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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS AND ACTION PLAN

The purpose of this Safe Routes to School (SRTS) plan is to guide school and city staff, local and state officials, parents, and educators in their efforts to make it easier, safer and more comfortable for students to walk and bicycle to and from school. It is the product of direct observation, expert analysis of the existing conditions around the schools and in the community, input from members of the community, Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) assembled crash and traffic data, and results from standardized parent surveys and student travel tallies. A successful SRTS program will require community involvement if it is to have a meaningful impact on students attending school. However, as an added bonus, SRTS programs and infrastructure usually prove beneficial to the whole community.

SRTS plans and programming are just a few of the tools being used to combat physical inactivity and increased levels of obesity in the United States. Both are considered public health crises that are greatly impacting the health of Americans, contributing to the rising costs of medical care today and much more so in the future if current trends continue. Walking or biking to and from school is an easy way for children to get the regular physical activity they need to combat these problems and to build healthy habits into adulthood. Physically-active kids have fewer chronic health problems. They also have improved mood and concentration, a stronger self-image and more self-confidence which are all critical for succeeding in school and in life. SRTS programs can also instill safe travel habits in children at an early age, which they can take with them into adulthood.

In the spring of 2016, the City of Breckenridge (City), the Breckenridge Independent School District #846 (School District) and Saint Mary’s Catholic School (St. Mary’s) were awarded an SRTS Planning Grant from MnDOT to conduct an SRTS plan for the city, the two Breckenridge public schools and St. Mary’s. SRTS planning process began in July of 2016 with a kick-off meeting and the formation of an SRTS planning team. The SRTS team envisions a community where it is safe and convenient for all its children to walk and bicycle to, from and between schools; where children can travel, explore and play in their community safely under their own power. Working together, the SRTS Team, consisting of members of the above entities, MnDOT, etc. were uniquely suited to identify and implement the suggested recommendations in this plan for the city and schools. This plan addresses the five “E”s of education, encouragement, enforcement, engineering and evaluation, which is the standard strategy in SRTS planning. Also addressed are possible issues of equity, as some communities and/or members of the community may have been historically underserved, have greater needs and/or have been more negatively affected by transportation planning decisions of the past. After the SRTS planning document is approved by both the City and School District, both entities may seek out funding and resources to implement the identified recommendations.
SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

- All three schools are well located in Breckenridge, close to the center portions of town and contiguous, if not surrounded by residential neighborhoods. Almost all residences within Breckenridge city limits are within two miles of all three schools. The Walk / Bike Analysis found that only one location was more that two street miles from just one of the schools at 2.1 miles.

- 76 percent of the elementary/middle school students, 70 percent of the high school students and 63 percent of St. Mary’s students live within the city of Breckenridge. No residence in the city is more than two bee-line miles from the elementary/middle school.

- All the schools are well-served by sidewalks except for the high school and the neighboring Breckenridge Aquatic Center, where there are no sidewalks for approximately two blocks.

- The high school and St. Mary’s seem to have few issues with circulation around the school at arrival and dismissal. There were some concerns at the elementary/middle school. During the morning, the use of the drop-off loop and parents parking, then backing out while students were still arriving is a concern and should be rectified by closing the drop-off during arrivals as it is during dismissal. The buses parked on Beede Avenue during dismissal raised concerns about limited sightlines and students filtering between the buses to walk home or to be picked up by a waiting parent. The problem was addressed early on and the buses were relocated to the side of the school on 8th Street, as well as behind the school on Hall Avenue. The new bus pick-up locations seem to be working well, according to school officials.

- Averaging once a month, elementary and middle school students, either by individual classroom or the entire school, will attend events at the high school. If conditions permit, the students are escorted by school staff and walk to the high school. If these events are in the afternoon, students have the option to take the bus directly home from the high school, walk home or walk back the elementary/middle school to attend afternoon activities, such as sports. As many as 50 students will choose the later option and walk back to the elementary/middle school along Hall Avenue, the most direct route, which has no sidewalks between the two schools. Installing proper walking facilities between the schools along Hall Avenue, with additional safety countermeasures at the crossing at 11th Street – County 16, was found to be the primary engineering priority.

- The Red River Valley and Western Railroad right-of-way, along with Minnesota Avenue, form a formidable barrier for students living in the southern portion of Breckenridge when walking and/or biking to and from all three schools. The only crossings over the tracks are at U.S. Highway 75 – 5th
Street and at 8th Street. The crossing at 8th Street has no sidewalks and may be frequently blocked by slow-speed rail yard traffic going back and forth across 8th Street.

- Feedback from the outreach session focused primarily on high traffic volumes and speeds on 11th Street – County 16 and U.S. Highway 75, inappropriate driving behaviors and the lack of sidewalks in some locations (Hall Avenue). Winter weather is also a noted barrier.

TRAFFIC VOLUME AND CRASH DATA ANALYSIS

- Heavy Commercial Average Annual Daily Traffic (HCAADT) counts from MnDOT confirm residents’ concerns with heavy amounts of truck traffic. The HCAADT on U.S. Highway 75 at Andrews Avenue is 630. This is a block from St. Mary’s. These numbers likely higher during harvest season.

- There were a total of nine crashes in Breckenridge involving pedestrians and bicyclists. None of these were fatal. However, five of the nine crashes happened at or very near the intersection of U.S. Highway 75 and Minnesota Avenue. This is also where the most truck traffic was recorded in Breckenridge.

- There was a spike of crashes in Breckenridge at the 15:00 hour. (3:00 to 4:00 p.m.) This corresponds to when students are dismissed from school. More research would be needed to see if walking and biking students are at extra risk and/or if high school students make up a disproportionate number of crashes during this hour.

- Traffic volumes on County 5 – Main Street in front of St. Mary’s (1,400 AADT) were higher than expected and from observations during the walking audit.

PARENT SURVEY AND STUDENT TRAVEL TALLY RESULTS

- Walking and biking mode share for all of the schools in Breckenridge is below the national average of 15.2 percent in the morning and 18.4 percent in the afternoon. Only St. Mary’s goes above the national average but just for the afternoon with a combined mode count of 24 percent. This is unfortunate when one considers that 76 percent of the elementary/middle school students, 70 percent of the high school students and 63 percent of St. Mary’s students live within Breckenridge city limits. However, there is great room for improvement, which is why this plan was composed.

- The school bus was the most frequently used mode of travel to and from school, followed by family vehicle. This is typical of findings in west central Minnesota.
EDUCATION

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

1. **Continue to facilitate an annual bicycle rodeo event to teach bicycle skills and safety to students.**

   Bicycle Rodeos are bicycle safety training events held over the period of several hours that teach bicycle safety lessons and on-bike skills, usually in a station format (e.g., bicycle safety check, helmet fitting, instruction about the rules of the road, on-bike obstacle course, on-bike skills drills, etc.). While geared towards children, many of the lessons can be appropriate for adults, as well. Bicycles rodeos can be held as part of a larger event or on their own, and either during the school day or outside of school. Adult volunteers can administer rodeos, or they may be offered through the local police department. Key partners in implementing a bicycle rodeo event may (should) include teachers, League of American Bicyclists Cycling Instructors, and PartnerSHIP 4 Health.

2. **Educate students about proper walking and bicycling etiquette through in-school and after-school bicycle and pedestrian safety education.**
   a. **If not existing, investigate establishing an after-school club.**
   b. **Utilize the Walk! Bike! Fun! curriculum to help students understand the rules of the road.**
   c. **Continue to maintain and use Breckenridge’s bicycle fleet.**

Observation results indicate that a portion of students did not exhibit proper walking techniques. Students were not utilizing crosswalks and some were seen not looking for traffic when they were crossing the street. Some of the bicyclists also displayed improper techniques by riding through stop signs and even not looking before entering streets and intersections.

The *Walk! Bike! Fun!* curriculum is an in-classroom and real-world (on foot, on bike) educational resource and can help address improper walking and biking behaviors like that observed by the SRTS team. Taught by specially-trained school district teachers, this curriculum is intended for children ages five through thirteen. It teaches life-long skills related to traffic rules, potential hazards, and bike handling skills that enable students to walk and bike safely and comfortably to and from school along with other trips around their communities. The curriculum addresses a variety of walking and bicycling topics and is endorsed by MnDOT.
3. Develop a school district safety campaign to build awareness of students walking and bicycling to and from school, and to encourage safe driving behavior among parents, high school students and passersby.

While observations by the SRTS team seem to indicate rather good driver behavior around the schools, other observations and comments from the public and parents in the parent survey indicate that drivers are speeding on major roadways through Breckenridge such as U.S. 75 and County 16 and do not yield to pedestrians. A school safety campaign should be developed that builds awareness around students walking and bicycling to and from school. An effective safety campaign might utilize multiple forms of media to get the attention of parents, students and passersby. Primary outcomes are improved walking, bicycling and driver safety behaviors (particularly near the school), and youth empowerment.

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

A parent workshop for those living in and around Breckenridge can provide the tools, resources and support needed for parents to overcome some of the common barriers noted by parents to not allow their children to walk or bicycle to and from school. While distance was the most notable barrier observed by parents in the parent surveys, traffic speed and the amount of traffic were the 2nd and 3rd most noted barriers. There were frequent comments made about less than ideal behavior of drivers in town. While traffic is a real threat to student safety for those walking to school, it is something that can be mitigated to some degree through education and parent involvement. Topics such as how to be a responsible driver, starting a walking school bus, and launching a safety campaign may impact the amount and speed of traffic near the school route.

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

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

6. If considering the reconstruction of a blacktop playground, think about building/painting it with “play” road markings in a manner sometimes referred to as a “Safety Town” or “Traffic Garden.” (See Figure 1)
Traffic gardens are common throughout Europe and are often painted onto a playground surface. They include “play” traffic lanes, intersections with removable stop signs, painted sidewalks, marked crosswalks, solid and dashed yellow centerlines, turn lanes and even a traffic circle, all with the purpose of teaching children proper traffic and safety behaviors associated with walking and biking, as well as driving. They can be elaborate and complex with completely functioning traffic lights, railroad gates, etc. This could be located on school grounds or in a park nearby.

Figure 1: Images from a German elementary school “Traffic Garden”. Besides its role teaching children traffic basics, this area otherwise serves as a regular macadam school yard. Note the crosswalk on the far side of the right image and the traffic circle to the far right.

For more Education ideas, see Minnesota SRTS Model Policies Tip Sheet (Appendix E) and the Minnesota SRTS Resource Center – Education:

http://www.dot.state.mn.us/mnsaferoutes/resources/education.html
ENCOURAGEMENT

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

1. The Breckenridge School District and St. Mary’s School should review their respective policies with the goal of adding language to meet current best practices with regards to SRTS. The Public Health Law Center at the William Mitchell College produced a document that suggests SRTS specific amendments for Minnesota school districts’ Wellness Policies. It can be found in Appendix D. It is suggested that Breckenridge and St. Mary’s adopt these policies in whole or in parts. An additional policy resource specific to Minnesota is the Minnesota SRTS Model Policies Tip Sheet which can be found in Appendix E. Finally, the SRTS National Partnership, in cooperation with ChangeLab Solutions (a multi-disciplinary, multi-government agency policy partnership), has developed an on-line SRTS District Policy Workbook. This resource is a comprehensive SRTS policy guide covering everything from general policies supporting SRTS to more advanced policies like “No Idling Policies” (which the Breckenridge policy does address) and “School Siting Policies.” This resource is best accessed on-line and can be found at: http://www.changelabsolutions.org/safe-routes/welcome Also look for possible improved policies from MnDOT SRTS Office and/or the Minnesota Department of Education in the near future.

A review of the Breckenridge School District’s policies, “707 Transportation of Public School Students,” “709 Student Transportation Safety Policy,” as well as the “533 Wellness” was performed. Of the transportation policies, only the 709 Student Transportation Safety Policy (an 18-page document mostly dedicated to busing students) briefly mentions walking or biking to school. It states, “The school district may provide student safety education for bicycling and pedestrian safety for students in grades K through 5,” and that “Parents/Guardians are responsible to … support safe riding and walking practices, and recognize that students are responsible for their actions.” However, “riding” in this circumstance likely refers to riding the bus but it is not clear. Again, while the policy states that “riding the school bus is a privilege, not a right,” it does not offer specific guidelines for students living within safe walking and biking distance to school. Besides the above language and a policy minimizing the idling of school buses, overall, the 707 and 709 policies appear to contain fairly standard language from Minnesota School Boards Association model policies.

Overall, the Wellness Policy is very supportive of the same goals generally pursued by SRTS plans and policies including, “physical activity and to promote and encourage students to adopt lifelong
healthy behaviors that can reduce the risk of chronic disease.” It also aims for students to get the recommended 60 minutes of exercise per day by providing opportunities during, before and after school and directly states that “Schools shall encourage bicycling and walking to and from school.” However, there is little guidance in the Wellness policy to actually help facilitate this.

A similar review of the St. Mary’s School Transportation and Wellness Policies was also performed. Since bus transportation is provided for nearly all of St. Mary’s students by the Breckenridge School District, such details need not be readdressed. The transportation policy does give a brief statement regarding biking to school but it is somewhat unclear by what is meant by “safety regulations.” Also, riding on the sidewalk is allowed in Breckenridge and, with some basic training, often the preferred location for young children to ride. The transportation policy does address the student “Safety Patrol” that helps students cross a busy intersection. The St. Mary’s Wellness Policy, while endorsing physical activity, does not directly promote walking and/or biking to and from school as a means to achieve this goal.

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

   Monthly informational messages can raise awareness about the positive health and academic benefits associated with increased physical activity, such as walking and bicycling. To get information to parents, a short message could be included in the monthly school newsletter.

3. **If not already policy, where safe to do so, explore the consolidation of bus stops so bused students are required to walk to a bus stop. The outlying communities of Wolverton, Kent, Foxhome and Doran and the development of homes at Breckenridge Lake are small enough that only one bus stop should be needed in these communities.**

   Front door pickups and drop-offs are common in many school districts but they minimize the amount of walking bused students can get on their trip to and from school. Requiring students to walk to and from a bus stop is one strategy for bused students to get more physical activity before and after school. It also can speed up travel times so students spend less time in the bus and more time either sleeping in the morning, studying and/or being physically active. Extreme weather conditions, particularly common in winter months, need to be considered, possibly on a day-to-day basis.
4. **Explore the development of a remote school bus drop site possibly at the corner of 11th Street and Hall Avenue where students would have the option of walking the remaining distance (a five-minute walk) to either school or taking the bus the rest of the distance.**

In a rural school district where students can live 20, 30 or more miles away from the school, it is not practical to have these students walk or bike to school. Others may live close by but are confronted with traffic barriers like highways and/or railroad track. These students can still get the exercise benefits of walking to school if the school bus system gives them the option of walking a few blocks to school from a safe remote drop-off site. This would also allow these students to participate in walking and biking to school competitions. (See below)

5. **Explore / develop a competition or challenge to reward students by tracking the number of times they walk or bike to school, including those that take the bus and opt to be dropped off remotely or participate in some sort of physical fitness activity like walking on school grounds, etc.**

Competitions or challenges provide students with immediate, positive reinforcement. Beyond a walk and bike to /from school challenge, possible competitions or challenges are endless and could target individuals, classrooms or the entire school.

6. **Continue to participate in International Walk and Bike to School Days and the new Minnesota SRTS Winter Walk to School Day to encourage students and their families to try walking or biking to school.**

International Walk and Bike to School Day attracts millions of participants all over the world. The intent is to encourage students and their families to try walking or bicycling to school for one day. In some districts with high busing numbers, events on this day might include a walk around school grounds and throughout the town for all students, or a remote bus drop-off which would allow all students to walk to school from that location. Depending on the response rate, these events could be extended into the future and turn into ongoing designated walking and bicycling days. Winter Walk to School Day started in Canada in 2007 and 2017 marked the first year that the Minnesotan SRTS program will be officially participating. Key partners include law enforcement officials, high school students, teachers, parent advocates and PartnerSHIP 4 Health. As a result, youth become empowered and more connected to health and their environment.
7. Consider investigating and composing a preferred bicycle route to schools map that uses low traffic stress streets and existing trails and routes.

Most communities, particularly those built on a traditional grid pattern like Breckenridge, will often have parallel side streets with very low traffic volumes a block or two away from higher trafficked main streets and avenues. These can often be optimized to create a neighborhood low-stress bicycle network perfectly appropriate for children eight years and up. A bike network for Breckenridge oriented to the needs of SRTS is proposed in the Engineering portion of the Action Plan.

8. Consider installing a bicycle repair station near the entrances to each one of the schools where the bicycle racks are located. (The bicycle racks should and are located in accordance to APBP guidelines). Others could be placed throughout the city to encourage cycling as a means of everyday travel and exercise.

Outdoor bicycle repair stations (Figure 2) are a great way to encourage bicycling, provide a way to make sure that bicycles are in good working order before students leave school for the day, make minor repairs that might otherwise leave a student stranded, all while teaching students basic mechanics and self-reliance. A typical station is equipped with a repair stand that holds the bike from the saddle, a heavy-duty, all-weather bicycle pump, and basic tools attached to the stand with theft resistant cables that allow a person to make most basic repairs.

Figure 2: A bicycle repair station with a heavy-duty all-weather pump, installed in the summer of 2015 at the Fergus Falls Public Library.
9. Investigate the feasibility of walking school buses for students from various neighborhoods within Breckenridge city limits.

Walking and biking school buses are a group of students walking or biking to and from school with chaperones (usually adult / parent volunteers). These “school buses” are a fun, healthy and easy opportunity for students to be physically active. A walking or biking school bus can start at muster points, have "bus stops" along the way and/or provide front door pick-up and drop-off of students, which can allay most parents' fears. It can be done daily or just on certain days of the week and/or depending on weather conditions. The Breckenridge schools serving elementary school-aged children should investigate the desire for a walking school bus and see if parents or other citizen volunteers are interested in taking turns walking students. If a walking school bus is explored, outreach to parents could be done via the parent newsletter. The hardest part to operating a walking school bus is finding enough dedicated volunteers to act as “drivers” but active elderly members of the community have been recruited to perform this task in other towns and cities with very successful results.

For more Encouragement ideas, see Minnesota SRTS Model Policies Tip Sheet (Appendix E) and the Minnesota SRTS Resource Center – Encouragement:

http://www.dot.state.mn.us/mnsaferoutes/resources/encouragement.html

ENFORCEMENT

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

1. Investigate deploying trained adult crossing guards at the corners of Beede Avenue and 9th, 8th and 11th Street – County 16 at Hall Avenue with another one possibly at the intersection of Beede Avenue and 11th Street – County 16.

The presence of a trained adult crossing guard can be of invaluable importance to student safety as they near the school location with all its traffic activity. They act as a second pair of much more experienced eyes and can see hazards of which young children may not be aware. They can also help with the traffic flow of parents picking up and dropping off students and help enforce the “no parking” restrictions. Adult crossing guards have the added benefit of acting as a source of encouragement to students and reassurance to parents. This person could be a school employee or adult volunteer.
2. Reposition school buses as they pick up students in the afternoon so they are not parked too close to the crosswalks (particularly at 9th Street) as to be in violation of Minnesota State parking laws per Statute 169.34 PROHIBITIONS; STOPPING, PARKING.

During additional walk audit observations on November 11th, 2016, the author made a second observation of the afternoon dismissal process at the Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School. He observed the school buses parked within 20 feet of the crosswalk in violation of Minnesota State Statute 169.34 PROHIBITIONS; STOPPING, PARKING that prohibits parking within an intersection, on a crosswalk, within 20 feet of a crosswalk at an intersection, among numerous other parking restrictions.

Note – This problem was immediately brought to the attention of the Elementary/Middle School principal that day and the buses were repositioned to the side and back of the school within a few weeks. This had the added benefit of moving the buses away from the south side of the school where most student walking and biking traffic occurs.

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

The SRTS team and one or two parents from the parent survey noted speeding traffic, particularly among the high school students, as a barrier for their children to walk and/or bike to school. Increasing the prevalence of law enforcement officers near the school may help to reduce vehicle speeds, improve compliance with speed limits around the school and increase the likelihood of vehicles yielding to pedestrians. This is a short-term, easy-to-implement recommendation that can be low cost.

4. Strictly enforce Minnesota State parking laws per Statute 169.34 PROHIBITIONS; STOPPING, PARKING.

Cars parked in driveways across sidewalks were observed on nearly every block in Breckenridge. While this causes no more than a minor nuisance for abled-bodied persons during warm weather months, cars parked across the sidewalk can become a significant obstacle during times of heavy snowfall and will always block the safe passing of pedestrians with disabilities which is likely also in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act. And while not observed as a systemic problem in Breckenridge, it is also illegal, per Statute 169.34, to park: within an intersection, on a crosswalk, within 20 feet of a crosswalk at an intersection, within 30 feet upon the approach to any flashing
beacon, stop sign, or traffic-control signal located at the side of a roadway, etc., (please see complete statute for all parking restrictions).

5. Enforce Breckenridge City Code Chapter 161. STREETS AND SIDEWALKS, Article I. Snow and Weeds, § 161-2. Removal of snow and ice. If residents are elderly and/or disabled and are not physically and financially able to remove the snow from the public sidewalk in front of their residence, look to city staff to remove snow and/or establish a volunteer snow removal program where neighbors, possibly even students, help to remove the snow from these sidewalks.

6. During a visit to Breckenridge during the winter months, snow was observed not being removed from the sidewalk in front of several residences in the blocks immediately surrounding the elementary/middle School.

7. If not done so already, rescind parking privileges to high school students observed driving in an irresponsible manner while arriving and leaving the school grounds. If possible, extend such restrictions to any student who receives any traffic citation and is found guilty of a moving violation.

Being able to drive a private automobile to school and park it on school property is a privilege. Irresponsible driving behaviors by students near the school and around Breckenridge should not be tolerated as the consequences can easily be fatal. Several parents of younger students noted the driving behaviors of high school students as a deterrent to allowing their children to walk and/or bike to and from school.

8. Restrict heavy truck through traffic to state and county controlled highways, city streets in commercial and industrial zones, and to only local deliveries on residential city streets.

Many residential city streets, including those near all three schools are narrow but of appropriate width for local automobile traffic. Highways that are under state and county jurisdictions and roads in commercial and industrial zones are wider and engineered to accommodate regular amounts of such traffic. Heavy truck traffic should be restricted from using residential city streets in Breckenridge unless making a local delivery.
9. Identify the most effective form of automated speed feedback sign and investigate the possible installation (permanent or temporary) at strategic locations within Breckenridge. Suggested locations for speed feedback signs include:

- U.S. Highway 75 halfway between Wegener Drive and Wilkin Avenue facing southbound traffic.
- U.S. Highway 75 just east of 8th Street South facing north (west) bound traffic.
- Minnesota Avenue just west of 16th Street facing westbound traffic.
- 11th Street – County 16 just north of Becker Avenue facing southbound traffic.
- 11th Street – County 16 just south of Andrews Avenue facing northbound traffic.

See Figures 10-12 in the Engineering section of the Action Plan.

Frequently noted as a problem, Breckenridge was no different with complaints of speeding in town as witnessed by members of the SRTS team, through observations and community input. Most notable were U.S. Highway 75 and County 16 as both enter town from the north. Speed feedback signs are a fairly uncontroversial and effective means of slowing down traffic and have been used in numerous communities through Greater and west central Minnesota. Using radar to detect a vehicle’s speed, these signs will display the speed of the oncoming vehicle to remind the driver of their speed if driving above the posted speed limit. If driving more than five mph over the limit, the sign can be programmed to flash the detected speed sometimes with a flashing light to really catch the driver’s attention. It is recommended that Breckenridge, with help of county and MnDOT officials, identify the most effective form of automated speed feedback and possible locations for deployment.

For more Enforcement ideas, see Minnesota SRTS Model Policies Tip Sheet (Appendix E) and the Minnesota SRTS Resource Center – Enforcement:

http://www.dot.state.mn.us/mnsaferoutes/resources/enforcement.html
ENGINEERING

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

Note – All of the following recommended proposals are rough but well thought-out ideas from a professional active transportation planner. They will need further vetting and refinement, including that of a licensed engineer, to see if they are feasible. The recommendations below are listed in a general order of priority. For a visual summary of the suggested Engineering proposals, please see Figures 3-15.

1. With the following engineering suggestions, ensure that all meet conventional standards including but not limited to the latest Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) for ADA compliance and the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities. For more information regarding ADA PROWAG guidelines in Minnesota, please see MnDOT's Curb Ramp Guidelines from October 2010.

2. Rehabilitate and install all new sidewalks, crosswalks and curb ramps per the latest Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Public Right-Of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG).

3. Install sidewalks and crosswalks near all Breckenridge schools per Figures 3-8 to aid students walking and biking to school. Be aware of the recommended sidewalk widths which are advised to handle the extra pedestrian traffic of walking students near the school and gathering in groups, along with children being dropped off on Beede Avenue.

4. Close the drop-off loop directly in front of the Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School to parents during morning arrival as is already the case during afternoon dismissal (see Figures 3 and 4).

Having nearly a hundred cars drive right up to the front door of the school brings a potential hazard right to the point where all students converge as they arrive at school. Of equal, if not greater concern, some parents park in the visitor stalls when they drop off their children and then back out as very young (short) students are still arriving on bike and foot. Backing a car out of a parking stall is a known hazardous maneuver which is highly discouraged by some federal government agencies. The driver may not notice all hazards and/or persons in the vehicle's line of movement while traveling in reverse. It seems very probable that even a careful driver may not notice a small student walking behind their car as they maneuver in reverse.
To see if it is possible for both the buses and parents in their private vehicles to find adequate space to pick up students all at once during dismissal, a parking study was conducted with the buses moved to the side and the back of the school. The drop-off loop was closed to all traffic, the area in front of the school and around the intersections of Beede Avenue and 8th and 9th Streets were reserved for parent pickup and with the proposed intersection bump-outs prevented drivers from parking illegally close to the intersections. The study showed that it is possible to have room for 15 buses, 60 +/- spaces for parents’ cars during afternoon pick-up and 62 spaces for teacher parking on Hall Avenue and the eastern section of Beede Avenue adjacent to school property. (See Figure 4)

5. At the 11th Street crossing of the Hall Avenue sidewalks, use high visibility Continental-style crosswalks in conjunction with sidewalk bump-outs. Bump-outs minimize crossing distances, increase the visibility of pedestrians and signs to drivers and eliminate illegal parking. Also, the installation of pedestrian-activated crosswalk beacons like a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) will increase driver yielding rates. (See Figure 3)
Figure 3: Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School - Proposed conditions.
Figure 4: Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School – Parking Analysis with Proposed Sidewalks and Bump-outs.
Breckenridge High School – Prop. Conditions

Figure 5: Breckenridge High School – Proposed Conditions.
Figure 6: Saint Mary's Catholic School – Proposed Conditions.
6. **Hall Avenue Corridor: Proposal 1 (Author’s Proposal)** – Construct a sidewalk of a six-foot minimum width along the south side of Hall Avenue from the eastern terminus of the sidewalk behind the Breckenridge Elementary School to the intersection of 11<sup>th</sup> Street. Also, complete the gaps in the sidewalk network on the north side of Hall between 9<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> Streets using a sidewalk of similar width to what is already in place. Continue sidewalk east on Hall using best professional judgment to decide if a sidewalk needs to be on one or both sides of the street but maintain at least a 6-foot width to accommodate the large groups of students that walk between the two schools between classes. Remove parking from the south side of Hall and paint two on-street bicycle lanes the length of Hall Avenue from 9<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> Streets. This is preferred by the author as there appears to be plenty of room to route a sidewalk on the south and possibly north sides of Hall without the need to remove many, if any trees; sidewalks can curve to avoid trees. Bicycle lanes on each side of the street in “traffic normative” locations would position bicyclists on the right sides of the street where they are expected by drivers and other road users at intersections, alleys and driveways. Such bike lane positioning would reinforce to young cyclists where they should position themselves on the roads when bike lanes are not present. (See Figure 7)

**Hall Avenue: Proposal 2** – A member of the SRTS team suggested not building new sidewalks along Hall between 11<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> Streets but instead remove parking from the south side of Hall. Then designate 10 feet in the street on the south side of Hall to become an on-street multi-use pathway, protected from traffic with flexible bollards or something similar. While this may be a good, inexpensive and short-term solution, the author of this plan, being a specialist in bicycle and pedestrian planning and safety, is concerned that placing two-way bicycle traffic on one side of the roadway would confuse other road users and place westbound bicyclists on the left side of the roadway where they are not expected. And while this facility is primarily intended to facilitate students traveling between the schools during daylight hours, it would still be there and continue to function as a traffic control device at night when visibility is reduced and road users rely much more on the normative expectations of long-standing traffic rules. (See Figure 8)
Figure 7: Hall Avenue Corridor – Proposed Conditions: 1 (with sidewalks and bike lanes)
Figure 8: Hall Avenue Corridor – Proposed Conditions: 2 (with south side two-way multi-use path)
7. Widen sidewalk to at least eight feet in width directly adjacent to the curb on the north side of Beede Avenue directly in front of the Breckenridge Elementary School to best accommodate the large groups of students boarding and alighting from school buses and private vehicles during morning arrival and afternoon dismissal. (See Figure 3 and 4) This may need to be done to the sidewalks on the 8th Street and Hall Avenue sides of the school if the decision to keep to school buses at these locations for afternoon dismissal remains permanent.

8. At the multi-use trail crossing of the U.S. Highway 75, install a pedestrian-activated crosswalk beacon like a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) in conjunction with a high-visibility Continental-style crosswalk to increase driver yielding rates. (Figures 10 and 11)

9. Install a sidewalk of five feet in width directly adjacent to the curb on the south side of Beede Avenue between 8th and 9th Streets to better accommodate students being dropped off and picked up by parents. Install sidewalk of five feet on the remaining south side of Beede Avenue from 5th to 11th Street using the pre-established 14-foot boulevard buffer seen at 6th, 8th and 10th Streets. (Figures 3 and 4)

10. Investigate a “School Zone” speed limit of 15 mph on:
   - Beede Avenue from 7th Street to 14th Street.
   - 9th, 10th and 11th Streets a half a block north from Hall Avenue and a half a block south from Beede Avenue.
   - 8th Street from a half a block south of Beede Avenue to Hall Avenue.
   - Hall Avenue from a half block east of 8th Street to 14th Street.
   - Douglas and Mackubin Avenues from 12th to their termini to the east.
   - 13th and 14th Streets from Beede Avenue to their northern termini.

Near the St. Mary’s School investigate a “School Zone” speed limit of 15 mph on:
   - 4th Street from a half block north of Mendenhall Avenue to a half block south of Nebraska Avenue.
   - Mendenhall and Nebraska Avenues from 3rd to 5th Streets.

Investigate a 20 mph School Zone speed limit on 5th Street (U.S. Highway 75) from Andrews to Minnesota Avenues. (See Figures 5, 6, 9)
Figure 9: Hall Avenue Corridor – Proposed Conditions: 1 with Proposed Speed Zones
Figure 10: Northwest Breckenridge – Proposed Conditions.
Figure 11: North Central Breckenridge – Proposed Conditions.
11. Besides specific recommendations previously mentioned, prioritize replacing sections of sidewalk missing and in disrepair and the crosswalks within a quarter mile of school working from those closest to the schools outward. East of U.S. Highway 75 – 5th Street: This includes all sidewalks on the streets south of the Otter Tail River to Nebraska Avenue and from 5th Street to 15th Street. West of 5th Street: This again would include all streets south of the Otter Tail River to Minnesota Avenue and from the Red River to 5th Street.

In addition to the areas nearest the schools, and the previously mentioned Hall Avenue Corridor, sidewalk and crosswalk construction should be prioritized on these corridors identified by the author.

First Priority:
- U.S. Highway 75 – 5th Street from Wilkin to Reber Avenues.
- 13th Street from Mackubin to Minnesota Avenues.
- Beede Avenue from U.S. Highway 75 – 5th Street to 15th Street.
- 4th Street from Andrew to Minnesota Avenues.
- 8th Street from Beede Avenue to U.S. Highway 75 – Buffalo Ave.
- Main Street – County 5 from Northern to Andrews Avenues.

Second Priority:
- 16th Street from Hall to Minnesota Avenues.
- Mendenhall Avenue from U.S. Highway 75 – 5th Street to 14th Street.
- Dacotah Avenue from 2nd to 10th Streets.
- Main Street from Grace to Northern Avenues.
- All of Wilkin Avenue.

Coordinate sidewalk installations with other road / infrastructure projects, to take advantage of potential cost savings. Use best local judgment when prioritizing installations. (See Figures 10 through 13)
Figure 13: Breckenridge – Priority Sidewalk/Crosswalk Improvement Corridors
12. Consider installing traffic calming measures such as bump-outs, speed humps, etc. on Beede and Hall Avenues adjacent to Breckenridge Elementary School property, (Figure 3), 13th Street from Mackubin to Beede Avenues, on streets surrounding the Breckenridge swimming pool, on Nebraska Avenue from 3rd to 5th Streets and 4th Street from Andrews to Minnesota Avenues. Temporary, low-cost installation can be employed on a trial basis to test these traffic calming measures before more permanent and expensive installations are employed. Coordinate sidewalk installations with other road / infrastructure projects, to take advantage of potential cost savings. Use best local judgment when prioritizing installations.

13. Investigate installing a multi-use trail on top of the levee on the south side of the Otter Tail River from U.S. Highway 75 near the point of the current multi-use trail crossing to 8th Street near the northwest side of the Breckenridge Elementary School. Similar levee-top trails were installed in Wahpeton just across the Red River to great success. (Figure 11) This trail would create a valuable and scenic short cut that would reduce the distance traveled from the neighborhoods off Wilkin Avenue by 500 feet. The trail should be designed to provide multiple access points such as at 6th and 7th Streets along the way and could be made to continue north and then east to 11th Street, finally terminating at 13th Street north of Mackubin Avenue. If it is decided to continue the trail, access should be provided at all locations where it passes local city streets (not alleys) to maximize its utility and connectivity.

14. Work with MnDOT and the State Legislature on the posting of 20 mph speed limits on all city streets that are not part of the state or county networks.

It is suggested that all streets within Breckenridge that are not a part of the state and county networks be posted at 20 mph. Lowering traffic speeds is a solidly-proven traffic safety countermeasure and can be done very inexpensively. Nearly all of the roads that fall under this recommendation are residential in nature and have limited potential to well serve through-traffic.
15. Coordinate with MnDOT, Red River Valley & Western Railroad and Wilkin County, regarding the possible reconstruction of the 5th Street (U.S. Highway 75) at-grade railroad crossing to assure that both sidewalks meet the latest ADA PROWAG standards. It is also suggested that barrier gates be installed at all four sidewalk access points to physically prevent pedestrians from encroaching into and crossing the railroad ROW when trains are present or approaching. (See Figure 14)

16. Coordinate with MnDOT, Red River Valley & Western Railroad and Wilkin County regarding the possible installation of a single, ADA PROWAG-compliant pedestrian crossing of the railroad at 8th Street. Use best professional judgment when deciding which side of 8th Street. However, cursory observation would seem to indicate that the east side is preferable. It is also suggested that barrier gates be installed at all sidewalk access points to physically prevent pedestrians from encroaching into and crossing the railroad ROW when trains are present and/or approaching. (See Figures 11 and 12)

17. Coordinate and investigate with Red River Valley & Western Railroad and MnDOT regarding the installation of fencing on the south side of the railroad from the alley west of 4th Street east to a point 200 feet east of the eastern edge of Jefferson Park, and on the north side at least from Pope Street to 5th Street south of Railroad Park. This can help to prevent pedestrian trespass onto the railroad right-of-way and focus pedestrians to legal crossing locations with proper warning beacons and gates.
18. Due to the high number of bicyclist and pedestrian crashes in the area of U.S. Highway 75 – 5th Street and Minnesota Avenue, (see Figure 53), have MnDOT conduct an intersection safety audit. Investigate installing traffic calming measures like sidewalk bump-outs at select intersections on U.S. Highway 75 – 5th Street at Andrews, Mendenhall, Nebraska and (if turning radii allow) Minnesota Avenues.

Bump-outs have a traffic calming effect, reduce the distance that pedestrians need to spend in the street with automobiles. They can prevent illegal parking of vehicles too close to a crosswalk and/or stop sign, which can block a driver’s view of these traffic control devices. Bump-outs can aid in making pedestrians and stop signs more visible to drivers by placing them in a more conspicuous, easier to be seen location, without being in the roadway. Sidewalk bump-outs can be engineered to be mountable on the occasions large, heavy trucks need to turn at bump-out intersections. Temporary, low-cost installation can be employed on a trial basis to test these traffic calming measures before more permanent and expensive installations are employed. Coordinate sidewalk installations with other road / infrastructure projects to take advantage of potential cost savings. Use best local judgment when prioritizing installations.

19. Investigate installing the SRTS optimized bikeway network depicted in Figure 15. Rank the bikeway routes in the priority corridors identified in Figures 13. Most recommendations are low-cost consisting mostly of painted lanes and MUTCD compliant signs. It is recommended that bike routes be augmented with MUTCD compliant bicycle shared lane markings also known as “sharrows.” Suggested lane widths for proposed bike lane improvements have already taken into consideration strategies to minimize loss of on-street parking. It is recommended that bikeway network improvements be phased in gradually, possibly included as part of existing scheduled roadway improvement projects. This allows local residents time to become accustomed to the changes with minimal extra costs and before a large expense is assumed.

Note- Proposed bike lanes on U.S. Highway 75 – 5th Street are primarily for traffic-calming effect and adult use and were not directly intended to serve an SRTS function.
Figure 15: Breckenridge – Proposed Draft Bicycle Network
20. Investigate painting the crosswalks at all intersections adjacent to school properties, crossing or running parallel to 11th Street, 8th Street from and including the intersections of Minnesota to Buffalo Avenues, and 5th Street (U.S. Highway 75) from and including the intersections of Beede to Chicago Avenues. This recommendation does not preclude the installation of painted crosswalks elsewhere throughout Breckenridge.

21. Where practicable, set sidewalks as far back as possible from the roadway curb to create a buffer between pedestrians and motor vehicle traffic.

Such buffers can reduce traffic stress on pedestrians and make walking safer and more enjoyable, while providing a place for street-trees to grow. These buffers are even more important on busier roadways with higher traffic volumes, faster vehicle speeds, and/or significant heavy truck traffic.

22. Plant trees within the public ROW, preferably between the sidewalk and the curb if there is proper space in the boulevard; ≥4 feet for small tree species, ≥6 feet for medium to large trees. Be mindful to keep sightlines open and free of obstructions at intersections and driveways.

Not only do trees provide a physical barrier between an errant car and a pedestrian but a colonnade of large overarching trees can provide a traffic calming effect by closing in the perceived width of the roadway and increasing the sense of speed. Trees also provide break from the persistent prairie winds around Breckenridge that can make winter temperatures that much more formidable. They also provide a shaded oasis during hot summer months making walking and biking more attractive to students and residents through a majority of months throughout the year.

23. Encourage infill residential development and/or development within close proximity to the schools to enable more potential students to walk and/or bike to and from school and to minimize busing costs.

24. On a case-by-case basis and if and when the need arises, encourage / require developers to construct multi-use shortcut pathways to make it quicker, easier and shorter for people to walk and bike to school, as well as other destinations in Breckenridge.
EVALUATION

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

1. **Administer the student travel tallies at least once per year to track the number of students walking and bicycling, in comparison to the 2016 baseline results.**

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

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

   The parent survey tool tracks and analyzes student travel behaviors and parents’ perceptions of walking and bicycling. This survey should be conducted no more than biannually as attitudes are not likely to change that quickly. If done too frequently, parents may not be as inclined to complete the surveys. Results can be compared to the baseline analysis completed in the fall of 2016.

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

   In order to track student health improvements over time, it is suggested that the Breckenridge School District and St. Mary’s School collect baseline health data. It is likely that the school district is already collecting this data. As SRTS programs and improvements are implemented, the health of students can be tracked on a continual basis. PartnerSHIP 4 Health may be able to help the school district organize this.
For more Evaluation ideas, see Minnesota SRTS Model Policies Tip Sheet (Appendix E) and the Minnesota SRTS Resource Center – Evaluation:

http://www.dot.state.mn.us/mnsaferoutes/resources/evaluation.html
OTHER

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

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

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

2. Breckenridge has strong Complete Streets (Chapter 161, Article V) and Sidewalk ordinances (Chapter 161, Article III). In an effort to maintain the political popularity of SRTS and sidewalks, it is suggested that the city refrain from assessing adjacent property owners as per § 161-16 when installing and replacing sidewalks unless there is undeniable evidence that the adjoining property owner has removed or damaged the sidewalk within the recent past. Also, sidewalks damaged or removed during construction at an adjoining property should be replaced and paid for by the property owner. Otherwise, sidewalks should be viewed as a public good that are more often of greater benefit to people that live away from the property in question. As such, the cost of regular repair and replacement of the sidewalk should be born by the community as a whole, as is currently the case with city streets.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In spring of 2016, the City of Breckenridge (City) with the Breckenridge Independent School District #846 (School District) and Saint Mary’s Catholic School (St. Mary’s) were awarded a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Planning Grant from the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) to conduct an SRTS Plan for the City, the Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School, Breckenridge High School and St. Mary’s. This plan is a product of that grant and was developed to encourage students who live within an appropriate distance of the three schools to walk and bike to and from school, and to do so safely. In a collaborative effort with the city, the school district, and members of the community, West Central Initiative staff developed this plan, which is focused on developing strategies and identifying the infrastructure needs to help attain these goals.

PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

An SRTS plan is a multi-faceted guide for school officials, city staff, parents and educators to improve the conditions for students walking and biking to and from school. Walking or biking to and from school is an easy way for children to get the regular physical activity they need for good health. Physical inactivity and increased levels of obesity are considered public health crises and, as such, the Minnesota Department of Health has allocated funds and personnel through the Statewide Health Improvement Program (SHIP) to assist with SRTS programs such as Walk to School Day. Physically-active kids have fewer chronic health problems, have improved mood and concentration, a stronger self-image, and increased self-confidence and independence—all of which are critical for succeeding in school and in life. In some communities, SRTS programs have had the added benefit of reducing and, in select cases, eliminating expensive student transportation costs.

Figure 16: New sidewalks and street lights next to the Barnesville, MN football stadium were installed after the need was identified in an SRTS plan. While the sidewalk and lights were paid for with an SRTS infrastructure grant, they will benefit all who wish or need to use them.
The recommendations in this plan are intended to improve safety, encourage walking and bicycling, empower students and reduce traffic congestion during the morning and afternoon school rush. Parents will only allow their children to walk to and from school if the parents are comfortable that it is safe for their children to do so. This plan was commissioned with these goals in mind.

While the primary goal of the plan is to make walking and bicycling to school a safe and desirable transportation choice, the safety improvements proposed have the potential to benefit the community as a whole. Sidewalk, trail and/or intersection improvements possibly built for students as a result of this plan will always be there for any and all who wish to walk or bike for transportation and/or recreation, whether that be a couple going for an evening stroll after dinner or an elderly widow who has no other means but to walk to her local church, convenience store, pharmacy, etc. They should also be looked upon by the community as long-term investments that have the potential to remain in use 100 years from when they are installed.

This five-to-ten year plan was developed for the City, and students of the School District and St. Mary’s. It is based specifically on the schools’ locations, the City’s and the surrounding School Districts’ geography, pre-existing conditions, school walk and bicycle zones, strengths, barriers, opportunities and student population throughout the district. This SRTS plan uses the standard "5 Es" approach (see Chapter 2) and greatly improves a school’s and community’s chances to be awarded state and federal SRTS infrastructure grant funds.

Figure 17: Sidewalks need to be viewed as long-term, multi-generational investments similar to how street trees are treated. This sidewalk in Breckenridge, Minnesota, was built by the Works Progress Administration nearly 80 years ago and remains in near perfect condition despite many harsh Minnesota winters.
Today more than ever, there is a need to provide options that allow all children—including those with disabilities—to walk and bicycle to school safely. Many communities struggle with traffic congestion around schools and motor vehicle emissions polluting the environment. At the same time, children in general engage in less physical activity, which contributes to the prevalence of childhood obesity. At first glance, these problems may seem to be separate issues, but SRTS programs can address all these challenges through a coordinated action plan.

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


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

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

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

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


THE DECLINE OF WALKING AND BICYCLING

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

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

The circumstances that have led to a decline in walking and bicycling to school did not happen overnight and have created a self-perpetuating cycle. As motor vehicle traffic increases, parents become more convinced that it is unsafe for their children to walk or bicycle to school. They begin driving them to school, thereby adding even more traffic to the road and sustaining the cycle. Understanding the many reasons why so many children do not walk or bicycle to school is the first step in interrupting the cycle. Many factors contribute to the reduction in children walking and bicycling to school. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) conducted a nationwide survey of parents to find out the most

---

common barriers that prevented them from allowing their children to walk to school. Parents of children aged 5 to 18 years cited one or more of the following six barrier reasons:

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

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


**HEALTH RISKS**

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

Despite these benefits, many children are not getting adequate physical activity. In the 2014 United States Report Card on Physical Activity for Children and Youth, the National Physical Activity Plan Alliance reports that only 24.8 percent of youth ages 12-15 years obtain 60 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity every day. A 2014 CDC study reports that during the school day, only 4 percent of elementary schools and 8 percent of middle/junior high schools provide daily physical education classes, and in 2012 only 58.9 percent of all school districts required that elementary schools provide students with regularly scheduled physical activity. Unfortunately, less active children are more likely to be overweight, according to the American Academy of Pediatrics.

---

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


THE 5 E’s OF SRTS PLANNING

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

EDUCATION

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

---

Figure 18: Bike MN instructors demonstrate to teachers how to do on-bike skill drills in a parking lot at the Rothsay, MN School.
ENCOURAGEMENT

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

ENFORCEMENT

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

ENGINEERING

Engineering involves the planning and implementation of physical improvements to the built environment that make it safer and more attractive for students to walk and bicycle to and from school. For example, providing a designated space for pedestrians, such as sidewalks, has been proven to reduce pedestrian crash risks. Up to an 88 percent reduction in ‘walking along the roadway’ pedestrian crashes has been seen with

Figure 19: Hundreds of Frazee, MN students along with teachers, parents, local officials, including police, participate in International Walk to School Day by walking on the new multi-use trail. The trail was built after it was identified in an SRTS plan as a possible valuable connector between a new neighborhood and the school, as well as downtown.
the installation of sidewalks on both sides of the road.\textsuperscript{5} However, engineering projects are most successful when used in conjunction with education, encouragement and enforcement strategies. Partnering with engineers and planners is crucial to the successful implementation of projects. Examples of engineering strategies include adding bicycle racks, installing fully-accessible crosswalks, sidewalks and multi-use trails, traffic calming, bicycle lanes, signs and signals, as well as other infrastructure.

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

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
EVALUATION

In order to measure the progress of the program activities over time, consistent evaluation is necessary. Evaluation techniques include a combination of quantitative and qualitative information. Schools are very strongly encouraged to continue conducting the National Centers for SRTS parent surveys (every two to three years) and student travel tally (once or twice a year) which were already done as part of this plan to provide baseline data. You can find the National Centers for SRTS survey forms in the Appendix C of this report. Other examples of evaluation strategies include, but are not limited to, school walking audits and observations of student travel behaviors arriving at and leaving school.

A 6TH E? - EQUITY

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

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

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

Figure 22: This is a common diagram used to illustrate the concept of Equity versus Equality.

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

---


SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

SRTS TEAM

Successful SRTS programs recognize each community as being unique and emphasize the importance of including a diverse range of community representation on the team. The Breckenridge SRTS team was primarily made up of members of the Breckenridge Active Living Committee. This included representation from the City, School District, Breckenridge Police Department, Wilkin County, Minnesota Department of Transportation – District 4, and PartnerSHIP 4 Health. The team members were directly involved in the planning process, with many having the knowledge and skills needed to implement the plan recommendations. After delivering the plan, West Central Initiative (WCI) will continue to provide ongoing technical assistance to aid in plan implementation.

SRTS PLANNING PROCESS

The SRTS planning process got its start in October of 2015 when City staff contacted WCI about performing an SRTS Plan for the City. The City and the School District thought it would be wise to include St. Mary’s as many local children walk and bike to that school as well, and it would strengthen the planning assistance application. With the assistance and expert staff at WCI, the SRTS team came together to review the school and community profiles, provide input on the barriers, outline the vision and goals, assist in data collection, and to develop and review the recommendations. As part of the planning and outreach process, the community was invited and encouraged to provide feedback on the community’s strengths, barriers and opportunities; a kind of SWOT Analysis tailored to planning.

In addition to gathering community input, the team conducted an assessment of the community’s current conditions and policies in order to identify opportunities to advance walking and bicycling to school or programs that support active transportation. The team conducted observations to understand how many students walk and bike to and from school, what routes were most traveled, their behaviors as pedestrians and bicyclists and the interactions between pedestrians and motorists. In addition, the team conducted a separate walk-audit of the entire community to survey its geography and infrastructure. During the walk-audit, the team recorded sidewalk conditions, child-friendly opportunities to cross streets, along with vehicle speeds, and potential trail and sidewalk connections.

Furthermore, the team helped administer the National Centers for Safe Routes to School (National Centers) student travel tally survey and a separate parent survey. The student travel tally form is used to count the number of students arriving to and departing from school by various modes. The parent survey collects information from parents of K-8th graders about how their children travel to and from school, their
attitudes towards active transportation and finally, barriers that prevent their children from participating in active transportation modes of travel. The results were then entered into the National Centers’ database. These assessment tools illustrate the range of current barriers and opportunities, which is the foundation of the identified recommendations. These surveys are to be done yearly with continuing WCI assistance so that possible trends in student travel behavior and parent perceptions can be identified and recorded with the National Centers for Safe Routes to School database. Understanding the possible changes in student travel trends will give school, school district and WCI staff the information they need to be able to determine if the goal of getting more children to walk and bike to and from school is being met.

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

**MNDOT WALK / BICYCLE ZONE CONCEPT**

Children are more likely to walk or bicycle to school if they live within the school “walk/bicycle zone.” MnDOT defines this as “the area within the school’s enrollment boundary from which students can realistically walk or bike to school.” MnDOT guidelines generally assume a distance of up to 0.5 miles for children in grades PreK-5, 1 mile for grades 6-8, and 1.5 miles for grades 9-12 is within the walk/bicycle zone.\(^\text{13}\)

While not stated in any MnDOT documents, the walk/bicycle zone distances are likely based on the following accepted standards. The average adult can walk a distance of 0.5 miles in 10 to 12 minutes. For a child in grades PreK-5, the same distance would likely require twice as much time (20 to 24 minutes) which is a reasonable amount of time to travel to school. For students in grades 6-8, 1 mile can likely be walked within 20 to 30 minutes, similar to an adult. However, children in these grades have the maturity to bicycle that distance if there are no significant traffic hazard barriers. At the relaxed speeds of 8 to 10 mph (the bicycle equivalent to a modest walking pace), 1 mile can be bicycled in 6 to 8 minutes. For high school students in grades 9-12, a distance of 1.5 miles could be walked in 30 to 40 minutes. However, these students can bike that distance in 9 to 11 minutes and have the maturity to navigate even more complex traffic situations.

---

STATUS OF STATE AND FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

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

FEDERAL

In previous federal transportation laws, the SRTS program was a separately-funded category, independent of the Transportation Enhancements program (TE - bikeways, trails, sidewalks, streetscapes reconstruction, etc.) and Scenic Byways program. In 2012, Congress passed a Federal transportation bill entitled Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). This law combined the SRTS, TE and Scenic Byways programs into one funding source called Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). TAP is funded from the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund at an amount equal to 2 percent of the total amount of federal-aid highways each fiscal year. Each state was charged with developing their own program for soliciting projects to be funded by the TAP funds allocated to them. MAP-21 states also have the option of redirecting 50 percent of TAP to other transportation projects.

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

STATE

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

MINNESOTA SCHOOLS STATEWIDE ENROLLMENT OPTIONS AND THE IMPACTS ON SRTS

Minnesota law allows parents, whose children are Minnesota residents, the choice to enroll their children in a regular public school district other than the one in which they reside.\footnote{Minnesota Department of Education. Enrollment Choices Statewide Enrollment Options (Open Enrollment) Key Topics, webpage. http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/StuSuc/EnrollChoice/003871. Accessed on January 14, 2016.} While not required to provide transportation, school districts will often send buses into the immediate neighboring districts with the practical and alluring promise of front-door pickups. To compete, local school districts have felt compelled to offer equivalent transportation services, even for students living within immediate proximity of the local school. This has had the unintended consequence of undermining many SRTS efforts. In communities where WCI has already completed SRTS plans, the SRTS team had observed students being picked up by the local district bus only to be transported to the school a block away, a distance walked in no more than a minute. However, some school districts have eliminated busing within the walk/bike zone for students without hazardous traffic barriers after SRTS plans written at WCI made the policy recommendations to do just that.
CHAPTER 3: VISION AND GOALS

The SRTS team created a unique vision for the City of Breckenridge, the Breckenridge School Independent School District #846 and Saint Mary’s Catholic School. This vision is what the team imagines their community will look like in five to ten years after the successful and complete implementation of the Breckenridge SRTS Plan. In order to make the vision a reality, the team set goals to attain and barriers to overcome in pursuit of opportunities to increase walking and bicycling to and from school. The goals outlined below are that of the SRTS team. These goals are attainable through the Action Plan Recommendations section which can be found in the beginning of this document. Those recommendations where not developed to address these goals as an itemized list.

VISION

The City of Breckenridge seeks to become a community where it is safe and convenient for all its children to walk and bicycle to, from and between schools, where our children can travel, explore and play in their community safely under their own power, and where they learn life-long habits of incorporating physical activity into their daily lives. We will seek to achieve this vision through safety awareness, education, encouragement and self-evaluation, all while building the infrastructure needed to make walking and bicycling safer and more convenient for all, especially for those disadvantaged populations in our community.

GOALS

1. Create designated safe routes to and from, as well as between all three schools.

2. To continue using the Walk! Bike! Fun! curriculum to teach children safe walking and bicycling practices.

3. To continue walking and bicycling safety awareness education and events such as bike rodeos.

4. To encourage use of SRTS through community events such as JAWS, Spring Mile Run, 5-k events, walking school buses and continued walk and bike to school day events.

5. Educate drivers in the community how to properly interact with bicyclists and pedestrians through a variety of outreach sources.

6. Enforce safe behaviors of drivers, walkers and bicyclists by working together with law enforcement, parents, crossing guards, etc.
7. Continue ongoing assessments of walking behaviors and routes.

8. Evaluate the progress of getting more children to walk and bike to school by using the standardized National Partnership for SRTS “Student Travel Tally” and “Parent Surveys.”

9. Create an environment within the public right-of-way that is more conducive to safe walking, bicycling and driving.

NOTE: The recommendations in this plan address all 9 goals identified by the Breckenridge SRTS team.
The city of Breckenridge lies in far west central Minnesota and sits directly on the border with North Dakota which is demarcated by the relatively narrow Red River of the North. Breckenridge lies in Wilkin County and is the county seat housing the county courthouse and other county services. It is also a “twin town” with Wahpeton, North Dakota on the other side of the river and happens to be roughly twice the size of Breckenridge. Breckenridge sits in the heart of the highly-fertile agricultural lands of the Red River Valley. Accordingly, agriculture makes up a large portion of Breckenridge’s economy. Large trucks haul various raw agricultural commodities and traverse the city at all times of the year. They deliver their cargo to the massive grain bins and elevators in Breckenridge where it is later transferred to train cars for shipment around the globe. Breckenridge is approximately 191 miles northwest of the state capitol in Saint Paul and is 22 miles west of Interstate 94 at Exit 54. While the ancestral lands of the Dakota Sioux, the area that would become Breckenridge was first a natural location for trade due to its location where Bois de Sioux River and Otter Tail River join to form the Red River of the North. Breckenridge was first platted in 1857 but real settlement didn’t begin until the railroads arrived in 1871. Due to its location, agriculture still plays a large role in Breckenridge’s economy. However, many who live in Breckenridge work across the river in the factories of Wahpeton, like the Bobcat Company, or for North Dakota State College of Science. Breckenridge also serves a bedroom community for residents that work in Fergus Falls, 23 miles to the east and Fargo, 50 miles north. Agriculture still makes up a majority of

Figure 23: The location of the city of Breckenridge within Minnesota relative to major landmarks.
the land use around the city in both Minnesota and North Dakota and is the center of the Red River Valley. Breckenridge sits square within the Prairie Biome. With the tracks acquired from the Burlington Northern Railroad, The Red River Valley and Western Railway was established in 1987 and is a private railroad headquartered in Wahpeton but operates a sizable rail yard in Breckenridge and on its eastern outskirts.

At the time of the 2010 U.S. Census, the city of Breckenridge had a population of 3,386 people, 1,445 households, and 861 families, all living within the 2.46 square miles. This gives the city a population density of 1,360 residents per square mile. The median age in the city was 43.3 years. 23.3 percent of residents were under the age of 18. The racial makeup of the city was 96.3 percent White, 0.6 percent African American, 1.4 percent Native American, 0.4 percent Asian and 1.4 percent from two or more races. Hispanic or Latino of any race was 2.5 percent of the population.\textsuperscript{16} As of 2015, the top five industries in Wilkin County are “Health Care and Social Assistance,” “Educational Services,” “Wholesale Trade,” “Retail Trade” and “Public Administration.”\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Wilkin_County_History.jpg}
\caption{The Beaux-Arts Wilkin County Courthouse on South 5th Street designed by Saint Paul architects Buechner & Orth and completed in 1929. It was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in July, 1980. Photo courtesy of McGhiever via Wikipedia Creative Commons License.}
\end{figure}


Figure 25: Breckenridge city limits and the central location of the Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School.
BRECKENRIDGE CITY SIDEWALK ORDINANCE / REGULATIONS

The city of Breckenridge has a full complement of sidewalk ordinances that require sidewalks to be built with new street construction, that they be properly maintained by the adjoining property owner and that they be kept clear of snow. The city also has a Complete Streets ordinance; one of the few in the region.

Chapter 161, Streets and Sidewalks, Article III, Sidewalks states in part that, “Sidewalks along streets and avenues shall be constructed at the time of any street construction/reconstruction,” that “The owner of any parcel of land adjoining any street or avenue shall reconstruct and maintain in good repair any sidewalk previously constructed along such street or avenue,” and “The City Council may, as it seems fit, order the construction of new sidewalks at locations where no sidewalks have been constructed.” Article I, Snow and Weeds states in part that “All snow and ice remaining on the public sidewalk more than 18 hours after its deposit thereon is a public nuisance. The owner and occupant of any property adjacent to a public sidewalk shall use due diligence to keep such walks safe for pedestrians. No such owner or occupant shall allow snow or ice to remain on the walk longer than 18 hours after its deposit thereon.”

Chapter 161, Streets and Sidewalks, Article V, Complete Streets states, in part, that:

A. The City of Breckenridge 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.

B. 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 (American 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.

The complete city ordinances referenced in part above are comprehensive and contemporary to the state of the practice and do not appear to the author to require any obvious alterations.
The Breckenridge Independent School District #846 is the home of the Cowboys and Cowgirls and is located in the Breckenridge Elementary-Middle School at 810 Beede Avenue, Breckenridge, MN, 56520. As of the date on this plan, Diane Cordes is the current superintendent.

**Vision Statement**

Breckenridge Pride...Inspiring to Excel!

**Mission Statement**

We are devoted to providing personalized learning through challenging, relevant and dynamic experiences in a safe environment where mutual respect is fostered and builders of the future are developed.

Source – Breckenridge Independent School District #846 website

The District itself, like many in Greater Minnesota, is large and encompasses 342 mostly agrarian square miles, almost all within Wilkin County. A tiny approximate quarter square mile sliver of the district just north and east of Foxhome appears to be in northwestern Otter Tail County and seems to include one solitary homestead. Breckenridge and its three schools sit on the western edge of the District, which is bounded by the Red River. From the city, it is approximately 26 miles to the northern tip of the District which is also the county line with Clay County. It is then approximately 15 miles to the eastern edge of the district which is two miles east of Foxhome. This is also the border line with Otter Tail County. Finally, running 11 miles south east of the city along U.S. Highway 75, one then hits the southern edge of the district approximately 2 and a half miles to the south of Doran. (Figure 26)
Figure 26: Breckenridge city limits, and the location of the Breckenridge District Offices in the Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School and concentric radii in miles from that location.
The District has two transportation policies deemed directly relevant to SRTS. Reviewed for this plan were policy “707 Transportation of Public School Students” and policy “709 Student Transportation Safety Policy”.

Policy “707 Transportation of Public School Students” was originally adopted in 1995 and last revised in 2015. It is a general policy stating the ground rules governing which students are eligible for school district-funded motorized transportation to and from school and other school functions and services consistent with the requirements of law. It “recognizes that transportation by school bus is a privilege and not a right for an eligible student.” Of note in this policy is that the school district will provide transportation “for all resident students who reside two miles or more from the school” as per state statute Minn. Stat. § 123B.88, Subd. 1. However, the policy does provide exceptions to transport students due to “higher than average crime or other social and economic challenges.”

The “709 Student Transportation Safety Policy,” was originally adopted in 1995 and last revised in 2014. Like most other 709 policies in the State of Minnesota, it is a detailed document focused on transporting students to school via school buses. The policy states, “The purpose of this policy is to provide safe transportation for students and to educate students on safety issues and the responsibilities of school bus ridership.” There is also a section that, “Bus drivers must minimize, to the extent practical, the idling of school bus engines and exposure of children to diesel exhaust fumes.” It also includes several lines regarding and even promoting walking and biking. The policy states that, “The school district may provide student safety education for bicycling and pedestrian safety for students in grades K through 5.” And that “Parents/Guardians are responsible to … support safe riding and walking practices, and recognize that students are responsible for their actions.” While again the policy states that “riding the school bus is a privilege, not a right,” it does not offer specific guidelines for students living within safe walking and biking distance to school as defined by MnDOT’s Walk/Bicycle Zone concept. (See Chapter 2) Besides these brief mentions, there are no specific guidelines for students, parents, teachers and administrators for those students who choose to walk and/or bike to and from school. For example, there are neither guidelines for when and where crossing guards are warranted, nor are there guidelines for crossing guard qualifications and training. By comparison, there are multiple pages detailing the qualifications and training of school bus drivers, their duties and responsibilities, operating rules, as well as school vehicle maintenance standards among many other details regarding school bus operations.
BRECKENRIDGE SCHOOL DISTRICT STUDENT WELLNESS POLICY

The District "533 Wellness" policy was originally adopted in 2006 and then last revised in 2011. “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 and to promote and encourage students to adopt lifelong healthy behaviors that can reduce the risk of chronic disease.” It also states that, “All students in grades K-12 will have opportunities, support, and encouragement to be physically active to achieve daily recommended physical activity.” In the section about daily physical activity opportunities before and after school, the Wellness policy says, “Schools shall encourage bicycling and walking to and from school.” While this is a great start, no specific details are given on how exactly to do this even though the District is in possession of a state granted bicycle fleet and uses the Walk! Bike! Fun! Curriculum.

BRECKENRIDGE ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE SCHOOL

The Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School is located in the heart of the city at 810 Beede Avenue, Breckenridge, MN, 56520. The school originally opened in 1934 and was constructed in a magnificent Art Deco style popular at the time. Built originally to house grades K-12, today, the school only houses grades PreK-8. Located in the middle of the city and surrounded by well-maintained residences, the Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School is already ideally situated for a large proportion of students who live in the city to walk and bike to school. While one building, the school is functionally divided between elementary (PreK-6) and middle school (7, 8). Middle school students travel to the high school, four blocks to the east, for occasional education activities. While a bus is provided, many students choose to walk the short distance, primarily down Hall Avenue.

In September 2016, the elementary school had an enrollment of 383 students; the middle school had 88. The breakdown of students per grade is shown in Table 1. 45 percent of the elementary school students are
eligible for free and reduced cost meals with 36 percent in middle school. The elementary school was awarded a Healthier US Challenge award at the Silver level which includes a monetary award for healthy foods and physical activity best practices and has been a Celebration Eligible School in 2015 and 2016.

Table 1: Number of Students per Grade (September, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the students attending the Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School, approximately 76 percent live within the city limits of Breckenridge, many of which are prime candidates to walk and/or bike to and from school.
BRECKENRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL

The Breckenridge High School is located at 710 13th Street North, Breckenridge, MN 56520. The school opened in 1969 to house students in grades nine through twelve. While located on the eastern edge of Breckenridge, the high school is contiguous with long-established residential neighborhoods as well as the latest residential construction to the immediate south and southeast of school grounds. As such, the high school is also ideally situated for a large portion of the student body who live in the city to walk and bike to school. In September 2016, the school had an enrollment of 245 students. The breakdown of students per grade is shown in Table 2. 32 percent of students are eligible for free and reduced cost meals.

![Figure 28: Breckenridge High School. Image via Google Streetview.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the students attending Breckenridge High School, approximately 70 percent live within the city limits of Breckenridge, most of which are prime candidates to walk and/or bike to and from school.

Also, to the immediate south of the high school building is the Breckenridge Family Aquatic Center. As such, any safety improvements near and leading to the high school will have added benefits to local residents traveling by bike and foot to the aquatic center, many of which also happen to be Breckenridge students.
SAINT MARY’S CATHOLIC SCHOOL

Saint Mary’s Catholic School is located at 210 4th Street North, Breckenridge, MN 56520 and is managed by the Diocese of Saint Cloud. The school was established in 1925 with the construction of Saint Mary’s Hall in the same year. An addition to the school was built in 1965. St. Mary’s offers classes for grades PreK through Eighth. It is located near the main crossroads within Breckenridge; one block west of 5th Street – U.S. Highway 75 and one block north of Minnesota Avenue – County 12. Like the other two schools in the city, St. Mary’s is located within a long-established residential neighborhood rich in pedestrian amenities like sidewalks, low-trafficked streets and bridges over the nearby rivers that allow the possibility for students to walk and/or bike from homes in Wahpeton. After graduating from St. Mary’s School, most students attend Breckenridge High School.

Mission Statement

St. Mary’s Catholic School is a faith community working together to provide a nurturing Christ-centered education that is rooted in Gospel values, centered on the Eucharist, and committed to faith formation, academic excellence, and service.
Table 3: Number of Students per Grade, St. Mary’s School (September, 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the students attending St. Mary’s School, approximately 63 percent live within the city limits of Breckenridge, many of who are prime candidates to walk and/or bike to and from school.

SAINT MARY’S SCHOOL STUDENT TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Not bound by policies of the Minnesota School Boards’ association rules, St. Mary’s Transportation Policy is much briefer. Since students that reside within the Breckenridge Independent School District are entitled to free transportation to St. Mary’s School, it is assumed that St. Mary’s students are held to the same rules and standards that govern the District and its students, at least with regards to school bus transport. The St. Mary’s Transportation Policy has a section that specifically discusses riding bicycles to and from school but the language is vague and unclear. It states in part, “Students riding bicycles must follow safety regulations if they wish to ride their bikes to school. They are to walk their bikes across crosswalks, highways, and on sidewalks.” It is unclear to the author what is meant by “safety regulations.” Also, riding on the sidewalk is allowed in Breckenridge and, with some basic training, often the preferred location for young children to ride. Finally, there is a section dedicated to a student “Safety Patrol” which helps other students cross the busy intersection at Mendenhall Avenue and U.S. Route 75 – 5th Street. This policy was last revised in August, 2015. No origin date was given.
SAINT MARY'S SCHOOL STUDENT WELLNESS POLICY

The purpose of Saint Mary's Wellness Policy is, “To assure that the environment at St. Mary's School promotes and protects students' health, well being, and ability to learn by supporting healthy eating and physical activity.” While this is in keeping with the goals of SRTS, there is no direct guidance that promotes walking and/or biking to and from school as a means to encourage physical activity and/or achieve the daily recommended amount of physical activity. This policy was last revised in August, 2015 and first adopted in April, 2006.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy recommendations to improve SRTS can be found in the beginning of this document in the subchapter titled “Action Plan Recommendations” in the “Encouragement” and “Other” sections, with further policy recommendations found in Appendices D and E.
CHAPTER 5: STRENGTHS – BARRIERS – OPPORTUNITIES ANALYSIS

A strengths, barriers and opportunities analysis of existing policies and programs related to walking and bicycling to school was also performed. This is similar to a SWOT Analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) but tailored for use in SRTS planning. The comments in the following tables are not edited and are not listed in any priority order. Recommendations to improve SRTS found in the sub-chapter titled “Action Plan Recommendations” at the beginning of this document have taken into consideration Breckenridge’s unique strengths, barriers and opportunities.

STRENGTHS

The City of Breckenridge and its schools have many strengths to work with similar to many other communities in west central Minnesota. Identifying and understanding those strengths are key with regards to any SRTS plan. The strengths listed in detail (see Table 4) below were gathered by the Breckenridge SRTS team.

Table 4: Community and School District Strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Breckenridge has a very well organized Active Living Committee that is already accomplishing much for active transportation that relates to SRTS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Breckenridge is already in possession of a bike fleet and trailer and uses it to teach the Walk! Bike! Fun! Curriculum. Many students already walk and bike to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Breckenridge has a dense, contiguous suburban form with a vibrant downtown and industrial centers well positioned at the edges of the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 All three schools are well positioned in the community with the St. Mary’s and the elementary schools centrally located and close to downtown, while the high school is at the central eastern edge but still well connected with residential neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Wilkin County and the City of Breckenridge have proven their commitment to pedestrian safety by installing new sidewalks on both sides of County 16 (11th St. North and 8th St. South) and along the south side of Dacotah Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 There is a multi-use pathway running along 5th Street – U.S. Highway 5 from Beede to Wilkin Aves with full funding to extend it to the hospital nearly secured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 The older neighborhoods close to downtown have a good network of sidewalks with wide tree boulevards and mature trees that creating a pleasant buffer from traffic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BARRIERS**

To successfully develop and implement SRTS activities and programs, it was important for the SRTS team to identify and understand the existing barriers within the community that are preventing children from walking and bicycling to school. These barriers, listed in detail in Table 5 below, are an accumulation of information received from the SRTS team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minnesota Ave along with the Red River Valley and Western Railroad rail yard and railroad tracks just to the south create a significant barrier for those students living on the south side of Breckenridge who wish to walk and/or bike to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Likewise the U.S. Highway 75 combined with the Otter Tail River both create a barrier between the schools and the northwest residential neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Neighborhoods outside of the old core have little to no sidewalks and/or a disconnected network of sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Many existing sidewalks are in fairly poor condition and some are inappropriately narrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Breckenridge experiences a large amount of heavy agriculture truck traffic on U.S. Highway 75 and County 16 – 11th Street North, particularly during harvest season in September and October, two ideal months for walking and biking to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Many sidewalks lack PROWAG ADA compliant curb ramps at intersections but newly constructed compliant curb ramps indicate that local and state officials are trying to remedy this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cars parked on residential and commercial driveways blocking the sidewalk were found to be commonplace during the walk audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sidewalk network is incomplete even close to the schools. This is particularly true at the high school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPPORTUNITIES

The SRTS team identified opportunities to improve walking and bicycling to school that are not currently being acted upon. The list of opportunities in Table 6 is not exhaustive but is an accumulation of ideas and action steps to help achieve the overall vision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong>  Bikeway project to extend the multi-use trail along U.S. Highway 75 up to the hospital is almost completely funded. Bikeway will reach to the north end of town and has potential as a route to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong>  Many residential streets are narrow which acts as a passive form of traffic calming. Others are wider allowing for possible bike lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong>  Over 70 percent of students live within city limits, many of which are prime candidates for SRTS programs and to encourage to walk and bike to and from school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong>  The City of Breckenridge has already passed a Complete Streets Policy which in part encourages the use of innovative bicycle and pedestrian safety countermeasures proven safe in other U.S. states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong>  The levees built as flood control measures offer prime opportunities for paved multi-use trails (like those already constructed in Wahpeton).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6: EXISTING CONDITIONS AND FINDINGS

The SRTS team conducted school observations, a community walking audit and a neighborhood assessment. This was done to identify the existing conditions within the city of Breckenridge and near the three schools. Traffic volume and crash data were also retrieved from MnDOT’s databases for the roads in and around Breckenridge. And while the SRTS team is a core group of individuals who are very familiar with Breckenridge, its schools, SRTS and active transportation planning, broader community input is always helpful to create a comprehensive list of existing conditions and concerns. To aid with additional community input, a table was set up at the Breckenridge Veterans Day event at the Breckenridge High School gymnasium at 9:30 a.m. on Friday, November 11, 2016. (See Chapter 7) Having information on existing conditions is critical in making strategic decisions that support wise and fiscally-sound future SRTS programming and activities.

BRECKENRIDGE WALK / BICYCLE ZONES

As discussed in Chapter 2, MnDOT guidelines generally assume that students can realistically walk and / or bike to and from school up to a distance of 0.5 miles for children in grades PreK-5, 1 mile for grades 6-8, and 1.5 miles for grades 9-12. For clarity, both the one-half and one mile “walk / bicycle zones” are shown for the Elementary/Middle School while only the one-half mile zones are shown for the High School and St. Mary’s. (See Figure 30) The Walk / Bike Zones are measured using bee-line radii from the main entrances of each school. For both the Elementary/Middle and St. Mary’s School, approximately 30 percent of the residences within Breckenridge fell within the half-mile walk / bike zone (Grades PreK-5) while >95 percent of residences fell within the one-mile zone. (Grades 6-8) The high school is likely more around 25 percent and 75 percent respectively but being more mature, all high school students living within Breckenridge should be capable of walking and/or biking to the school. Distances, walking and biking times to each school using the city street network at various points throughout Breckenridge was measured with Google Maps and calculated per the metric noted in Figure 30.
Figure 30: Breckenridge – Walk / Bike Analysis with Distance and Walk / Bike Travel Times to Each School.
**WALK AUDIT**

A walk-audit of the city of Breckenridge was conducted in September and November of 2016. This is done to gather data related to major streets, intersections and sidewalk conditions impeding or facilitating pedestrian and bicyclist safety. Factors that were documented include sidewalk width and condition, possible ADA PROWAG (Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines) violations, traffic volume, terrain, threatening features (dogs, perception of criminal activity, highways and busy intersections), trash, speed limits and general safety. The audit provided an opportunity for the team to identify where the community is walkable and where there are opportunities for improvement. The results of the sidewalk survey can be found in Figures 32, 36, 38, 41-43 and is discussed throughout the narrative of this section of the report. Areas of particular concern are discovered by this and all of the survey processes are listed in Table 9 at the very end of this chapter.

*School Locations*

As noted in Chapter 4, all three schools are positioned in locations highly conducive to walking and biking to school as they all immediately border dense suburban neighborhoods. The elementary/middle school is located at what is close to the geographic center of the city while St. Mary’s is a block away from the commercial heart of Breckenridge. The high school, while at the eastern edge of the city, is still easily accessible and borders areas with the latest residential development. As such, a large portion of the students who live within the city of Breckenridge should be able to walk and/or bike to and from school and nearly all in grades six and up. Outside of city limits, there are several farmsteads that are within two miles of the schools. Several residences are notably just to the northeast including two very close to the high school on Mackubin Avenue. Several others are located on 345th Street and are still within 2 miles using the street network. Directly south, there are several more homesteads at the 2-mile threshold. Finally, to the southeast, there are 20 residences at the Breckenridge Lake community that are a three-mile trip via the roadway network. Unfortunately, walking or biking to school from most of these nearby out-city residences would require students to travel on streets with high traffic speeds and notable amounts of heavy commercial (truck) traffic.
It is regularly noted among SRTS experts that the area closest to schools can be the most dangerous part of the journey for children who walk and bike to school. This is due to the multitude of traffic modes converging on and delivering people to the school. Exacerbating this, the design of school grounds are often primarily focused on the circulation of motor vehicle traffic flow with an emphasis on front door pick-up at the safety expense of those arriving on bike or foot. While well connected to the surrounding residential neighborhoods and located on a street not designed to prioritize motor vehicle flow, traveling to and from the Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School still requires students from points south, east and west, to traverse an area with a great deal of motor vehicle traffic. In the morning, a line of cars was observed dropping off students in the loop directly in front of the main entrance. Some parents even parked in the “front-end in angled spots” in the loop and later backed out with students still arriving. Meanwhile, students arriving by bus alight at the sidewalk directly adjacent to Beede Avenue; where the buses are seen in Figure 31. However, the buses arrive sporadically in the morning; not all at once as seen in the photo.

In the afternoon, all ten buses lined up on Beede Avenue, purposely blocking the drop-off area to force parents picking up students to wait elsewhere. As students were dismissed and began walking to their homes or cars across the street, many were seen filtering through this line of large buses. (Figure 31) Sensing a potential safety issue here, the author suggested early in the planning process that the buses be moved elsewhere to remove this potential hazard from the main flow of dismissed students. Since January
of 2017, administrators at the school have relocated the buses to the side (8th Street) and back (Hall Avenue) of the school and report that this has worked fairly well.

There are several traditional “schoolyard” style bike racks of extremely robust construction located at the secondary entrance to the school, 120 feet east of the main entrance with another located at the north east entrance of the school that is closer to Hall Avenue. (See Figures 32, 33). Mixed with these are two “ribbon” racks painted sky blue. While the location of these bike racks comply with the bicycle parking standards established by the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professional (APBP), the rack designs do not because of concerns that both only offer one point of contact for stability and security. Also, the schoolyard rack can bend the bicycle wheels as it is designed to be the only point of contact. These are legitimate concerns in locations with high bicycle theft and vandalism. However, in a community with negligible crime, these bicycle racks, particularly the traditional schoolyard rack work very well and are exceptionally good at keeping the bicycles organized. (See Figure 32) In fact, this old style of bike rack is still the preferred choice for schools in the city of Davis, California, known as the most bike-friendly town in the U.S. Davis is where the school system does not provide busing due to its comprehensive network of bike routes and lanes. Security, if a concern at schools, may be best addressed with rack placement near an office or placing the racks in a fenced-in corral.

Figure 32: The traditional “school yard” style bike racks located at the secondary entrance to the school, 120 feet east of the main entrance. While these racks are not APBP compliant, they work quite well in areas with low theft problems like Breckenridge and are exceptionally good at keeping the bicycles organized as demonstrated in this photo with 20+ bikes parked on the racks during observation day, September 14th 2016.
Figure 33: Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School – Existing Conditions.
Some of the sidewalks on and around the elementary/middle school grounds are either lacking or missing altogether. Directly in front of the main entrance, the sidewalk immediately adjacent to Beede Avenue is five feet wide, which is narrower than preferred for an area where students are boarding/alighting buses or even private automobiles. (Figure 34) If many students are congregating on such a narrow sidewalk, it is possible that some may spill over into the street. Behind the school near the corner of Hall Avenue and 8th Street, the sidewalk is again very narrow with cars in the adjacent parking lot encroaching upon what little pedestrian space the narrow sidewalk provides. (Figure 35) A similar encroachment by cars upon the pedestrian sidewalk space was also seen in the parking lot adjacent to Hall Avenue between 9th and 10th Streets. (Figure 36) Finally, there is no sidewalk east of the just-mentioned parking lot all the way to 11th Street despite this being the well-traveled route of middle school children traveling to the high school in the afternoon.

Figure 34: The narrow five-foot wide sidewalk immediately adjacent to Beede Avenue in front of the main school entrance. There is not much room for students to loiter while waiting to be picked up by either school buses or private automobiles.
Figure 35: Parked cars encroach upon the already narrow sidewalk on Hall Avenue near 8th Street.

Figure 36: Parked cars encroach upon the wider sidewalk in the parking lot adjacent to Hall Avenue between 9th and 10th Streets.
Figure 37: Breckenridge High School Existing Conditions and those of the immediate surrounding neighborhood.
Breckenridge High School

Located on the eastern edge of Breckenridge, the high school is well-connected to the residential neighborhoods immediately surrounding it. Conspicuously absent however, are sidewalks leading to the school from these otherwise bucolic and walkable residential neighborhoods. (See Figure 37) Since the students that attend the high school are older and more mature, there was much less drop-off and pick-up traffic at the school than at the elementary/middle school. Much of this is also due to the fact that many older high school students drive their own personal automobiles to school. West of the main entrance, there are two large parking lots that provide adequate parking for both faculty and students. Since these parking lots are accessed from Hall and Douglas Avenues, traffic generated by the lots has minimal effect on the traffic circulation in front of the school on 13th Street.

Saint Mary’s Catholic School

Located near the heart of downtown Breckenridge, St. Mary’s is also well-connected to the residential neighborhoods immediately surrounding it. The adjacent streets have a comprehensive network of sidewalks and crosswalks. (See Figure 39) Of some concern is the large curb cut and ambiguous sidewalk of St. Mary’s parking lot immediately north of the school entrance. A similar condition exists at the abandoned Stop and Go gas station on the north side of Mendenhall Avenue at the 5th Street. Like the high school, there were no glaring safety concerns seen during morning arrival and afternoon dismissal.

Figure 38: This Google Streetview image from Oct. 2012 shows students being lead on Mendenhall Avenue near St. Mary’s.
Figure 39: The Saint Mary’s Catholic School existing conditions and immediate surrounding neighborhood.
The City of Breckenridge

For organizational purposes, it seemed best to breakup Breckenridge into its geographically distinct neighborhoods. The north central Breckenridge is the area which lies north of the railroad tracks and south of the Otter Tail River. Northwest Breckenridge is that part of the city north of the Otter Tail River and south Breckenridge is the area located south of the railroad tracks. (Figure 41)

North Central Breckenridge

The north central portion of Breckenridge houses all three schools, city hall, the library, the aquatic center and the central business district including the city grocery. The sidewalk network is relatively contiguous and in good to excellent condition with some exceptions. There is sidewalk with missing sections and in poor condition, with whole streets missing sidewalks north of Hall Avenue and east of 11th Street. (See Figure 42) While likely not limited to this portion of town, it was common to find cars parked on residential and commercial driveways partially or completely blocking the sidewalks. (Figure 40) Also, there are sidewalks along Main Street, rather narrow over the river, and a multi-use pathway along 5th Street – U.S. Highway 75 connecting to the northwest portion of the city. There are sidewalks leading south on both sides of 5th Street – U.S. Highway 75 connecting to the south portion of the city but none going over the tracks at 8th Street. Finally, there was a sidewalk along the north side of Minnesota Avenue – County 12 leading west over the river to Wahpeton, North Dakota. While this does provide a walking connection for any potential St. Mary’s students living in Wahpeton, the sidewalk was rather narrow west of 2nd Street to the bridge for the volume and speed of traffic, including heavy trucks, on Minnesota Avenue. If students do walk over from Wahpeton to St. Mary’s, it is likely preferable for them to walk down Nebraska Avenue into Welles Park, cross the Otter Tail River on the pedestrian bridge and continue west to Wahpeton from there.

Figure 40: This photo shows both poor sidewalk condition and vehicles completely and partially blocking the sidewalk.
Figure 41: The City of Breckenridge divided into three distinct geographic areas: Northwest, North Central and South.
Figure 42: North Central Breckenridge – Existing Conditions.
Figure 43: Northwest Breckenridge – Existing Conditions.
Northwest Breckenridge

The northwest portion of Breckenridge seems to be the newest section of town, with almost all structures appearing as if built after World War II. (See Figure 43) As this was the age of the automobile, most streets in this portion of town were built without sidewalks; not that all of them require sidewalks. A notable exception is Main Street with a sidewalk extending from the bridge over the Otter Tail River to a point a few hundred feet north of Northern Avenue. Also of note are the sidewalks on the newly-constructed Riverbend Trail and the far northern part of Main Street. This latter sidewalk was likely built due to the requirements of the 1973 Breckenridge ordinance found in Chapter 161. STREETS AND SIDEWALKS Article III. Sidewalks § 161-14. Sidewalks required. The multi-use trail that runs along the west side of 5th Street – U.S. Highway 75 from the west central part of Breckenridge terminates at Wilkin Avenue. Finally, there is a multi-use trail bridge that crosses into Wahpeton, North Dakota just west of Oak Street and Crescent Drive. While the primary purpose of this bridge is to accommodate golf carts as they travel between holes on the Bois de Sioux Golf Course with nine holes in North Dakota and nine in Minnesota, the bridge is open to the public who wish to cross by foot or on bike.

South Breckenridge

This portion of the city seems to be as old as any. The 1929 Wilkin County Courthouse is located in this part of Breckenridge at 5th Street – U.S. Highway 75 between Dacotah and Oregon Avenues. The sidewalk network here is sporadic and incomplete on most streets. (See Figure 44) However, there has been a noticeable recent effort to rectify this shortcoming with new sidewalks installed on both sides of 5th Street – U.S. Highway 75 and 8th Street down to New York Avenue as the streets are important north/south corridors in this portion of town. At the same time, new sidewalks seem to have been installed on the south side of Dacotah Avenue as an east/west connector. Buffalo Avenue – U.S. Highway 75 east of 5th Street is a prominent industrial/commercial corridor that does create somewhat of a barrier for residences south of this corridor on 7th Street and west to 5th Street. West of 5th Street however, the Buffalo Avenue corridor is no longer industrial/commercial and is, in fact, no more than vacant lots which appear to be awaiting residential development. As such, walking and biking northwards from this southwest corner of town should be relatively safe and easy.
Figure 44: South Breckenridge-Existing Conditions with distances to the schools from marked points at 5th and 8th Streets.
Street, Lane, and (if present) Shoulder Widths

Street design and lane width can provide subtle clues to drivers as to the safe operating speed on a particular stretch of roadway. Recent thinking today is that bigger is not always safer and that wide road and lane widths can encourage drivers to speed, even unintentionally. They also require pedestrians to spend more time in the roadways when crossing, extending the time that they are exposed to potentially hazardous motor traffic. Wide streets and lanes however, can provide the space needed within the right-of-way to retrofit bike lanes, sidewalks, wider sidewalks, tree boulevards, etc.

For the most part, all local city streets are of an appropriate narrow width from 32 to 36 feet which are conducive to walking and biking as they keep motorist speeds lower. This amount of space is enough to accommodate on-street parking on both sides but requires drivers to operate their vehicles more slowly to navigate between the remaining space. With the narrower 32 foot streets, drivers may even have to wait until oncoming traffic has passed between the two cars parked on opposite sides of the street. There are some notable exceptions where city streets have been widened beyond 36 feet close to the central business district and the St. Mary’s School. Most notably, 4th Street just south of St. Mary’s between Nebraska and Minnesota Avenues has been widened to 55 feet with a center turn lane, two parking and two travel lanes. However, it was later discovered that 4th Street North is a county highway. Of all the observations of this section of roadway, never once did the reason to warrant such an expansion reveal itself. Nebraska Avenue was widened on both the north and south sides for a half block on either side of 5th Street – U.S. Highway 75 to accommodate nose-in angle parking. Again the parking demand to warrant such an alteration versus parallel parking never showed itself during observations.

County highways through town were often indistinguishable from their neighboring city-managed counterparts save for additional traffic volume on some streets due to the more arterial nature of these routes. Main Street and 4th Street North is County 5, 11th Street North and 8th Street South is County 16 and 7th Street South is County 157. As noted in the prior paragraph, St. Mary’s is on County 5. While the traffic volume on 4th Street – County 5 seemed no different that the neighboring city streets, the block just south of the school was exceptionally wide (55 feet) for the traffic observed. Minnesota Avenue – County 12 is a major arterial approaching Breckenridge from the agricultural fields in the east that goes through the heart of the city and then crosses the Red River into Wahpeton, North Dakota where it becomes Dakota Avenue and Wahpeton’s central business district. Back in Breckenridge, Minnesota Avenue – County 12 is the main point of access from surface streets to the railroad and the grain elevators within the city. While 58 feet and five lanes wide (two parking, and three travel), it seems an appropriate width for the nature of the street and the heavy commercial traffic. Also, there are no real pedestrian destinations on the south side of Minnesota Avenue besides the crossings at 5th and 8th Streets.
The only state or federal highway that traverses through Breckenridge is U.S. Highway 75. From the north, it enters town and then becomes 5th Street. Where it crosses Minnesota Avenue, it could be considered the heart of the Breckenridge central business district. It is also the busiest intersection in the city and the only one with any pedestrian accommodations to cross Minnesota Avenue and the railroad tracks to access the south side of town. Pedestrians are not forbidden from using 8th Street to cross the tracks but there are no accommodations to facilitate them. South of there, U.S. Highway 75 turns east onto Buffalo Avenue by cutting the corner with a sweeping turn engineered with a 240 foot radius. This conglomeration of roadways here at this intersection and the discontinuation of sidewalks does not make for the best pedestrian or bicyclist environment. From here, U.S. Highway 75 leaves Breckenridge on Buffalo Avenue.

**Speed and Speed Limits**

High vehicle speeds have been known to be a significant safety hazard to pedestrians and bicyclists. According to the AAA in the U.S., if a pedestrian gets hit by a car traveling at 20 mph, there is an approximately seven percent chance of death. The fatality rate climbs to 90 percent for a pedestrian struck at 60 mph. According to AAA, the greatest rate of fatality risk increase happens between the speeds of 25 and 45 mph, increasing from 12 percent to 60 percent.\(^{18}\) Other studies have the 45 mph pedestrian fatality rate as high as 85 percent. High-speed traffic also creates noise and induces stress on pedestrians, making even wide, well-designed sidewalks unappealing places to walk.

All roadways in the urbanized portions of Breckenridge are marked or assumed to be 30 mph. The only exception to this is U.S. Highway 75. When approaching Breckenridge from the north, the speed limit drops from 55 to 45 mph approximately 375 feet south of the north intersection with State Highway 210 near the hospital. From here, U.S. Highway 75 maintains its 45 mph speed limit until Wilkin Avenue where the speed limit is then reduced to 40 mph. It is not until a point approximately 160 feet south of the bridge over the Otter Tail River does the speed limit drop to 30 mph. From here, the speed limit remains 30 mph until the highway is in the southern portion of town and converges with Buffalo Avenue. At a point approximately 155 feet east of 7th Street, the highway increases to 45 mph. Finally, at a point 560 feet west of the city limits at County 9, the speed limit increases to 55 mph and U.S. Highway 75 exits town.

---

Red River Valley and Western Railroad

The Red River Valley and Western Railroad (RRWW) began operations as an independent company in July, 1987 on track acquired from the Burlington Northern Railroad. Since then, RRVW has continued to grow in terms of freight volume, employees and physical improvements. The RRVW operates over 500 miles of track, primarily in North Dakota, providing local freight services used for transporting grain, fuel and fertilizer. While headquartered just across the river in Wahpeton, North Dakota, all of the railroad’s main operations and maintenance facilities are located in Breckenridge. While a small railroad compared to the national giants, the RRVW continues to expand operations. The RRVW presently serves more than 60 customers, including 9-grain shuttle facilities, 33 grain elevators and a number of processors.

Healthy operations at the RRVW do, unfortunately, pose some conflicts related to the goals of SRTS. As mentioned earlier, the railroad is located right in the heart of town with crossings only at U.S. Highway 75 – 5th Street and at 8th Street. While this central location made logistical sense when the town was established and the railroads were the primary means of longer distance, overland transportation, today it effectively cuts the town in half. The tracks in Breckenridge not only serve through traffic for both RRVW and BNSF Railway trains but also the numerous elevators and processors in town as well as the RRVW maintenance operations. It appears that only through trains forced a closure at U.S. Highway 75 – 5th Street. But yard operation to reposition railcars just east of 8th Street had RRVW locomotives traversing the 8th Street crossing multiple times during the day, or so the author observed the one day he was in the area doing the walk audit. Due to the high activity levels of the railroad in Breckenridge, it is also more likely that a person traversing the 5th and 8th Street crossings will look to do so when a train is also there; moving, stationary or approaching.
**Winter Conditions**

During a visit to Breckenridge during the winter months, it was observed that snow was not removed from the sidewalk in front of several residences in the blocks immediately surrounding the elementary/middle school. While a relatively light snowfall, the lack of snow removal still presents a hazard to all students walking to school and all other Breckenridge residents. Breckenridge City Code Chapter 161. STREETS AND SIDEWALKS, Article I. Snow and Weeds, § 161-2, does not have a minimum threshold depth for snow removal and states that all snow and ice must be removed or mitigated within 18 hours of the end of the weather event.

![Image of snow not shoveled from in front of two residences on 11th Street – County 16 (note snow at top of photo).](image)

**Figure 46:** Snow not shoveled from in front of two residences on 11th Street – County 16 (note snow at top of photo).
During the walk audit, the author traveled to Wahpeton, North Dakota to investigate the levee-top, multi-use paths to see if they had any utility as safe routes to school for Breckenridge students attending St. Mary’s and/or those residing Wahpeton. (Figure 47) While no high SRTS utility could be found for the Wahpeton multi-use pathway network, the idea could easily be replicated in Breckenridge to create useful shortcuts and safer routes to some of Breckenridge's schools. (Figure 48)

Figure 47: The multi-use trail atop the levee in Wahpeton, North Dakota, along the Red River.

Figure 48: A view of the levee along the Otter Tail River from behind the elementary/middle school at 8th Street and Hall Avenue. A trail on the levee would provide a nice short cut from the multi-use trail along U.S. Highway 75 and could continue around the city.
OBSERVATION DAY RESULTS

To gain a better understanding of how students, parents, bus drivers, teachers and staff operate and interact during morning arrival and afternoon dismissal at the three schools and at select points around Breckenridge, an Observation Day was held on Wednesday, September 14th 2016. Members of the SRTS team conducted field observations of students’ travel behaviors, patterns and mode choices during morning arrival and afternoon departure. Team members were strategically positioned around the school and at select locations in Breckenridge. They were tasked with counting the number of student pedestrians and bicyclists traveling to school and which routes the students took. They also observed whether students were using good techniques when crossing the street and how motorists behaved in relation to pedestrians and bicyclists on the streets and on school grounds. Detail of observations will depend on level and concentration of activity at that location and may vary at times at a single location.

Morning Observations

- Local weather at the Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School:
Observations began at 7:30AM with school starting at 8:30AM.

Station 1: Beede Avenue @ 8th Street North - Andrew J. Besold

- Walkers - 57.
- Bicyclists - 14.
- Buses - 10.
- Cab – 1.
- Buses dropped off on 8th Street (3) and on Beede Avenue (7).
- Parents drop off was fairly orderly, even if traffic was busy at times.
- Speeds relatively safe around school at arrival.
- Concerned about students needing to cross drop-off loop, particularly as some parents were backing out of parking spaces in the loop.
- No crossing guard or school aid noted at front entrance.
- Half of the students were observed using safe walking techniques.
- Most students used crosswalks or were close to crosswalks. Some students crossed mid-block at alley directly across from school.

Most bicyclists were observed using poor techniques. Some may have been better but hard to observe with so much going on.
Figure 49: Breckenridge - Observation Day Posts.
Station 2: Hall Avenue @ 13\textsuperscript{th} Street North – Lori Gefre

- Walkers: 7.
- Bicyclists: 4.
- Buses: 10.
- Lots of walking across 13\textsuperscript{th} Street by Douglas Avenue but could not tell if it was people parking in parking lot or students walking to school from home.
- Most students did not use crosswalk from parking lot.
- Lots of students at Beede Avenue and 13\textsuperscript{th} Street and drivers not stopping for them.
- Buses come in on Hall Avenue, drop off in front of school on 13\textsuperscript{th} Street and leave via Douglas Avenue.

Station 3: Mendenhall Avenue @ 4\textsuperscript{th} / 5\textsuperscript{th} Street North - ???

- Walkers: 2.
- Bicyclists: 9.
- Semis and Beet Trucks: 28

Station 4: US Highway 75 (5\textsuperscript{th} Street North) @ Trail Crossing near Lions Park – Corinna Erickson

- Walkers: 1.
- Bicyclists: 3.
- At 8:08, traffic stopped for three bicyclists crossing.
- At 8:25, walker ran across to beat traffic but traffic did slow.

Station 5: US Highway 75 (5\textsuperscript{th} Street North) @ Nebraska Avenue – Wayne Hurley

- Walkers: 3.
- Bicyclists: 12.
- Parent observed walking child to school.
- Biking on sidewalks.
- Heavy traffic on US Highway 75 with a large percentage of heavy trucks, but speeds not excessive.
Station 6: Hall Avenue @ 11th Street North (County Highway 16) - Jamie Neppl
- Walkers: 8.
- Bicyclists: 3.
- Students walked around parked cars and on the streets, not in wet grass.
- Traffic on 11th Street was fast, including those turning on Hall Avenue heading east with blinding low sun.

Station 7: US Highway 75 (5th Street North) @ Wisconsin Avenue – Julie Ernst
- Walkers: none observed.
- Bicyclists: none observed.
- Sidewalks present, but road still didn’t feel safe.
- There is heavy traffic and most cars appear to be driving 30 mph or greater.

Station 8: Minnesota Avenue @ 8th Street North - ???
- Walkers: none observed.
- Bicyclists: none observed.
- Road seems safe but still a concern around railroad tracks.
- There is heavy traffic at this time of the morning but speeds seem normal.

Station 9: US Highway 75 (5th Street North) @ Andrews Avenue - ???
- Walkers: 1.
- Bicyclists: 4.
- Andrews Avenue from Main Street Bridge to US 75 has no sidewalks.
- A noticeable amount of beet trucks.

Station 10: Beede Avenue @ 11th Street North (County Highway 16) - ???
Note – This intersection was not the pre-designated observation station. Shown on map as “10m”.
- Walkers: 2.
- Bicyclists: 1.
- Good techniques observed when students crossed the street including use of the crosswalks.
- No issues regarding speeding observed.
Afternoon Observations

- Local weather at the Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School:

Observations began at 3:00PM with school dismissing at 3:15PM.

Station 1: Beede Avenue @ 8th Street North - Andrew J. Besold

- Walkers – Not counted.
- Bicyclists - 10.
- Buses - 10.
- Family Vehicles – Not counted.
- Cab – 1.
- All 10 buses lined up on north side of Beede Avenue to pick up students extending well east of the front of the school. All shut off engines.
- Saw driver back into intersection (illegal maneuver) and park on 8th Street to wait for child.
- Most parents wait on 8th Street, some on Beede Avenue.
- One vehicle parked in loop, backed up (dangerous maneuver) as students were leaving. Was then blocked by buses and couldn't leave.

Station 2: Hall Avenue @ 13th Street North - Lori Gefre

- Walkers - 45.
- Bicyclists - 2.
- Buses - 10.
- 35 middle school-aged students were observed walking back to elementary school on south side of Hall Avenue as part of their routine of taking classes in both schools.
- Most students did not use crosswalk and were crossing mid-block.
- Traffic busy and fast going both north and south in front of school.
- Fast traffic approaching four-way stop at 13th Street and Hall Avenue.
- Buses come in on Hall Avenue, drop off in front of school on 13th Street and leave via Douglas Avenue.
Station 3: Mendenhall Avenue @ 4th / 5th Street North - ???

- Walkers: 24.
- Semis and Beet Trucks: 17
- Student crossing patrols with one adult supervisor at the intersection of 5th Street North and Mendenhall Avenue.
- Students are using crosswalks but likely due to the presence of crossing patrol.

Station 4: US Highway 75 (5th Street North) @ Trail Crossing near Lions Park – Corinna Erikson

- Walkers: 1.
- Bicyclists: 0.
- Steady stream of cars observed.
- Walker was adult with dog

Station 5: US Highway 75 (5th Street North) @ Nebraska Avenue – Wayne Hurley

- Walkers: 23.
- Parent observed walking child to school.
- Two adults observed bicycling on the sidewalk on the east side of 5th Street.
- Heavy traffic on US Highway 75 with a large percentage of heavy trucks but speeds not excessive. May warrant a more robust crossing treatment if high HAADT.
- School crossing patrol helpful with crossing 5th Street North at Mendenhall Avenue for the five to ten minutes they were there.

Station 6: Hall Avenue @ 11th Street North (County Highway 16) - Julie Ernst

- Walkers: 55.
- Bicyclists: 4.
- Students were observed using crosswalks and seemed to watch for cars.
- When crossing 11th Street (County Highway 16), they used crosswalks but on Hall Avenue north of school, they crossed mid-block.
- No sidewalks on Hall Avenue which was very busy with traffic. Drivers don’t always stop for walkers at crosswalks. Most are driving at a speed greater than 30 mph.
Station 7: US Highway 75 (5th Street North) @ Wisconsin Avenue -

Note – Due to no observed walker or bikers in the morning, this station was not posted in the afternoon.

Station 8: Minnesota Avenue @ 8th Street North - ???

- Walkers: 8.
- Most students are using crosswalk including those on bicycles.
- Walkers are using sidewalks.
- One driver swerved to the middle of the road when a pedestrian was trying to cross.

Station 9: US Highway 75 (5th Street North) @ Andrews Avenue - ???

- Walkers: 9.
- Bicyclists: 9.
- Many walkers and bicyclists observed going north on 5th Street.
- One walker and one cyclist going west on Andrews Avenue.
- Three bicyclists going south from Beede Avenue.

Station 10: Mendenhall Avenue @ 11th Street North (County Highway 16) – Missy Johnson

- Walkers: 4.
- Bicyclists: 0.
- High school walker on sidewalk turned onto Mendenhall Avenue.
- One elementary school walker ran west at Mendenhall and darted / jaywalked across 11th Street.
- One driver stopped for adult walker crossing 11th Street.
- One truck, one pickup and one police car were observed not stopping.
TRAFFIC VOLUME DATA

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

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

Figures 51 and 52 are maps of the AADT and HCAADT respectively, from data collected by MnDOT of the more significant roads in the immediate vicinity of the city of Breckenridge. Tables 7 and 8 are a breakdown again of both AADT and HCAADT (where available) respectively, on roads within urbanized Breckenridge and on other select roadways. MnDOT traffic volume data comes from the MnDOT Basemap (Available at: [http://mndotgis.dot.state.mn.us/basemap/](http://mndotgis.dot.state.mn.us/basemap/)) and was accessed on May 22nd 2017.

**Table 7: Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) for state system highways in and around Breckenridge.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Name and Location</th>
<th>Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 north of State 210</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 between State 210 and Beede Ave</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 at Andrews Ave</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 at Nebraska Ave</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 from Minnesota Ave to 7th Street South</td>
<td>3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 from 7th Street South to County 9</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 south of County 9</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Ave from North Dakota State Line to 4th Street</td>
<td>12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Ave at 4th Street</td>
<td>10,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Ave between 4th and 8th Streets</td>
<td>4,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Ave between 8th and 11th Streets</td>
<td>3,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Ave between 11th and 13th Streets</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Ave east of 13th Street</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 5 – Main Street north of Wegener Ave</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 5 – Main Street between Wegener and Northern Aves</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Heavy Commercial Average Annual Daily Traffic (HCAADT) on select highways in and around Breckenridge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Name and Location</th>
<th>Heavy Commercial AADT (HCAADT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 north of State 210</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 between State 210 and Beede Ave</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 at Andrews Ave</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 at Nebraska Ave</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 from Minnesota Ave to 7th Street South</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 from 7th Street South to County 9</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 south of County 9</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 51: Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) for more significant roads in and around Breckenridge.
Figure 52: Heavy Commercial Average Annual Daily Traffic (HCAADT) for more significant roads in / around Breckenridge.
CRASH DATA

Crash data from within the Breckenridge city limits was gathered using the online Minnesota Crash Mapping Analysis Tool (MCMAT) (http://www.dot.state.mn.us/stateaid/crashmapping.html). MCMAT is MnDOT's crash database that includes all crashes involving a motor vehicle where a crash report was filed. It includes crash reports from the past ten years. However, a crash involving a solo cyclist, the most common type of bicycle crash, would not be recorded even if emergency services responded as long as the crash did not involve a motor vehicle. The MCMAT data for Breckenridge was accessed, May 23rd, 2017. As of that date, the dataset included crash reports from January 1st, 2006 through December 31st, 2015, all of which were included in this analysis. According to the MCMAT homepage accessed on the date above, there has been a delay in updating the database with crash data from 2016. Typically, the lag time between crash occurrence and data entry into the MCMAT database can be approximately 2-3 months with the data updated four times per year, approximately quarterly.

The staff at WCI felt that collecting crash data within the city limits of Breckenridge would provide the most utility. There were a total of 399 crashes with nine of those involving either a pedestrian (five) or bicyclist (four). Five of the bicyclist / pedestrian crashes resulted in “possible injury”, three “non-incapacitating injury” and one “incapacitating injury”. None of these nine crashes involved a fatality. There was a noted concentration of bicyclist and pedestrian involved crashes near the intersection of U.S. Highway 75 – 5th Street and Minnesota Avenue. (See Figure 53) The summaries of the numbered bicycle / pedestrian crashes are as follows:

1. On March 31, 2006 at 08:10 under wet, cloudy daylight conditions, a 17-year old female driver of a passenger car made a left turn northeast and due to distraction, failed to yield the right of way to an 11-year old female pedestrian in a crosswalk resulting in a possible injury.

2. On August 2, 2006 at 12:49 under dry, clear daylight conditions, a 50-year old male driver of an SUV driving straight west, collided with a 13-year old merging bicyclist driving west resulting in an incapacitating injury.

3. On May 4, 2008 at 16:59 under dry, clear daylight conditions, a 31-year old female driver of an SUV made a right turn south and due to distraction, failed to yield the right of way to a 58-year old female pedestrian resulting in a non-incapacitating injury.
4. On May 6, 2009 at 08:20 under dry, clear daylight conditions, an 83-year old female driver of a passenger car driving straight north and due to distraction, collided with an 82-year old female pedestrian with an “other human factor” who was not in a crosswalk resulting in a non-incapacitating injury.

5. On April 4, 2010 at 20:45 under dry, clear dark conditions with street lights, a driver (of unknown sex and age) of a passenger car was driving distracted, collided with a 17-year old bicyclist driving properly and straight ahead resulting in a possible injury.

6. On July 14, 2010 at 16:02 under dry clear daylight conditions, a 61-year old female driver of a passenger car driving straight and not improperly, collided with an eight-year old male “emerging” pedestrian resulting in a possible injury.

7. On July 14, 2013 at 20:54 under dry, clear daylight conditions, a 19-year old male bicyclist riding south with traffic collided with the passenger car operated by a 78-year old female who was not driving improperly resulting in a possible injury.

8. On November 5, 2013 at 09:17 under dry, clear daylight conditions, a 28-year old female driver of an SUV made a right turn traveling south and failed to yield the right of way to an 88-year old bicyclist “darting into traffic” resulting in a possible injury. An improperly parked car was noted as a contributing factor.

9. On December 31, 2013 at 17:46 under icy and packed snow street conditions and clear, dark conditions with street lights, a 66-year old female driver of passenger car driving straight north was distracted and collided with a 50-year old male pedestrian in a crosswalk resulting in a non-incapacitating injury.
Figure 53: Map of the 399 crash sites within the city limits of Breckenridge. Nine crashes involved either a bicyclist or a pedestrian. Map auto-generated online by MCMAT and then edited. Note that some dots represent crash multiple sites.
Of all 399 crashes within Breckenridge, none involved a fatality. The severity classes and numbers of each severity class include two with incapacitating injuries, 13 with non-incapacitating injuries, 51 with possible injuries, and 333 with property damage. (See Figure 54) Of the “Crash Types,” the vast majority are collisions with other motor vehicles in transport or parked vehicles, followed by collisions with deer. The rest are mostly collision with fixed objects while five were collisions with pedestrians and four with bicyclists. (See Figure 55) From 2006 to 2015, there seemed to be a trend towards less crashes within Breckenridge as 2015 had the lowest number of crashes of the 10 years analyzed. That said, 2013 still had the second highest number of crashes, so any trends may not be statistically significant. (See Figure 56) The peak time for crashes was during the 15:00 hour with a secondary peak in the 12:00 hour. (See Figure 57) This 3:00 pm peak might correspond to student driver behaviors upon dismissal. Further evaluation of the crash data would need to be done to see if student drivers could be a cause in this crash spike. It must be noted that a crash peak in the 15:00 hour has been seen in other communities where WCI has done SRTS plans. Finally, the data reveals the typical pattern of crashes happening more often in winter months which corresponds to poorer surface and light conditions. (See Figure 58)

**Breckenridge Crash Severity – Severity Class and Number**

![Bar chart](image)

**Figure 54: Breckenridge Crash Severity - Severity Class and number of crashes in each class.**

*Graph automatically generated online by MCMAT.*
Figure 55: Breckenridge Crash Type – Crash type and number of each crash type. Graph automatically generated online by MCMAT.

Figure 56: Breckenridge crash rate per year. Graph automatically generated online by MCMAT.
Figure 57: Breckenridge crashes per hour of the day (24 hour time). Graph automatically generated online by MCMAT.

Figure 58: Breckenridge crashes per month of the year. Graph automatically generated online by MCMAT.
### Table 9: Street and Intersection Conditions in Breckenridge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street or Intersection</th>
<th>Posted/Assumed Speed Limit</th>
<th>Conditions Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hall Ave between schools</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50 students seen walking between schools during observation day but no sidewalks to accommodate them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All streets around High School</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>There are no sidewalks for several blocks around the high school and the neighboring aquatic center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 16 – 11th Street North</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AADT &gt;2000 vehicles, anecdotal reports of high volumes of truck traffic, and complaints of speeding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th and 8th Street crossings of RRVW Railroad ROW.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Both crossing could be better designed for pedestrian safety. There are no gates preventing pedestrian traffic from venturing onto the ROW when a train is approaching or present and the 8th Street crossing which could act as a main route for students to walk and bike from the south portion of Breckenridge to both the Elementary/Middle School and High School has no sidewalks at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75 near intersection with Minnesota Ave</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>A high proportion of bike and pedestrian crashes near this intersection (five out of nine within Breckenridge city limits over the past 10 years of records). Fortunately none of the bike or pedestrian crashes in Breckenridge were fatal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>The speed limit for U.S. Highway 75 when traveling south into town does not drop from 40mph to 30mph until the highway is well into city limits and south of the Otter Tail River. For traffic traveling north into town the speed limit does not drop from 45mph to 30mph until a point west of 8th Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Highway 75</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>High truck volumes (HCAADT) as measured by MnDOT confirm casual observations. Numbers likely higher during harvest season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 5 – Main Street in front of St. Mary’s</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Traffic volumes (AADT of 1,400) higher than expected from walk audit observations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On Friday, November 11, 2016 from 9:30-11:00 am, Breckenridge High School held a community Veterans Day Ceremony in the high school auditorium. Due to a poor attendance record at previous SRTS Open House events in other communities, the team decided that it may be more fruitful to go to the people instead of trying to get the people to come to us. As such, it was decided that having a table at this public event may prove to be a more effective way to present the project and get community feedback. As such, members of the community were able to meet some of the SRTS team, learn how SRTS works, and help envision what a more walkable, bikeable community could look like. Available to the community members at the open house were the results from the strengths, barriers and opportunities analysis seen in the previous chapter.

At the outreach events, WCI staff had a map of the city and numbered sticker dots and participants were asked to put the dot at a location of a concern, problem or even something good; anything that could help the SRTS planning process. WCI staff recorded their comments in number order corresponding to the numbered dot. Comments from members of the community are as follows and not edited. They are not listed in any priority order. Figure 59 is a digital reproduction of the map created by the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday, November 11, 2016 Community SRTS Open House Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1   Traffic doesn’t stop for pedestrians at crossing on U.S. 75. Drivers “blow through.” (Dot #1 placed north of the Otter Tail River and south of Wilkin Ave.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   Traffic is busy in front of school and seems dangerous (Dot #2 placed directly in front of the Breckenridge Elementary School.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   Comment by student: There is speeding and “near accidents” in front of my house. (Dot #3 placed on 9th Street South between Dacotah Ave and Oregon Ave.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   11th Street, trucks and tractors speeding; cars too. My neighbors have lost several pets to traffic. (Dot #4 placed on 11th Street between Beede and Andrews Aves.) Note - This was a very concerned mom who will or does have kids in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   No sidewalk for students on Hall Ave on the north side of school property. Students either walk in the middle of the street or on the grass but mostly in the street. (Dot #5 placed on Hall Ave between 10th and 11th Streets.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General comment (no number) – Where there are crosswalks, there is no need to cross. Where there aren’t, that’s where people cross! Note – Comment made by a gentleman senior citizen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 59: Points of concern from the public outreach event held in conjunction with Veterans' Day ceremonies.
A take-home, self-report parent survey and a teacher-administered in-class student travel tally were conducted in the fall 2016 for all three schools. These surveys and survey documents have been designed by the National Centers for Safe Routes to School (National Centers). (http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/) These surveys and survey forms are the national standard for reporting SRTS data in the United States and help the National Centers keep track of walking and biking rates. National Centers’ guidelines, up until 2016, had focused on gathering survey data from students in grades K-8 only. However, with the SRTS program expanding focus to now include high schools, surveys are taken from schools that teach grades 9-12. The results analyzed are from the following schools:

- Breckenridge Elementary/Middle School (PreK – 6 / 7 – 8)
- Breckenridge High School (9 – 12)
- Saint Mary’s Catholic School (K – 8)

The parent survey questionnaire is a two-page form that was taken home by students for parents to complete asking about their child’s school travel behaviors and the parents’ perceptions regarding whether walking and biking to school is appropriate and fitting for their child. Besides English, the parent survey is available from the National Centers in Spanish, Arabic, Armenian, Mandarin Chinese, Haitian Creole, Hmong, Korean, Russian, Somali, Ukrainian and Vietnamese. The parent survey (English and Spanish only) can also be done by parents directly online if school administrators and SRTS believe that this will provide a greater survey return rate. This also has the potential to increase survey response accuracy and saving administrative time with data entry. The results provide valuable information about parental attitudes and opinions relevant to SRTS and create a benchmark baseline by which future analysis can be compared.

The student travel tally is administered by teachers and conducted over three days (Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday) in one single school week throughout the entire school. Teachers record weather conditions on each particular day, in the morning and afternoon. The teachers ask about students’ travel modes to school that particular day and how they plan on going home. These also provide a benchmark baseline by which future analysis can be compared.
Once the paper forms are completed and collected for both surveys, the data is entered on-line into the National Centers’ database by staff at WCI. This is done to maintain data entry continuity and as a service to the school. After the survey data is entered, those with access to the National Centers’ database can produce automated individual reports from each school for both the parent survey and the student travel tally. These reports provide a breakdown of the basic statistics that first establish a baseline that progress can be measured against in the future. The reports generated by the National Centers are the origin of most of graphs and tables in this chapter. The 2016 surveys will be used to establish baseline data for the three Breckenridge schools. Moving forward, the parent survey will be done once every two to three years and the teacher-administered student travel tally will be done at least once, but preferably twice per school year (Fall and Spring). Follow-up surveying, with help from WCI, will be done so that local, state and national officials can monitor trends over time in the travel habits of students traveling to and from school.

This chapter only reproduces the most important survey results and provides some analysis.

**PARENT SURVEY – SELECT QUESTIONS / KEY FINDINGS**

For the complete parent survey results for all three schools, see Appendix A.

**BRECKENRIDGE ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE SCHOOL**

*Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school*

Of the children whose parents participated in the survey, the breakdown of travel mode to and from school is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Trip</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Response Morning: 2
No Response Afternoon: 2
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding
There is a change in travel modes chosen for school departure compared to arrival. There is a switch to the school bus and more students walking in the afternoon, and not using the family vehicle. This is in keeping with what has been seen in other schools in the west central region of Minnesota. It is the belief of the author that this mode shift from the family vehicle happens in most communities and schools because it is easy for parents to drive children to school as they are headed to work. In the afternoon, parents are at work when students are dismissed and students can take their time getting home. Bike mode share for students does not vary between morning and afternoons as it stands to reason that students will need to ride their bikes home if they wish to ride to school the next day.
When compared to the 2013 national SRTS combined walk and bike mode share of 15.2 percent in the morning and 18.4 percent in the afternoon, the percentages of students walking and bicycling to and from the Breckenridge Elementary/ Middle School (12 percent morning, 15 percent afternoon) are below average.

Parent estimate of distance from child's home to school

Parents were asked to give the distance from their home to the school. This question is asked in a way so that parents likely estimate that distance. These results are shown in Table 11. This is recorded because what parents estimate will have an effect on their mode choice for their child. Often, parents will overestimate that distance and drive their child to school when walking and/or biking is a viable, safe and timely alternative.

Table 11: Parent estimate of distance from the child's home to school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance between home and school</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 5
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Cross-reference – Distance, by arrival and departure modes

These estimated distances are then cross-referenced with actual arrival and departure mode choice. (Tables 12 and 13)

Table 12: Parent estimate of the distance from child’s home to school and mode choice to school.

School Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>23</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>

Don’t know or No response: 5
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Table 13: Parent estimate of the distance from child’s home to school and mode choice from school.

School Departure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>17%</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.

Mode analysis within the Walk / Bike Zone, arrival and departure modes: Additional WCI analysis.

According to the MnDOT Walk / Bike Zone concept, one-half mile is considered an appropriate distance for students in grades PreK-5 to walk and/or bike to and from school. For grades 6-8, it is one mile. Since the elementary/middle school serves grades PreK – 8 and there is no way to parse the data depending on grade, it was decided for this analysis that all those living within a perceived one mile from the school...
would be considered to live within the appropriate Walk / Bike Zone for this school. Even when only those students living within one mile were selected, only 17 percent walk or bike to school in the morning and 20 percent walked or biked home in the afternoon. The rest used motorized modes to travel to and from school from within just one mile.

Table 14: School arrival modes for students (raw numbers and percent)
living within one mile of the Elementary/Middle School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than ¼ mile</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>19 (59%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ mile up to ½ mile</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
<td>12 (75%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>13 (65%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total within 1 mile</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>8 (12%)</td>
<td>49 (71%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Walk / Bike within 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Motorized Modes within 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Table 15: School departure modes for students (raw numbers and percent)
living within one mile of the Elementary/Middle School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than ¼ mile</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10 (31%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>17 (53%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ mile up to ½ mile</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (38%)</td>
<td>9 (56%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>12 (57%)</td>
<td>8 (38%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total within 1 mile</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>21 (30%)</td>
<td>34 (49%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Walk / Bike within 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Motorized Modes within 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
What of the following issues affected your decision to allow, or not allow, your child to walk or bike to/from school?

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

![Figure 61: 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.](image)

As seen in the chart above, of the 81 respondents that answered this question and their child does not walk or bike to school, the three leading reasons to not allow a child to walk to school are all related to traffic safety followed by "weather or climate" and "distance". Crime, time available and even a potential lack of sidewalks was cited as a barrier by less than half of the respondents.
As seen in the chart above, of the 9 respondents that answered this question and their child does walk or bike to school, the leading reasons to allow a child to walk to school is “distance”. Categories all related to the perception of relative traffic safety were the following three reasons.
BRECKENRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL

Note! Three responses for the high school parent survey came from parents of children in the elementary school; one from 3rd grade and two from 5th grade. Since the survey was done on-line, these responses could not be separated and were added to the elementary/middle school surveys and are included in these results.

Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school

Of the children whose parents participated in the survey, the breakdown of travel mode to and from school is as follows:

Table 16: Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Trip</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Response Morning: 3
No Response Afternoon: 3
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding
There is a change in travel modes chosen for school departure compared to arrival. There is a switch to the school bus and carpooling from the family vehicle. Walking remains unchanged, where in other schools it is often seen rising in the afternoon, but lack of mode shift isn’t that unusual. Otherwise, this mode shift is in keeping with what has been seen in other schools in the west central region of Minnesota. Bike mode share is zero.

When compared to the 2013 national SRTS combined walk and bike mode share numbers of 15.2 percent in the morning and 18.4 percent in the afternoon, the percentages of students walking and bicycling to and from the Breckenridge High School (eight percent morning, eight percent afternoon) are below average. It should be noted however that the national numbers are for grades K-8.
Parent estimate of distance from child's home to school

Parents were asked to give the distance from their home to the school. This question is asked in a way so that parents likely estimate that distance. These results are shown in Table 17. This is recorded because what parents estimate will have an effect on their mode choice for their child. Often parents will overestimate that distance and drive their child to school when walking and/or biking is a viable, safe and timely alternative.

Table 17: Parent estimate of distance from the child’s home to school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance between home and school</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 5
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Cross-reference – Distance, by arrival and departure modes

These estimated distances are then cross-referenced with actual arrival and departure mode choice. (Tables 18 and 19)

Table 18: Parent estimate of the distance from child’s home to school and mode choice to school.

School Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 3
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Table 19: Parent estimate of the distance from child’s home to school and mode choice from school.

School Departure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 3
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Mode analysis within the Walk / Bike Zone, arrival and departure modes: Additional WCI analysis.

According to the MnDOT Walk / Bike Zone concept, one and a half miles is considered an appropriate distance for students in grades 9 through 12 to walk and/or bike to and from school. Since there is no way to parse the data between those living less than one and a half miles and at a perceived distance greater than one and a half miles, it was decided for this analysis all those living within a perceived two miles from the school would be considered to live within the appropriate Walk / Bike Zone for the High School. This should include everyone living within the city of Breckenridge. Even when only those students living within two miles were selected, only 13 percent walk or bike to school in the morning and 13 percent walked or biked home in the afternoon. The rest used motorized modes to travel to and from school from within two miles.

Table 20: School arrival modes for students (raw numbers and percent)

<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 ¾ mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¾ mile up to ½ mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (80%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (90%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total within 2 miles</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>19 (79%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Walk / Bike within 2 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Motorized Modes within 2 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 (88%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
### Table 21: School departure modes for students (raw numbers and percent) living within two miles of the high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than ¼ mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ mile up to ½ mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (60%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total within 2 miles</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 (13%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 (21%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 (50%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 (17%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Walk / Bike within 2 mile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3 (13%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Motorized Modes within 2 mile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21 (88%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
What of the following issues affected your decision to allow, or not allow, your child to walk or bike to/from school?

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

![Figure 64: 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.]

As seen in the chart above, of the 25 respondents that answered this question and their child does not walk or bike to school, the three leading reasons to not allow a child to walk to school are “distance”, “safety of intersections and crossings” followed by “weather or climate”. It is notable that “safety of intersections and crossings” is still a major concern for parents of high school-aged children. Crime, time available and even a potential lack of sidewalks was cited as a barrier by less than half of the respondents.
Figure 65: 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.

As seen in the chart above, of the 4 respondents that answered this question and their child DOES walk or bike to school, the leading reasons to ALLOW a child to walk to school is “distance”. Categories related to the perceptions of relative traffic safety and weather were the following three reasons.
SAINT MARY'S CATHOLIC SCHOOL

Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school

Of the children whose parents participated in the survey, the breakdown of travel mode to and from school is as follows:

Table 22: Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Trip</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Response Morning: 6
No Response Afternoon: 1
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding

Figure 66: Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school.
There is a big change in travel modes chosen for school departure compared to arrival. There is a large switch to walking followed by a lesser increase to the school bus in the afternoon from the family vehicle. This is in keeping with what has been seen in other schools in the west central region of Minnesota but with not quite as drastic a switch to walking. When the author asked the SRTS team, they revealed that many students walk either home or to their parents’ workplaces from St. Mary’s. As elsewhere, it is still the belief of the author that this mode shift from the family vehicle happens in most communities and schools because it is easy for parents to drive children to school as they are headed to work while in the afternoon parents are at work when students are dismissed and students can take their time getting home. Bike mode share for students does not vary between morning and afternoons because students will need to ride their bikes home if they wish to ride to school the next day.

When compared to the 2013 national SRTS combined walk and bike mode share numbers of 15.2 percent in the morning and 18.4 percent in the afternoon, the percentages of students walking and bicycling to and from Saint Mary’s Catholic School (six percent morning, 24 percent afternoon) are still below average, overall.
Parent estimate of distance from child’s home to school

Parents were asked to give the distance from their home to the school. This question is asked in a way so that parents likely estimate that distance. These results are shown in Table 23. This is recorded because what parents estimate will have an effect on their mode choice for their child. Often parents will overestimate that distance and drive their child to school when walking and/or biking is a viable, safe and timely alternative.

Table 23: Parent estimate of distance from the child's home to school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance between home and school</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don’t know or No response: 5
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
**Cross-reference – Distance, by arrival and departure modes**

These estimated distances are then cross-referenced with actual arrival and departure mode choice. (Tables 24 and 25)

**Table 24: Parent estimate of the distance from child’s home to school and mode choice to 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>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</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>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don’t know or No response: 7
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

**Table 25: Parent estimate of the distance from child’s home to school and mode choice 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>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</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>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</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.
Mode analysis within the Walk / Bike Zone, arrival and departure modes: Additional WCI analysis.

According to the MnDOT Walk / Bike Zone concept, one-half mile is considered an appropriate distance for students in grades PreK–5 to walk and/or bike to and from school. For grades 6-8, it is one mile. Since St. Mary’s School serves grades K – 8 and there is no way to parse the data depending on grade, it was decided for this analysis that all those living within a perceived one mile from the school would be considered to live within the appropriate Walk / Bike Zone for this school. Even when only those students living within one mile were selected, only 13 percent walk or bike to school in the morning but a sizeable 37 percent walked or biked home in the afternoon. The rest used motorized modes of travel to and from school from within one mile of the school.

Table 26: School arrival modes for students (raw numbers and percent) living within one mile of St. Mary’s School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than ¼ mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ mile up to ½ mile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>9 (90%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total within 1 mile</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>12 (80%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Walk / Bike within 1 mile</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Motorized Modes within 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (87%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Table 27: School departure modes for students (raw numbers and percent) living within one mile of St. Mary’s School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than ¼ mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ mile up to ½ mile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total within 1 mile</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6 (37%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>9 (47%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Walk / Bike within 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Motorized Modes within 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (63%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
What of the following issues affected your decision to allow, or not allow, your child to walk or bike to/from school?

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

As seen in the chart above, of the 28 respondents that answered this question and their child does not walk or bike to school, the three leading reasons to not allow a child to walk to school are all related to traffic safety with “weather or climate” and “distance.” Crime and even a potential lack of sidewalks were cited as a barrier by less than a third of the respondents.

![Figure 67: 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.](chart_image)
As seen in the chart above, of the three respondents that answered this question and their child does walk or bike to school, the leading reasons to allow a child to walk to school is “distance” followed by the “amount of traffic along route” and “weather or climate”.

Figure 68: 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.
STUDENT TRAVEL TALLY – SELECT QUESTIONS / KEY FINDINGS

For complete Student Travel Tally results, see Appendix B.

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

BRECKENRIDGE ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOLS

The student travel tally counts for both the elementary/middle School and high school were combined. This was because some of the middle school students travel to the high school for afternoon classes and their afternoon modes of travel may have been recorded there. Since this data could not be parsed, it was decided to combine the two schools together. Total enrollment between the two schools in September 2017 was 716.

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

Travel mode results from the student travel tally generally match up with the travel mode results from the parent survey. According to the tally as seen in Figure 69, the combined rate of walking and biking to school in the morning was 12 percent (eight percent walking, four percent biking). This combined rate increased to 13 percent in the afternoon (nine percent walking, four percent biking). 35 percent of the students rode the school bus in the morning and 36 percent in the afternoon. 49 percent of the students took the family vehicle to school in the morning and 42 percent in the afternoon. This mode shift towards the school bus, car pooling and a bit of walking in the afternoon is consistent with patterns seen at other schools. The switch to “other” modes in the afternoon is unusual and cannot be explained by the author as to what these “other” modes might be. The higher use of a family vehicle in the morning is, in all likelihood, due to the convenience of dropping off students while parents are headed to work.
Morning and Afternoon Travel Mode Comparison

SAINT MARY’S SCHOOL

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

Travel mode results from the student travel tally generally match up with the travel mode results from the parent survey. According to the tally as seen in Figure 70, the combined rate of walking and biking to school in the morning was five percent (two percent walking, three percent biking). This combined rate then increased to 17 percent in the afternoon (14 percent walking, three percent biking). 23 percent of the students rode the school bus in the morning and 27 percent in the afternoon. 69 percent of the students arrived at school in the family vehicle in the morning and 47 percent left in the afternoon. This mode shift towards the walking, the school bus and car pooling in the afternoon is consistent with patterns seen at other schools. The higher use of a family vehicle in the morning is in all likelihood due to the convenience of dropping off students while parents are headed to work.
DISCUSSION / COMPARISON

Travel mode results from the Breckenridge Elementary/Middle and High School combined student travel tally generally match up with the travel mode results from the parent survey from each school. There is a general shift away from the family vehicle towards the school bus, walking and some car pooling as has been seen by WCI staff at other schools in the west central region of Minnesota. Using parent survey data and looking only at those students who live within the appropriate Walk / Bike Zone (students who live close enough to school to walk and bike,) we see that just 17 percent of elementary/middle school students are walking/biking in the morning and increased to 20 percent in the afternoon. The high school Walk / Bike Zone numbers are even lower at just 13 percent morning and afternoon. Overall, results from both the parent surveys and student tallies are comparable and for the most part did not contradict one another.

Travel mode results from the St. Mary’s School student travel tallies match up nearly perfect with the travel mode results from the parent survey. Again, there is a general shift away from the family vehicle towards the school bus, car pooling and walking. However, nowhere has the staff at WCI seen such a massive spike in walking in the afternoon compared to the morning; three percent jumping up to 21 percent.
This jump required some inquiry and it was revealed that many students walk to either relatives or to their parents’ place of work in the afternoon. Using parent survey data and only looking at those students who live within the appropriate Walk / Bike Zone, we see that just 13 percent of St. Mary’s School students are walking / biking in the morning but that increased to an impressive 42 percent in the afternoon. Overall results from both the parent surveys and student tallies are comparable and did not contradict one another.

Unfortunately, walking and biking mode share for all of the schools in Breckenridge is below the national average. Only St. Mary’s goes above the national average but just for the afternoon mode count. This is disappointing when one considers that 76 percent of the elementary/middle school students, 70 percent of the high school students and 63 percent of St. Mary’s students live within Breckenridge city limits.

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

For a comprehensive set of recommendations, please see the “Action Plan” in the “Executive Summary, Significant Findings and Action Plan” at the beginning of this document.
CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSION

This Safe Routes to School (SRTS) plan is intended to guide the City of Breckenridge, the Breckenridge Independent School District #846 and Saint Mary’s Catholic School towards their collective goal of making it safer, more convenient and fun for students to walk and bicycle to and from school. Where it is already safe, encourage students to walk and bicycle to school. Where it is less than ideally safe, improve the existing conditions to make it as safe as practically possible with an eye towards walking and bicycling comfort. When children get exercise on their way to and from school, they:

- Arrive more alert and able to focus,
- Get a large portion of their recommended daily physical activity,
- Are more likely to be a healthy weight,
- Demonstrate improved test scores,
- Are less likely to suffer from anxiety, and
- Build healthy habits and practices they can bring with them into adulthood.

The SRTS recommendations in the Action Plan at the beginning of this document address the “5 Es” and recognizes the “6th E” of Equity, and were created to improve safety, reduce traffic congestion, encourage students to consider walking or bicycling, and instill an active lifestyle. The recommendations in this plan were formed based on expert analysis of the existing conditions around the school and in the community, direct observation, input from members of the community, MnDOT assembled crash and traffic data, and results from standardized parent surveys and student travel tallies. SRTS plans are the most successful when programs involve the entire community and when they are integrated into current and future policies. If, at any time, the City of Breckenridge, the Breckenridge Independent School District #846, and Saint Mary’s Catholic School have any questions of how to best enact the recommendations in this report, whether that be funding sources, best policies and practices, etc., they are encouraged to contact the staff at West Central Initiative and/or PartnerSHIP 4 Health.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: PARENT SURVEY RESULTS

BRECKENRIDGE ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE SCHOOL

Parent Survey Report: One School in One Data Collection Period

School Name: Breckenridge Elementary Public School
School Group: Breckenridge SRTS tallies & Parent survey data
School Enrollment: 0
% Range of Students Involved in SRTS: Don’t know
Number of Questionnaires Distributed: 0
Number of Questionnaires Analyzed: 116
Set ID: 15586
Month and Year Collected: December, 2016
Date Report Generated: 02/14/2017
Tags:

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 Centers for Safe Routes to School.
Sex of children for parents that provided information
Grade levels of children represented in survey

![Bar chart showing grade level distribution]

Grade levels of children represented in survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade in School</th>
<th>Responses per grade</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</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>32</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 5
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Trip</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

[Graphs showing mode of transportation for different distance categories]
## Typical mode of school arrival and departure by distance child lives from school

### School Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33%</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.

### School Departure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>17%</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 mile up to 1/2 mile</th>
<th>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</th>
<th>1 mile up to 2 miles</th>
<th>More than 2 miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 5
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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Child does not walk/bike to school</th>
<th>Child walks/bikes to school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Intersections and Crossings</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather or climate</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks or Pathways</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Guards</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of Driving</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults to Bike/Walk With</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence or Crime</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's Participation in After School Programs</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No response: 12

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

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

![Pie chart showing percentages of healthy, neutral, unhealthy, and very unhealthy opinions.]

### Comments Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1485761</td>
<td>Questions 13 should be &quot;not applicable&quot; as my kindergarten age child has neither walked nor biked to school. Thanks!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485767</td>
<td>In the spring and fall, my girls walk or ride bike. In the winter we drive them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486841</td>
<td>I work at the school, so it has been convenient for my children to ride to school with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488600</td>
<td>We drive our kids to school because they have to cross the highway to get on the bus in the morning. We have had cars not stop and blow by the bus going the opposite direction. No fault of our bus. On the way home, they are dropped off on the same side of the road as our home, so there is not the worry about crossing a busy highway with cars going 60. I think knowing the amount of distracted driving happening with cell phones is a big difference in my perception of safety for my kids on the roads. I know my kids know the correct way to look for traffic and cross, but I don't trust other cars to pay attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501333</td>
<td>I would let my child walk or bike to school if traffic would stop or recognize pedestrians. Breckenridge is horrible at yielding. I am an avid walker. My child would have to cross Highway 75 and that's the worst spot for a crossing as a pedestrian. This spot is rarely monitored by police and even then, nothing is done for failing to yield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501335</td>
<td>I feel for the bus drivers. The disrespect and unruly behavior is 100 times worse that it was 10 years ago. I feel the bus drivers deserve more support and assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504405</td>
<td>Some of the houses across from the school do not shovel their sidewalks, particularly the one on the corner of 8th and Beede, also, a lot of bad activity happens in the houses on that block unfortunately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504533</td>
<td>The distance to school, distracted drivers and the main road that has to be crossed to get to school are all factors that prevent me from allowing my children to walk or bike to school on their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485295</td>
<td>My concern is the Fifth street/Highway 75 crossing from the west side of the road to the east on the bike/walk path. Traffic is either accelerating to get out of town northbound or still maintaining a high speed coming in to town southbound. A stoplight for pedestrians or a tunnel would remedy this situation. I am an avid walker and I have seen people in the crosswalk get honked at and nearly run down or people just don't stop. My son would walk or ride his bike to school with friends but the traffic is difficult for kids to navigate as they have difficulty estimating the distance of vehicles and they simply are moving too fast. This is a longstanding concern of mine and I have voiced it many times. Thank you!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485313</td>
<td>I do wish there was some sort of crossing alert on 5th street however, as I have witnessed some children, primarily younger that have crossed when they should not have. If even a sign that makes people slow down to 10mph for a couple block area so that all kids crossed in the same area. This is instituted in towns I have lived before with a police officer sitting in their car, occasionally to make sure people comply. Also in the state of Texas, it does carry quite a fine and it works really, really well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485806</td>
<td>We live out of town about 20 miles so it is not an option for my kids to bike or walk to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486954</td>
<td>We bike to/from school with our kids as often as we are able. I would not be comfortable letting them go alone anytime soon as we have to cross the highway and it is rare for people to stop and let us cross. If this could be fixed it would help a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501328</td>
<td>My son has a disability, so because of this I would not allow him to walk alone at any age. However, my children that do not have disabilities, maybe jr high? 7-8th grade I would maybe allow this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501330</td>
<td>My issue has always been the crossing of the bike path at Highway 75/5th street. Traffic from the south is speeding up to head up out of town, and traffic approaching from the north is still going 40 mph and won't stop for pedestrians waiting to cross. A pedestrian activated signal would be helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501332</td>
<td>We live in a small town 30 miles from the school. So bike and walking are not an option for my boys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501438</td>
<td>We would love to see more children riding bike to school if it were safer for them and better routes to take for children of all ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504396</td>
<td>11th St. North is a major concern for most people. We have many kids that head towards the high school for activities after school and that is a very dangerous area to cross.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504399</td>
<td>We live in Kent and my son buses to daycare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504400</td>
<td>Being closer to the high school my son needs to cross many streets that are traveled by teen drivers who are not always prepared for young walker/bikers. Also the main street that concerns me is 11th street that is traveled by many semis, beat trucks and other vehicles with no crossing guard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504403</td>
<td>Some of the houses across from the school do not shovel their sidewalks, particularly the one on the corner of 8th and Beede, also, a lot of bad activity happens in the houses on that block unfortunately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504408</td>
<td>With all the traffic and no crossing guards, it is extremely unsafe for kids walking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504409</td>
<td>The crossing of the bike path at 5th street/highway 75 is not safe. I would like to see a crossing signal that would stop traffic, such as a red light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504724</td>
<td>Have a person to help the children cross the intersection near the school will help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486176</td>
<td>I won't let my kids walk alone; however, when they are both mature enough I will let them walk together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488486</td>
<td>Right now it's easier for me to drive because I have a young baby under 1 years old, meaning she's not quite old enough to endure inclement or cold weather. It might be ideal to implement speed bumps within a half block radius of the school to discourage speeding. I've been astonished at the rates some vehicles blow by at, without yielding to sidewalk crossings even if no traffic is present. Flashing road crossing signs and a stronger police presence while reminding citizens their duty of obeying traffic laws within a school zone is crucial would also be helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501338</td>
<td>We live in the country, so I feel that this survey doesn't really apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485343</td>
<td>I have and will allow my 6th grader to walk with friends between High School and middle school on occasion; but would prefer he didn't do it at this age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485745</td>
<td>little to no security for the bikes that are ridden to school. My child has had a bike stolen from school grounds...that is also a concern that I have. I cannot afford to buy bikes every time they are stolen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485907</td>
<td>It would be EXTREMELY nice if we had sidewalks on ALL streets on BOTH sides. The sidewalks are very sporadic in our town which forces kids to walk on the street now and then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486169</td>
<td>We promote healthy lifestyles, but it is difficult with the safety concerns. Lot's of traffic from the high school and crossing the busy 11th St. &amp; Beede Ave. intersection can make it dangerous at times.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parent Survey Report: One School in One Data Collection Period

School Name: Breckenridge Public High School
School Group: Breckenridge SRTS tallies/Parent survey data
School Enrollment: 0
% Range of Students Involved in SRTS: Don't Know
Number of Questionnaires Distributed: 0

Set ID: 15584
Month and Year Collected: 12/2016
Date Report Generated: 02/14/2017
Tags: 
Number of Questionnaires Analyzed for Report: 40

This report contains information from your school's classrooms about students' trip to and from school. The data used in this report were collected using the in-class Student Travel Tally questionnaire from the National Centers for Safe Routes to School.
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>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</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>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don’t know or No response: 2
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Trip</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Response Morning: 3
No Response Afternoon: 3
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Typical mode of school arrival and departure by distance child lives from school

- For trips < 1/4 mile:
  - Walk: 40%
  - Carpool: 40%
  - Other: 10%

- For trips 1/4 to 1/2 mile:
  - Walk: 40%
  - Carpool: 40%
  - Other: 10%

- For trips 1 to 2 miles:
  - Car: 90%

- For trips > 2 miles:
  - Walk: 20%
  - Carpool: 30%
  - Other: 10%
Typical mode of school arrival and departure by distance child lives from school

### School Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 3
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

### School Departure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 3
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 mile up to 1/2 mile</th>
<th>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</th>
<th>1 mile up to 2 miles</th>
<th>More than 2 miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>92%</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 allow a child to walk or bike to/from school by parents of children who already walk or bike to/from school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Child does not walk/bike to school</th>
<th>Child walks/bikes to school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Intersections and Crossings</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather or climate</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks or Pathways</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of Driving</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's Participation in After School Programs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Guards</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence or Crime</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults to Bike/Walk With</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Respondents per Category</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No response: 11
Note:
--Factors are listed from most to least influential for the 'Child does not walk/bike to school' group.
--Each column may sum to > 100% because respondent could select more than issue
--The calculation used to determine the percentage for each issue is based on the 'Number of Respondents per Category' within the respective columns (Child does not walk/bike to school and Child walks/bikes to school.) If comparing percentages between the two columns, please pay particular attention to each column's number of respondents because the two numbers can differ dramatically.
Parents’ opinions about how much their child’s school encourages or discourages walking and biking to/from school

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

- 62, Very Healthy
- 29, Healthy
- 6, Neutral
- 0, Unhealthy
- 3, Very Unhealthy
### Comments Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1501334</td>
<td>If the children didn't need to cross Highway 75, they would probably walk, bike or roller blade more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486278</td>
<td>If our school had a safe route to school it would be easier to allow my children to ride bike or walk. Once they leave the immediate area of the school there are not paths until they cross Hwy. 75.5th street and that is too dangerous for my child to cross alone. If there was a light there I would feel safer allowing them to go that direction - as the bike path on the other side (west) of the road there is nice for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489247</td>
<td>Since our children ride the bus to school, I am more worried about them leaving school grounds once they arrive. At least one of our children has admitted to doing so. How is this occurrence monitored?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488563</td>
<td>My child is a senior and drives to school, so some of these questions don't really apply to our family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488505</td>
<td>We live in the country so it's probably not a helpful survey response - but IF we lived close enough I'd love my kids to walk or bike to school!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504461</td>
<td>Rides bus usually but when weather is nice likes to ride bike. Rides bike to and from sports practice in spring/summer. Plans route to avoid busy intersections and high traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501358</td>
<td>This survey is irrelevant to my child/children we live 20+ miles from the schools. Walking or biking would be impossible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488538</td>
<td>We have no cross guards on our busy street corners, with 2-3 very busy intersections, as the high school is just a few blocks away. The circle drive at the Elementary/Middle School is terrible, parents do not pay attention to the children getting off the bus that have to walk through the circle drive to get to the front steps to enter the school. They park right in front of door, I have been almost hit 4 times last year, and twice already this year so far! One being just the other day when parent dropping child off and was not looking at all, and a group of K-2 students behind me that had just gotten off the bus. Very unsafe for children and staff walking in! As far as pick up after school, the street to the west is a cluster, people double parked, kids running across the street out in front of traffic, just waiting for someone to get hit in circle drive or west door. We need to find a better solution to drop off and pick up for safety of everyone!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BRECKENRIDGE SAINT MARY’S SCHOOL**

Parent Survey Report: One School in One Data Collection Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Breckenridge St Mary's School</th>
<th>Set ID: 15587</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Group</td>
<td>Breckenridge SRTS tallies &amp; Parent survey data</td>
<td>Month and Year Collected: December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Enrollment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Date Report Generated: 02/14/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Range of Students Involved in SRTS</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>Tags: SRTS Planning Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Questionnaires Distributed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Number of Questionnaires Analyzed: 40</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 Centers for Safe Routes to School.

Sex of children for parents that provided information

![Sex of children chart](image)
Grade levels of children represented in survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade in School</th>
<th>Responses per grade</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</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>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23%</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

![Bar chart showing typical mode of arrival at and departure from school](chart.png)
## Typical mode of arrival at and departure from school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Trip</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Response Morning: 6
No Response Afternoon: 1
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Typical mode of school arrival and departure by distance child lives from school.
Typical mode of school arrival and departure by distance child lives from school

**School Arrival**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</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>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know or No response: 7
Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

**School Departure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number within Distance</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</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>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</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.

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 mile up to 1/2 mile</th>
<th>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</th>
<th>1 mile up to 2 miles</th>
<th>More than 2 miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Child does not walk/bike to school</th>
<th>Child walks/bikes to school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Intersections and Crossings</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather or climate</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of Traffic Along Route</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Participation in After School Programs</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks or Pathways</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults to Bike/Walk With</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of Driving</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence or Crime</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Guards</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No response: 9

Note:
--Factors are listed from most to least influential for the 'Child does not walk/bike to school' group.
--Each column may sum to > 100% because respondent could select more than issue.

--The calculation used to determine the percentage for each issue is based on the 'Number of Respondents per Category' within the respective columns (Child does not walk/bike to school and Child walks/bikes to school.) If comparing percentages between the two columns, please pay particular attention to each column’s number of respondents because the two numbers can differ dramatically.
Parents’ opinions about how much their child’s school encourages or discourages walking and biking to/from school

- 42% Encourages
- 13% Strongly Encourages
- 13% Neutral
- 0% Strongly Discourage
- 45% Discourages

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

- 61% Fun
- 8% Very Fun
- 0% Very Boring
- 0% Boring
- 31% Neutral
Parents' opinions about how healthy walking and biking to/from school is for their child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1509234</td>
<td>I allow my children to walk or bike as long as they have a partner/buddy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509225</td>
<td>Children walk to parent’s office after school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509232</td>
<td>We live in a small town outside of Breckenridge so walking/biking isn’t an option (10 miles) to school. However, they have activities after school and also would like to go to library after school but I’m not comfortable with them crossing Highway 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509258</td>
<td>I bring my kids to my work office and they walk to school from there. It is approximately 5 blocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509220</td>
<td>I do not allow my child(ren) to walk because of the potential for them to be hurt by untrustworthy people/strangers/etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509237</td>
<td>Based on the location of where we live walking/biking to school is not an option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509265</td>
<td>We live in country, but have brought bikes to town to ride several blocks away from school and then leave in town at families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509239</td>
<td>I think encouraging a lot of kids to the street in our town is not a good idea. During warm months here is harvest or planting season. Going to school is the busiest time...[the rest of the comment is not legible.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BRECKENRIDGE K-12 COMBINED

Student Travel Tally Report: One School in One Data Collection Period

**School Name:** Breckenridge Public Schools  
**School Group:** Breckenridge SRTS tallies & Parent survey data  
**School Enrollment:** 480  
**% of Students reached by SRTS activities:** Don't Know  
**Number of Classrooms Included in Report:** 33  

**Set ID:** 15888  
**Month and Year Collected:** 09/2016  
**Date Report Generated:** 10/17/2016  
**Tags:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

![Graphs showing morning and afternoon travel modes for different days.]

<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>540</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday PM</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday AM</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday PM</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday AM</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday PM</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather Condition</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunny</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</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.
### Student Travel Tally Report: One School in One Data Collection Period

**School Name:** Breckenridge St Mary's School  
**Set ID:** 21621

**School Group:** Breckenridge SRTS tallies & parent survey data  
**Month and Year Collected:** 09/2016

**School Enrollment:** 150  
**Date Report Generated:** 10/25/2016

**% of Students reached by SRTS activities:** Don't Know  
**Tags:**

**Number of Classrooms Included in Report:** 9

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

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Morning and Afternoon Travel Mode Comparison by Day

Morning and Afternoon Travel Mode Comparison

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather Condition</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunny</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
## Parent Survey: English – Page 1

### Parent Survey About Walking and Biking to School

Dear Parent or Caregiver,

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

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

Thank you for participating in this survey!

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

   and

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

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

   **Arrive at school**
   - Walk  
   - Bike  
   - School Bus  
   - Family vehicle (only children in your family)  
   - Carpool (Children from other families)  
   - Transit (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? □ Yes □ No

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

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

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

   My child already walks or bikes to/from school

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

   □ My child already walks or bikes to/from school

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

16. Please provide any additional comments below.
**Encuesta sobre ir caminando o andando en bicicleta a la escuela**

**- PARA PADRES -**

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

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

¡Gracias por participar en esta encuesta!

**LETRA MAYÚSCULA SOLAMENTE USE TINTA AZUL O NEGRA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre de la Escuela:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   **Tiempo del recorrido para llegar a casa**
   - Menos de 5 minutos  
   - 5 a 10 minutos  
   - 11 a 20 minutos  
   - Más de 20 minutos  
   - No lo sé / No estoy seguro/a
8. ¿En el último año, le ha pedido permiso su hijo para caminar o andar en bicicleta hacia o desde la escuela?
   ☐ Sí  ☐ No

9. ¿En qué grado permitiría que su hijo camine o ande en bicicleta solo/a de la escuela?
   (seleccione un grado entre PK, K, 1, 2, 3, ...)
   ☐ grado  ☐ No me sentiría cómodo/a en ningún grado

10. ¿Cuáles de las siguientes situaciones afectaron su decisión de permitir, o no permitir, que su niño camine o ande en bicicleta hacia o desde la escuela? (marque todas las que correspondan)

   ☐ Distancia
   ☐ Conveniencia de manejar
   ☐ Tiempo
   ☐ Actividades antes o después de la escuela
   ☐ Velocidad del tránsito en la ruta
   ☐ Cantidad de tránsito en la ruta
   ☐ Adultos que acompañen a su niño
   ☐ Aceras o caminos
   ☐ Seguridad de las intersecciones y cruces
   ☐ Guardias de cruce peatonal
   ☐ Violencia o crimen
   ☐ Tiempo o clima

   ☐ Mi hijo/a ya viaja a pie o en bicicleta a/desde la escuela
   ☐ Sí  ☐ No  ☐ No estoy seguro/a

11. ¿Probablemente dejaría que su hijo caminara o usara la bicicleta para ir a / regresar de la escuela si este problema cambiara o mejorara?
   (elija una respuesta por línea)

12. En su opinión, ¿cuánto apoyo provee la escuela de su hijo a caminar y usar la bicicleta para ir o regresar de la escuela?
   ☐ Anima Fuertemente  ☐ Anima  ☐ Ni uno ni otro  ☐ Desalienta  ☐ Desalienta Fuertemente

13. ¿Qué tan DIVERTIDO es caminar o andar en bicicleta hacia o desde la escuela para su niño?
   ☐ Muy Divertido  ☐ Divertido  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Aburrido  ☐ Muy Aburrido

14. ¿Qué tan SANO es caminar o andar en bicicleta hacia o desde la escuela para su niño?
   ☐ Muy Sano  ☐ Sano  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Malsano  ☐ Muy Malsano

15. ¿Cuál es el grado o el año más alto de educación que usted terminó?
   ☐ Grados 1 a 8 (Escuela primaria)
   ☐ Grados 9 a 11 (alguna High School/secundaria)
   ☐ Grado 12 o GED (graduado High School/secundaria)
   ☐ Universidad 1 a 3 años (alguna universidad o escuela técnica)
   ☐ Universidad 4 años o más (graduado de la universidad)
   ☐ Prefiero no contestar

16. Por favor proporcione comentarios adicionales:

A high-quality and text readable original version of this document can be found at:
http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/sites/default/files/resources/Parent_Survey_Spanish.pdf
### Safe Routes to School Students Arrival and Departure Tally Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Letters Only – Blue or Black Ink Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Grade: (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
- Monday’s Date (Week count was conducted)
- Number of Students Enrolled in Class:
- 02/22/2023
- 02 22 2023
- 15

- 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather Condition</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>S = Sunny</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R = Rainy</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O = Overcast</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN = Snow</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample AM:**
- S
- 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:**
- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...

#### 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.

- Only with Children from your family
- Riding with children from other families
- City bus, subway, etc.
- Skateboard, scooter, etc.

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

---

A high-quality and text readable original version of this document can be found at:

Promoting Health in Minnesota Schools:
SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

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

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

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

A school’s SRTS programs may include:
- Walking and/or biking maps.
- Consolidated bus pick-up points.
- Remote pick-up and drop-off locations.
- Bike and pedestrian curriculum.
- Walking school bus.
- Safe Routes to School Day.
- Designated team of stakeholders.
- Bicycle parking.
- Hand tallies to assess usage of various modes of student transportation.
- Hazard or zero-mile busing to transport children past areas unsafe for walking or biking.
Safe Routes to School policies and programs are often designed to remove barriers that may prevent children from walking or biking to and from school, including:

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

Why is Safe Routes to School important?

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

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

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

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

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

No, not specifically.

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

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

- 707 (Transportation of Public School Students)
- 708 (Transportation of Nonpublic School Students)
- 709 (Student Transportation Safety Policy & Notification Forms)
- 710 (Extracurricular Transportation)
How can Minnesota schools incorporate Safe Routes to School into a school wellness policy?
The following language can be incorporated into a school board policy that follows the MSBA’s model. This language can also be individually tailored to fit into a school board policy that does not follow the MSBA model policy.

Addition to the MSBA School Wellness Policy

533. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL POLICY

I. PURPOSE

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

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

II. GUIDELINES

A. General

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. Biking

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

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

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

C. Walking

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Public Health Law Center
  - School Zone Speed Limits in Minnesota, [link](http://publichealthlawcenter.org/sites/default/files/resources/ship-sf-ww-schoolzonespeedlimit-2010.pdf)
  - Waivers and Releases, [link](http://publichealthlawcenter.org/sites/default/files/resources/ship-sf-WaiversReleases-2011.pdf)
  - Liability for Volunteers in the Walking School Bus Program, [link](http://publichealthlawcenter.org/sites/default/files/resources/ship-sf-wsb-schoolbus-2010-0.pdf)
  - Liability Concerns in Minnesota: Recreational Maps, [link](http://publichealthlawcenter.org/sites/default/files/resources/ship-sf-communitymappingliability-2010-0.pdf)
Minnesota Department of Transportation, Safe Routes to School Program, [Link]

Minnesota Department of Health, Safe Routes to School Program, [Link]

National Center for Safe Routes to School
- Walkability Checklist, [Link]
- Personal Security and Safe Routes to School, [Link]
- Plan the Event, [Link]

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Walk-to-School Programs, [Link]

Michigan Department of Transportation, Effectively Planning and Implementing Safe Routes to School for Students with Disabilities, [Link]

Last updated June 2013.

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

**EDUCATION**

**Safety Education**

Our school requires a comprehensive education curriculum with a focus on traffic safety education and active transportation skills. The curriculum shall include:

- Implementing the Minnesota Walk! Bike! Fun! Pedestrian and Bicycle Curriculum for all students age 5-13
- Conducting pedestrian safety workshops for all students in grades K-2nd
- Hosting bicycle skills and safety workshops for all students in 5th grade
- Holding 'How to use public transit' classes in 6th grade
- Promoting safe-driving skills to 10th graders, with an emphasis on avoiding injuries to pedestrian and bicyclists

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

---
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**EVALUATION**

**Beginner**

*Establishing a School Team*

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

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

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

*Data Collection*

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

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

### Beginner

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

**Safe Routes to School Events**
We shall promote at least two active transportation events per school year. Events will promote active, healthy lifestyles for the community and may include Walk to School Days, Bike to School Days, and School Walk-a-Thons.

### Intermediate

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

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

### Advanced

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

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

---
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## ENFORCEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law Enforcement Partnership</th>
<th>Crossing Guards</th>
<th>No Idling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On an annual basis, our school provide our SRTS Plan and policies to our local public safety and police departments. Our school shall partner with these agencies to ensure that they 1) understand the details of this policy, 2) provide rigorous traffic safety enforcement in the vicinity of schools, and 3) understand the rights and responsibilities of those engaging in active transportation.</td>
<td>Our school, in partnership with the administrator of the crossing guard program, shall work together to implement an effective process for hiring, funding, training, locating, supervising, and properly equipping crossing guards. If the number of crossing guards at our school is insufficient, we shall, in partnership with the crossing guard agency, seek additional funding or resources to increase the number of crossing guards.</td>
<td>Our school acknowledges that motor vehicles idling on or near campus increase air pollution, negatively affecting the health of everyone in the vicinity of the school. Accordingly, our school prohibits all motor vehicles from idling on campus. “No Idling” signs shall be posted on campus to alert drivers of this policy. In extreme weather, bus drivers will be allowed to wait in a temperature-controlled room until students are dismissed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEGINNER</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessing Routes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bike Parking</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Travel Plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our school will perform an annual walk audit to 1) assess traffic and safety conditions in the vicinity of the school, 2) identify safety conditions needing mitigation, and, based on those assessments, 3) begin to identify recommended active transportation routes to school. Findings will be shared with the appropriate entities to mitigate concerns and hazards. Maps will be produced that 1) identify the hazards or travel conditions needing mitigation, and 2) show recommended routes from surrounding neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Our school shall provide sufficient storage facilities for bicycles, scooters, skateboards, or similar devices to encourage active transportation. The quantity of storage facilities will increase in proportion to demand, and we will seek input from active transportation advocates to ensure that the quality and quantity of facilities is satisfactory. To ensure convenience and protection from theft or vandalism, storage facilities shall be located in visible areas, near school entrances, and when deemed appropriate, in locked facilities. All storage facilities shall provide protection from the elements. Our school will also provide repair tools such as air pumps and other common tools to help students repair minor equipment failures.</td>
<td>Our school will adopt a School Travel Plan that addresses all modes of active transportation and related safety, access, and parking issues. The plans shall also include goals, strategies, and objectives for increasing active transportation among students and staff, including those with disabilities. At a minimum, the School Travel Plan shall contain a map identifying the school, streets surrounding the school, existing traffic controls, established pedestrian and bicycle routes, pedestrian crossings, school and municipal bus routes and bus stops, with the goal of minimizing risk of injury and maximizing safety and convenience for active transportation. School travel plans shall be updated regularly with input from various stakeholders and should seek opportunities to incorporate the Travel Plan into local municipalities’ comprehensive plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Engineering Success:

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

### Local Engineering Success:

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

### Resources:
- [http://saferoutesinfo.org/program-tools/find-state-contacts/minnesota](http://saferoutesinfo.org/program-tools/find-state-contacts/minnesota)
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