sidewalks along several streets leading to the school. This is especially dangerous during the winter months when compacted snow and ice and rising snow banks bring additional challenges to safe travel.

While the plan proposes significant improvements in safety, it also fosters community-wide connectivity. The path section proposed from the school to Halverson Park connects with a large senior living facility and bridges a gap between our city’s bike trail hub and an extended trail out to Glendalough State Park. The plan also provides several components that will make walking to school a more attractive option for our students and their families. We believe it will foster better student health and have a positive impact on our environment through a reduction in the number of in-town bus pickups.

We look forward to continued collaborative work with our city and community to make Battle Lake the very best it can be!

Respectfully,

Jeffrey D. Drake
Superintendent/Principal/Curriculum Director
Battle Lake Public Schools
February 1, 2013

To whom it may concern:

Clitherall Township shares road authority with the City of Battle Lake for the city street known as Olaf Avenue. We have no objection to the planned improvements adjacent to this roadway as conveyed in the City of Battle Lake's application for a Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Grant. We believe that this proposed infrastructure project addresses issues of pedestrian safety that will benefit both residents of Clitherall Township and the City of Battle Lake.

If the proposed project is selected for funding, we will work with the City engineer and Public Works Director as needed on crosswalk design and any other aspect of the project that concerns Clitherall Township.

Sincerely,

Dallas Grewe
Township Chair
February 8, 2013

To whom it may concern:

As the County Engineer for Otter Tail County, I am confirming my concurrence with the City of Battle Lake’s application for a Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Grant. I believe that this proposed infrastructure project will address issues of pedestrian safety especially in that segment of the proposed route that intersects with County Highway 83.

If the project is selected for funding, I have agreed to work with the City of Battle Lake on the proposed installation of crosswalks and signage related to County right-of-way.

I look forward to assisting the City of Battle Lake with the implementation of this plan to help improve pedestrian safety, promote active living for school children and increase community connectivity.

Sincerely,

Otter Tail County Highway Department

Richard West, P.E.
County Engineer

RKW:mk

cc: File
February 8, 2013

Minnesota Department of Transportation
Transportation Building
Attn: Lisa Bender, MS 430
395 John Ireland Blvd
St. Paul, MN 55155

Subject: Letter of support for the City of Battle Lake and Battle Lake School District #542 SRTS infrastructure grant application

Dear Lisa:

The Trail Advisory Committee in the City of Battle Lake Minnesota enthusiastically supports the funding request submitted by the local Safe Routes to School team.

By summer's end 2013, the citizens of Otter Tail County in central Minnesota will realize a vision they have collaborated to affect for more than five years – a comprehensive bike and pedestrian trail tied to Glendalough State Park. Additionally, a Halverson Park trail (along Highway 78) will address safety, connectivity and access for senior citizens, residents and boaters.

A central part of this trail planning effort has been physical and academic benefit for students in District #542. The Safe Routes to Schools funding amplifies those benefits considerably by providing District students safe access, to and from the rich physical and academic elements of Glendalough State Park.

The SRTS request will essentially unite students with numerous aspects of our community that were outlined in our original plans. And, if you think about schools as “places of learning”, this SRTS funding enables students from the District to experience traditional learning AND the richness of experiential learning in outdoor and indoor classrooms within the context of Glendalough State Park—safely.

I am grateful the City of Battle Lake and the Battle Lake Public School are pursuing the SRTS concept, and I strongly recommend the awarding of these funds to our area.

Dan Malmstrom
Chairperson
Bike & Pedestrian Trail Advisory Committee
February 11, 2013

Wanda Berg-Vogt
City of Battle Lake
108 Main Street East
Battle Lake, MN 56515

Dear Ms. Berg-Vogt,

I am sending you this letter on behalf of PartnerSHIP 4 Health in support of the application by the City of Battle Lake for a Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Grant. PartnerSHIP 4 Health is a collaborative effort of Becker, Clay, Otter Tail, and Wilkin Counties, and is funded in part by a Statewide Health Improvement Program grant from the Minnesota Department of Health. We are committed to making communities more conducive to active transportation (biking and walking) through improved community design, and we have recently begun working with the City of Battle Lake in this regard.

We support Battle Lake’s desire to increase opportunities for children to bike or walk to school in their community. Awarding this SRTS Infrastructure Grant to Battle Lake would be a major step towards Battle Lake’s goal. We support Battle Lake’s vision for improved safety and healthier lifestyles for their children.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Patrick C. Hollister
PartnerSHIP 4 Health
Becker, Clay, Otter Tail, and Wilkin Counties
218-329-1809
patrick.hollister@co.clay.mn.us

cc: Gina Nolte, PartnerSHIP 4 Health
January 28, 2013
Minnesota Department of Transportation
Transportation Building
Attn: Lisa Bender, MS 430
395 John Ireland Boulevard
St. Paul, MN 5515

Subject: Letter of support for the City of Battle Lake and Battle Lake Independent School District #542 SRTS infrastructure grant application

Dear Lisa,

The Battle Lake Police Department strongly supports the City of Battle Lake and the Battle Lake School application for a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Infrastructure grant application.

As the police chief for the City of Battle Lake I have observed the many dangers faced by students who walk or ride a bike to school. These dangers are also recognized by the parents as well who then choose to drive their children instead of allowing them to walk. These dangers consist of narrow roadways and unmarked crossings at intersections. In the winter time this is coupled by snow banks and icy roads which cause a hazard of being seen along with slippery spots while children are walking down the street with cars passing by at close distances.

I believe that the enhancement of our city by providing Safe Routes to Schools will greatly reduce the dangers and risks that our children face when travelling to and from school.

I have been in attendance at neighborhood and community meetings and have heard the importance of providing safe routes for our children and residents.

Sincerely,

Kent Kortleve, Police Chief
City of Battle Lake
February 5, 2013

Minnesota Department of Transportation
Transportation Building
Attn: Lisa Bender, MS 430
395 John Ireland Boulevard
St. Paul, MN 5515

Subject: Letter of support for the City of Battle Lake and Battle Lake Independent School District #542 SRTS infrastructure grant application

Dear Lisa,

It is with great pleasure that I offer my support to the City of Battle Lake and Battle Lake School District in their joint application to apply for SRTS infrastructure funding. As you know I had the opportunity to facilitate a Safe Routes to School planning session in Battle Lake in late November, and I was very pleased to see the broad interdisciplinary partnership they have convened and the work they are pursuing.

Despite its small size this is a thoughtful community working hard to create safer and more inviting settings for routine walking and cycling. They are supporting a four-to-three-lane conversion on their main street which will improve bicycle accommodation and ease pedestrian crossing. They are also adding trail to connect the school to a nearby state park. This will obviously accommodate students walking and cycling from that direction on a quality, off-street facility. But it also will connect a senior housing facility to the school, providing a chance for those older adults to support walking groups and other school activities. The link will also enable classes to walk to the park, and supports use of the park as a remote drop-off area for car and bus riders.

A fairly modest investment will provide terrific benefits to Battle Lake, and I urge your support of this funding request, and look forward to hearing of the community’s success.

Sincerely,

Mark Fenton
January 25, 2013

Mao Yang
Mn/DOT State Aid Division
395 John Ireland Blvd, Mail Stop 500
St. Paul, MN 55155

Subject: Letter of support for the City of Battle Lake and Battle Lake Independent School District #542 SRTS infrastructure grant application

Dear Mao,

Lake Region Healthcare strongly supports the City of Battle Lake and Battle Lake School District application for a Safe Routes to School infrastructure grant.

As a non-profit healthcare organization whose aim is to improve the health of the people in our region we emphatically support efforts to improve safety for children.

As Minnesota's preeminent regional healthcare partner, Lake Region Healthcare is committed to working with the City of Battle Lake and Battle Lake School on its Safe Routes to School infrastructure efforts.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jed LaPlante
Outreach Clinic Director
January 23, 2013

Mao Yang  
Mn/DOT State Aid Division  
395 John Ireland Blvd, Mail Stop 500  
St. Paul, MN 55155

Subject: Letter of support for the City of Battle Lake and Battle Lake Independent School District #542 SRTS infrastructure grant application

Dear Mao,

West Central Initiative (WCI) enthusiastically supports the City of Battle Lake and Battle Lake School District application for a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) infrastructure grant.

Over the past 15 years, WCI has partnered with Mn/DOT to address transportation planning needs and issues in our region of west central Minnesota. During this time, WCI has worked on a variety of transportation initiatives and has seen the tremendous need for SRTS planning and implementation in west central Minnesota.

WCI has also been increasing its efforts recently in the areas of SRTS and active transportation planning. In addition to our work with Mn/DOT, WCI has entered into a partnership with the Minnesota Department of Health to further our work in these vital planning areas.

WCI is committed to working with the City of Battle Lake and Battle Lake School on its SRTS infrastructure efforts, and we look forward to partnering with them on this important process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Nancy Straw  
President
February 8, 2013

Mao Yang
MN/DOT State Aid Division
395 John Ireland BLVD, Mail Stop 500
St. Paul, MN 55155

Subject: Letter of support for the City of Battle Lake and Battle Lake Independent School District #542 SRTS Infrastructure grant application

Dear Mao,

Good Samaritan Society-Battle Lake, a senior living and long-term-care provider in Battle Lake, strongly supports the City of Battle Lake and Battle Lake Independent School Districts application for a Safe Routes to School SRTS infrastructure grant.

As a non-profit health care organization whose goal is to provide frail elderly with long-term-care and housing services in the greater Battle Lake area, we enthusiastically support efforts to improve safety for area children.

As the Country's largest not-for-profit provider of senior care services, the Evangelical Lutheran Good Samaritan Society, dba Battle Lake is committed to working side-by-side with the City of Battle Lake and the Battle Lake School District on its Safe Routes to School infrastructure efforts.

Sincerely,

James Wolf, Executive Director
Good Samaritan Society-Battle Lake
Community Contributes Input
For Safe Routes To School Grant

Kayla Rossiter of West Central Initiative Active Transportation Planner gave the group a brief informational presentation on the SRTS.

Small groups were formed to discuss options and figure out safe routes on aerial maps. Superintendent Jeff Drake points out the location of the school.

Safe Routes to School is a program to help make it safer for kids to walk and bike to school in Battle Lake. As part of that program, a community input meeting was held Monday, January 14th from 6-8 p.m. at Battle Lake City Hall. Members of the community were asked to give their feedback on the work that has been done so far and also to provide their recommendations on how to make Battle Lake more walkable, bikeable for its students.

The focus of Safe Routes to School is children grades K-8. Structured around “the 5 E’s,” this program aims to do more than just provide new bike paths and trails. The five E’s are: Education, Encouragement, Enforcement, Engineering and Evaluation. By using these five elements, it makes sure that this program will be successful on multiple levels. At the community input meeting the five E’s were discussed along with multiple ideas for safer routes and street crossing improvements that will help children in Battle Lake.

Another small group shows City Clerk Wanda (right) pointing out the future bike/hike trail from Battle Lake to Glendalough State Park that could also be used as a safe route to school.

The overall purpose of this is to create a plan with short and long range strategies in each of the five areas. In addition to the many benefits for kids, this is a great thing for residents as well. Planning out these strategies gives Battle Lake a “leg-up” when it comes to applying for government funding for projects they would like to see in the future.

The City of Battle Lake and the Battle Lake School are planning to apply for an infrastructure grant to install sidewalks and paved pathways in areas that have been identified as routes used by school children. If grant funding is approved, the project would be completed in 2014.
BIKE OR WALK TO WORK OR SCHOOL WEEK PROCLAMATION
FOR THE CITY OF BATTLE LAKE, MINNESOTA

Whereas biking and walking are two of the easiest and most efficient ways to increase energy, manage weight, and reduce health risks; and

Whereas, the City of Battle Lake, Minnesota encourages the increased use of the bicycle and walking as means of transportation, benefiting all citizens of Battle Lake by improving air quality, reducing traffic congestion and noise, decreasing the use of and dependence upon finite energy sources, and fostering increased physical activity; and

Whereas, the City of Battle Lake, Minnesota recognizing the use of bicycles and walking as viable modes of transportation, endeavors to promote safe and responsible bicycling and walking and is committed to the accommodation of bicycling and walking in Battle Lake; and

Whereas, The City of Battle Lake recognizes that biking or walking to work or school may not be practical for all of its residents, but nonetheless encourages those residents who cannot bike or walk to work or school during said week to take a walking or biking break during the day that week;

Whereas, for more than a century the bicycle has been an utilitarian, economical, environmentally sound and effective means of personal transportation, recreation and fitness; and

Whereas, the City of Battle Lake, Minnesota recognizes the bicycle as a legitimate roadway vehicle and therefore cyclists are entitled to legal and responsible use of all public roadway facilities in Minnesota except highways constructed to interstate standards;

Now, therefore, I, Charles M Reeve, Mayor of Battle Lake, Minnesota, do hereby proclaim May 5 to May 13, 2012, as Bike or Walk to Work or School Week in the City of Battle Lake, Minnesota.

In the witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the seal of the City of Battle Lake, Minnesota, this 10th day of April, 2012.

Charles M Reeve, Mayor

Attest:

Wanda Berg-Vorgert, Clerk-Treasurer
Snow drifts along Roosevelt St. looking north towards the school.
Attachment G

Complete Streets Policy Resolution
RESOLUTION # 06-14-2011

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A COMPLETE STREETS POLICY

WHEREAS, the mobility of freight and passengers and the safety, convenience and comfort of motorists, cyclists, pedestrians — including people requiring mobility aids, transit riders and neighborhood residents of all ages and abilities should all be considered when planning and designing Battle Lake’s streets;

AND WHEREAS, integrating sidewalks, bike facilities, transit amenities and safe crossings into the initial design of street projects avoids the expense of retrofits later;

AND WHEREAS, streets are a critical component of public space and play a major role in establishing the image and identity of a city, providing a key framework for current and future development;

AND WHEREAS, active living integrates physical activity into daily routines and Active Living communities encourage individuals of all ages and abilities to be more physically active;

AND WHEREAS, communities that support active living strive to create amenities that will enhance the quality of life of its residents, improve the physical and social environment in ways that attract businesses and workers and contribute to economic development;

AND WHEREAS, the goal of complete streets is to improve the access and mobility for all users of streets in the community by improving safety through reducing conflict and encouraging non-motorized transportation and transit, which will enhance the promotion of active living as a means to improve the health of the community residents and improve environmental conditions, including air quality;

AND WHEREAS, it is recognized that are some streets or corridors in the City which would not fully satisfy a complete streets environment, but that sidewalks be installed wherever there is developed frontage, except for short cul-de-sac streets.

NOW THEREFORE, Be it resolved that the City Council of the City of Battle Lake, Minnesota establish a Complete Streets Policy that provides as follows:

1. The City of Battle Lake will, whenever it is economically feasible, seek to enhance the safety, access, convenience and comfort of all users of all ages and abilities, including pedestrians (including people requiring mobility aids), bicyclists, transit users, motorists and freight drivers, through the design, operation and maintenance of the transportation network so as to create a connected network of facilities accommodating each mode of travel that is consistent with and supportive of the local community, recognizing that all streets are different and that the needs of various users will need to be balanced in a flexible manner.

2. Transportation improvements will include facilities and amenities that are recognized as contributing to complete streets, which may include street and sidewalk lighting, sidewalks and pedestrian safety improvements such as median refuges or crosswalk improvements; improvements that provide ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant accessibility; bicycle accommodations including bicycle parking, bicycle routes, shared-use lanes, wide travel lanes or bike lanes as appropriate, and street trees, boulevard landscaping, street furniture and adequate drainage facilities.

3. Early consideration of all modes for all users will be important to the success of this Policy. Those planning and designing street projects will give due consideration to bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities from the very start of planning and design work. This will apply to all roadway projects, including those involving new construction, reconstruction, or changes in the allocation of pavement space on an existing roadway (such as the reduction in the number of travel lanes or removal of on-street parking).
4. Bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities will be considered in street construction, reconstruction, re-paving, and rehabilitation projects, except under one or more of the following conditions:

A. A project involves only ordinary maintenance activities designed to keep assets in servicable condition, such as mowing, cleaning, sweeping, spot repair, concrete joint repair, or pothole filling, or when interim measures are implemented on temporary detour or haul routes.

B. The City Engineer, with Council consultation, determines there are relatively high safety risks.

C. The City Council exempts a project due to excessive and disproportionate cost of establishing a bikeway, walkway or transit enhancement as part of a project.

D. The City Zoning Officer determines that the construction is not practically feasible or cost effective because of significant or adverse environmental impacts to streams, flood plains, remnants of native vegetation, wetlands, steep slopes or other critical areas, or due to impacts on neighboring land uses, including impact from right-of-way acquisition.

5. It will be important to the success of the Complete Streets Policy to ensure that the project development process includes early consideration of the land use and transportation context of the project, the identification of gaps and deficiencies in the network for various user groups that could be addressed by the project and an assessment of the tradeoffs to balance the needs of all users. The context factors that should be given high priority include the following:

A. Whether the corridor provides a primary access to a significant destination such as a community or regional park or recreational area, a school, a shopping/commercial area or an employment center;

B. Whether the corridor provides access across a natural or man-made barrier such as a river or freeway.

C. Whether the corridor is in an area where a relatively high number of users of non-motorized transportation modes can be anticipated.

D. Whether a road corridor provides important continuity or connectivity links for an existing trail or path network; or

E. Whether nearby routes that provide a similar level of convenience and connectivity already exists.

6. The design of new or reconstructed facilities should anticipate likely future demand for bicycling, walking and transit facilities and should not preclude the provision of future improvements. (For example, under most circumstances, bridges, which last for 75 years or more, should be built with sufficient width for safe bicycle and pedestrian use in anticipation of a future need for such facilities.)

7. The City will maintain a comprehensive inventory of the pedestrian and bicycling facility infrastructure integrated with City street and utility maps and will carry out projects to eliminate gaps in the sidewalk and trail networks.
8. Complete streets may be achieved through single projects or incrementally through a series of smaller improvements or maintenance activities over time.

9. The City will generally follow accepted or adopted design standards when implementing improvements intended to fulfill this Complete Streets policy but will consider innovative or non-traditional design options where a comparable level of safety for users is present.

10. The City will develop implementation strategies that may include evaluating and revising manuals and practices, developing and adopting network plans, identifying goals and targets, and tracking measure such as safety and modal shifts to gauge success.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the feasibility report prepared for a street project shall include documentation of compliance with this policy.

Adopted this 16th day of June, 2011.

Wanda Berg-Vorger, Clerk-Treasurer

Charles M Reeve, Mayor