

Safe Routes to School National Partnership Annual Meeting
Meeting Notes
October 24, 2005
Washington, DC

Executive Summary

On October 24, 2005, approximately 50 leaders representing more than 40 organizations and agencies met in Washington, DC, to discuss Safe Routes to School and how the new federal program will be implemented now that \$612 million is available over the next four years through SAFETEA-LU.

Representatives from federal agencies including the Federal Highway Administration, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, and National Park Service attended the meeting, as did a few state Department of Transportation representatives, consultant groups, professional service organizations, and non-profits representing pedestrian, bicycle, health, school and smart growth organizations.

The meeting provided an opportunity to discuss the implementation of Safe Routes to School including state funding for infrastructure and non-infrastructure activities, the clearinghouse, and the task force. The group discussed in detail the Partnership's draft Guiding Principles for Safe Routes to School, which were revised based on input from this meeting. Meeting participants also discussed long term goals for the Safe Routes to School movement and the Partnership, as well as communication strategies.

While this was the first annual meeting of the Safe Routes to School National Partnership, it represented the third meeting of this kind. Meetings were held in June of 2003 and June of 2004 to plan for the Safe Routes to School legislation and the formation of this Partnership.

Attending: Please see the list of participants at the end of this document.

Welcome and opening remarks by Tim Blumenthal

Introductions for Participants
Agenda Review

Partnership Presentation on Safe Routes to School

How we got to this point, by Andy Clarke
Where we are now and Partnership Goals, PowerPoint presentation by Deb Hubsmith, available for review at:
<http://bikesbelong.org/site/page.cfm?PageID=274>

Presentation by Tim Arnade, Safe Routes to School Program Manager, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

FHWA and Safe Routes to School

This program is a great complement/addition to what FHWA is already doing, not a replacement. It's a cross-cutting, collaborative program—not just a safety program.

What's Been Done So Far:

- Got a memo out to the field asking the States to take action and bring on their Safe Routes to School coordinators by December 31, 2005.
- Launched a website with FAQs
- Done some outreach in Washington, DC, with stakeholder groups
- Working on Guidance to states now

The Dollars:

- On August 10, the President signed the bill, designating \$612 million for Safe Routes to School through fiscal year '09.
- On September 1, 2005, the '05 fiscal year money went out (\$1 million per state in Contract Authority).
- On Oct 1, 2005, the '06 fiscal year money went out (\$97 million in Contract Authority to the States).

This program does not come with its own obligation limitation and is subject to the overall Federal-aid obligation limitation. FHWA allocates obligation limitation to each State DOT as one sum. Within the overall limitation, each state has flexibility to choose how to use funds among various highway programs. So, SR2S is part of a pool, competing for obligation limitation within the core Federal Highway Program (STP, Bridge, CMAQ, etc). Since '05 funding was distributed during the last weeks of the fiscal year (too late for states to obligate these new dollars), and for '06, we have only partial year funding (we're on a 49 day continuing resolution since Congress has not passed our annual appropriations act), states aren't likely to spend their SR2S funding right now until Congress passes our full-year appropriation.

AASHTO:

Things have been confused because the bill was signed so late. While there's hope that there will be an omnibus bill and a move forward, it's not clear if that will happen. The amount between the Contract Authority and the Obligation Limitation is called a "lop off" or "hair cut."

The real issue here is how to work with the states to get their coordinators in place and move their programs forward. View this as seed money and leverage for future programming. Don't focus on the dollars at this point; get the planning and programming in place.

Contract Authority money has a four-year lifespan. States don't tend to let that money lapse, as it doesn't look good in a budget. No-year money, however, doesn't ever lapse, which can be problematic, as states may not rush to spend it. The Safe Routes to School funds are "no year" funds.

Q & A (All answers are given by Tim Arnade of FHWA, unless otherwise specified.)

Q: We're ready now! What should we do?

A: There's such a need for guidance, that it may be good that the money isn't ready right away. States that are ready now should be able to keep within the bounds of legislation and keep the ball rolling.

Q: Philosophically, how do you feel about this program?

A: The first car I ever bought in Washington, DC, was to bike—to get to weekend rides that started out of town. Also, I was an amateur bike racer for 7 years. When living in DC for eight years, I walked to work, to grad school. The biggest adjustment I have living in the 'burbs is that it's car-focused. My wife is a walking enthusiast. But I think the challengers are bigger than infrastructure, encouragement and enabling. Societal challenges need to happen too. People are busy, time is precious, and often, two parents are working. Charter schools and magnet schools

have upset the balance of walking and biking. We need to take where we are today and make the best of it.

Q: We get so bogged down in detail, oversight, and structure, that we don't have quality programs. And states that don't have programs in place could easily use their money to develop pet projects like sidewalks, etc, that aren't strictly related to schools. How do we combat this?

A: We're going to have to be vigilant. There's no penalty for NOT hiring a coordinator or NOT using this money—but we need to be vigilant. Keep things positive. There are worst-case scenarios, but let's not focus on them.

Comment: As a national organization that represents DOTs, we're pleased to be on this partnership. But the key issue is how do we form the partnership between DOTs, so peer-to-peer sharing and support encourages the states to build great programs? With successful programs, the states can use Safe Routes money to leverage enhancements money, etc.

Comment: Those of us who are actually on the ground, running these programs, are excited about the movement, excited that Tim Arnade is behind this. At the same time, local and state advocates are really concerned about the money on a grassroots level, to be sure the money, however small, is spent on these important programs that we're building.

Q: What areas of the bill are less specific—that FHWA might focus on for guidance?

A: We'll write guidance on the whole thing. We're sitting down with attorneys to be sure that the meaning is completely clear (comma placement is key; the issue of matching needs to be clearly stated; we want language for leveraging; the "shalls" need to be addressed).

Q: State SR2S Coordinators—will they last after the initial funding runs out?

A: (Tim A) I can't promise that coordinators will be a part of a State DOT after the funding expires.

Principles for Desired Outcomes

Presented by Bill Wilkinson, Executive Director of the National Center for Bicycling and Walking

Issues We Struggle With:

We all must recognize that this program is about changing priorities. It's not business as usual. Advocacy is all about change. There's inherent resistance to change; this program may not be welcomed with open arms.

Outcomes:

We're defining our expectations. Highest Purpose: This is a bicycling and walking program. Safe Routes is a mode-shift program, not a safety program. However, one of the primary objectives of SR2S is safety. We've got to ensure, assure, and be assured that walking and biking to school is *safe*. It's not teaching kids how to cross the street. The biggest threat to our kid's safety is motor vehicles, and more, their operators. We need to change the way motor vehicles are operated. The Highway Safety Improvement Program is a \$5 billion program—and their guidance is already on

their website. They're up and running. We're playing catch-up. If we don't end up with more kids bicycling and walking, we haven't achieved anything.

Funding:

We need to go to our state DOTs and urge them to put the \$1 million in play *now*. Commit funds now to fully fund this program right up to Contract Authority. Utilize existing and additional resources now, and make that an expectation.

Leveraging:

The law is specific—we can leverage funds associated with the Highway Safety Improvement Program (Section 1401) Thirteen percent of 5 billion is \$650 million. We should plan to work with states to get them to spend that much. We should use the Safe Routes to School program to leverage other funds to reach our goal.

Comments from meeting participants

- There's no such thing as absolutely safe, so we need to be very careful about our language on that. Kids who have already made the shift, or have always walked and biked to school, need to be highlighted as heroes.
- The states may have a problem with the idea that the primary purpose of this is mode-share.

Tim Arnade: I'd encourage you as you're doing this not to pit one goal against the other. We're talking children, and a program that is titled SAFE routes to school. It's housed in the safety part of the bill. Every secretary of transportation, regardless of party, places safety at the top of their priority list. The US DOT's top priority is safety, not mode-share. So it would be in our best interest to bill this as a safety program.

- We need to help those communities that have success already continue to build on their success. While safety is a huge portion of this, the bigger picture is the risks associated with NOT walking and biking. Health problems, inactivity-related diseases. Leveraging community funding and participation is key, but it's great that there isn't a match, as the low-income communities can't swing it.
- We need to be careful. This could become a program for rich, suburban communities. Safety issues will drive the program in some areas and mode-share will be the boon for others—both are great.
- The solution for low-income places is to be sure to include safety and encouragement in the plan, so that kids who are *already* walking and biking are able to do it in a safer manner.
- Everyone at the state and local level should be informed, so they use the resources wisely AND so we don't inadvertently make decisions that could cause harm. Suggesting mode-

shift is a huge responsibility. We need to level the playing field. We need to be sure to help the “communities of disparities.”

- Schools that are eliminating bussing are prime candidates for Safe Routes, but we *can't* bill it as a money-saving program, or kids will be walking and biking on unsafe routes.
- Are parks and recreation centers eligible for safe routes funding? The program is called Safe Routes TO school, but FROM school is important, too. A significant percentage of kids go to rec centers and parks for sports, etc, so Parks & Rec. should be involved in the program.
- It is important to build coalitions, particularly with the health community. Evaluation needs to be based across the board, not on a single metric.
- An important basis for this program is listening to the kids and their parents. Their feedback should be the basis for what we're doing.

Principles for Mechanics of SR2S Programs

Presented by Andy Clarke, Executive Director of the League of American Bicyclists

- Safety and mode-share don't need to be competing goals.
- We don't want SR2S Programs to take away from existing programs or existing bike/ped coordinators.
- The good states will help the less-enthusiastic states move along.

Mechanics:

- We need to make sure this program is flexible and easy to implement while also insuring that the standards, products, and outcomes are good.
- We need to maintain a multi-disciplinary approach, so that diverse partners are part of the planning process. We need to promote accountability.

Specifics in the document:

- The Statewide Plan will help determine the boundaries and implementation.
- The Advisory Committee is key, so diverse partners help guide the program at the state level.
- Safe Routes coordinators need to be skilled at collaboration.
- This should be a grant program rather than a reimbursement program.
- It's key to make sure small programs can be funded as well as large ones; multi-year programs will insure long-term success.

Comments from meeting participants on Statewide Plans

- Is a structured plan a mandate? It may be beyond what the states may be able to establish. Instead, the focus could be on training and sharing best practices peer to peer.

- Getting out of the gates quickly is key. The most important planning that should be done in this program is on the local level in schools. Maybe a statewide “idea,” but not a written plan.

Tim Arnade: I’m concerned about the “statewide plan” because, federally, we can’t enforce it. It gives states reasons not to move forward. Requiring a plan will cause a lot of resistance. It’s self-defeating.

- State DOTs are not interested in having to do another statewide plan. They may be more interested in developing guidelines under which schools will produce plans for their specific needs, as they’re all quite different in demographics. They need as much flexibility as possible to develop the plans they need to improve safety. The DOT can move physical obstacles, and the schools themselves can help remove the social obstacles. We’d like to get them the money as quickly as possible.
- If there’s an obligation for highways to include statewide plans, why can’t we include safe routes provisions as part of those plans?
- Safe Routes programs are so unique in every community, that we need flexibility—especially in terms of non-infrastructure funds—to implement them. It would be good, however, if infrastructure programs had guidelines to ensure that they have a solid Safe Routes plan in place before they start building.
- Safe Routes is an opportunity to give back to communities that often don’t get funding or a return on highway dollars. We need to do something that means something over time. State plans are realistic; states own many of the roads to begin with.
- Multi-year funding is key. One year is not enough to make these programs stick in most schools. Is there a way to provide three-year funding for non-infrastructure funding?

Partnership Consensus: It’s important to make it easy for states to do the right thing.

Principles for Planning and Evaluation of SR2S Programs

Presentation by Scott Bricker, Policy Director of the Bicycle Transportation Alliance in Oregon

Local School Transportation Plan/Program

Key Question: How do we best use our limited resources?

There are very few places that make accommodations for *youth* to use alternative transportation. Discussions with the community are key to success; we need their help to develop the most effective transportation programs. Oregon law mandates schools and cities to do this together.

Safety

There are a variety of ways to increase safety. When you get kids biking and walking to school by facilitating it with adults and community involvement, it increases overall community safety.

Three miles of sidewalk won't make kids that much safer, but 200 walking school busses will greatly increase safety.

It's key to measure people's sense of safety before and after the program has been implemented.

Programs, not Plans

Programs include the full five elements for Safe Routes to School—evaluation, education, encouragement, engineering, and enforcement. It would be ideal for communities to have Safe Routes to School Programs for the 5 Es in place before funding is provided. Should/can this be required? How should that work?

Comments and Q&A on requiring school transportation plans/programs and implementing Safe Routes to School programs

- Parents want a formal way of increasing safety. A formal plan may be an impediment to the schools, however.
- Given all the demands on schools, we pitch Safe Routes so that it doesn't impact the workload of teachers or students in a negative way. We highlight the health benefits and "kids being ready to learn" benefits. Q: How are others collecting data to measure their success?
- We work with a menu of options, so some schools get only the planning and evaluation portion, and other places with more funding get encouragement as well. By not requiring Safe Routes to be one bundle, we can take schools where they are and hope that they'll want more as they learn more and experience the program.
- Many communities are not aware of the opportunities. We need to put this information in the minority papers.
- What does "program" mean? School districts may have their own transportation plans regarding busses, and this might confuse things. Q: How can we help a school community assess its condition in terms of the five Es?
- A: (Deb Hubsmith) A Safe Routes to School transportation program can be done on a school level, a community level, or a state level. The group creating the program can decide what interventions they want to execute to fulfill the five Es. By working as a group, they can conceptualize from the beginning how to incorporate all five Es for Safe Routes to School. Groups can also decide what elements of the program they plan to do at what times, and who will be responsible for each element. This makes it a comprehensive program.
- A: (Scott Bricker) The reason for the word PROGRAM is because it's a holistic program with the 5 Es, it's not just a transportation plan, which many schools have in place with bussing already.

- A: (Wendi Kallins) The reason for a program, is to determine who is going to get limited funding. If we don't get the schools to take ownership of Safe Routes through the creation of programs and plans, Safe Routes will only last as far as the funding does.
- A: (Franz Gimmler, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy) A Program is an important move in the direction of reality. A Plan is hypothetical. Program is an action plan or project which defines money, timelines, and responsibilities. We need that kind of a program, so there's no ambiguity.
- Parents are an asset to this process. The PTA is just learning about Safe Routes. Schools are already burdened with a lot of things, but parents are the link between the communities and the schools; we need to utilize them.
- Evaluation is key. We can get teachers to do a headcount once, but they aren't interested in doing it every day. That's also just looking at mode shift. We also need to include safety in our evaluation—How many kids who walked to school had an adult with them?
- We need to involve the communities and the local civic organizations so that they'll be willing to have a sidewalk built in their front yard so that a kid can walk to school. Embracing the whole community around the school, not just the people going to the school, is key.

Principles for SR2S Infrastructure and Non-Infrastructure Projects

Presentation by Deb Hubsmith, Coordinator, Safe Routes to School National Partnership

Multi-Party Execution

Different agencies are best-suited to operate various aspects of SR2S programs.

- City and road authorities do roads.
- Education and encouragement is often best implemented by a nonprofit.
- Enforcement is done by local law enforcement working together with the others such as crossing guards.

It's critical for these groups to all work together. We should ask ourselves—what is the largest number of people we can touch with this new federal program?

Infrastructure and Non-Infrastructure

It seems to be best to separate these pots of funding in order to get the best quality applications for both types of programs. If schools have SR2S school transportation programs, the money will have a better chance of leveraging other funds (CMAQ, Safety funds etc) for the program.

Tim Arnade: We have really struggled with this one. It's complicated. In order to have a successful project, one size doesn't fit all. We all agree, it's a mixture of infrastructure and encouragement. How do you integrate that if you're running from two different pots? How do you coordinate two competitive programs? We're going to have to get a number of suggestions on this.

Testimonials from states on existing Safe Routes programs

Maine: It's been important to do pilot programs that are really thorough in specific areas. In our second phase of Safe Routes, any infrastructure project requires an encouragement program. The state only has to manage the competitive process for infrastructure, as the state DOT can give the non-infrastructure funds to a non-profit to manage. The advocates then guide communities through the encouragement and education process.

Texas: For the size of our state, the amount of the non-infrastructure money is quite small. We've allocated 90/10 split on the money this time, and we hope to move forward to a 70/30 split to get more non-infrastructure in the future. To be able to do a decent job on the non-infrastructure projects, you need to be able to do it for several years in a row.

Oregon: We're really struggling with this, too. One comprehensive grant would enable a school to develop a plan and fund all 5 Es together. However, a separate non-infrastructure grant could run a walk-and-bike-to-school-day campaign for every school that wants it. There's no infrastructure there. It would be nice if there were a way to fund broad programs like this, not just programs on the school level.

Summary of General Comments

- Guidance on non-infrastructure is very important.
- Non-infrastructure projects must be multi-year in order to have a big impact.
- Many communities have achieved major mode-shift as a result of non-infrastructure alone.
- The infrastructure portion of this program is very important, but because of the limited sums of funding available, infrastructure may have a miniscule effect when compared to the effect that non-infrastructure programs can have on communities (as long as non-infrastructure is structured to be able to affect wide geographic regions).
- It's key to bring together infrastructure and encouragement. We may not see great increases as a result of new infrastructure if the non-infrastructure isn't there.

Q: Will the infrastructure programs needed to be vetted through the regional and metro improvement plans?

Answer (Tim Arnade): Yes, all transportation projects need to be included in the TIP and STIP. If projects, however, are determined not regionally significant (most SR2S should meet this definition), they do not need to be listed individually and can be grouped in a single line item. For NEPA, except in unusual circumstances, SR2S projects will fall under the Categorical Exclusion provision.

Comment: This federal program is a piece of the larger goal of building a national Safe Routes to School movement—a little bit of the effort that we're ramping up to. Let's not let the tail wag the dog. Let's talk about questions that should be asked.

Process Comment: The Steering Committee for the Safe Routes to School National Partnership will review all of the comments provided today, and revise the draft Guiding Principles for Safe

Routes to School. (Note: The final copy of *Guiding Principles* was submitted to FHWA on November 1, 2005. Visit bikesbelong.org to see the final *Guiding Principles* developed by the Safe Routes to School National Partnership.)

Discussion on Clearinghouse and Task Force

Led by Tim Arnade, FHWA

Priorities:

- 1) Creating Guidance for Program Implementation
- 2) Clearinghouse
- 3) Task Force

Implementation:

My focus is now on implementation. The number-one priority is guidance.

Clearinghouse:

When the guidance is out, I'll turn to the Clearinghouse. Our website is skinny because that's not our focus. It will be the Clearinghouse's charge.

Task Force:

- We're not going to make a March 31, 2006, date for this. We believe it's an error in the bill, and it should be changed.
- We need to call together a task force, name the members, and come up with a strategy.
- It's important to evaluate the results of the program in order to set up a good task force.
- The bill's language triggers FACA (it can take a year to set up a committee; meetings have to be in the federal register; there's a comment period—it's not going to be easy).
- There may be opportunities to utilize a structure that's already in place, such as the partnership. We can take a look at that.

Vision: This task force does what it needs to do and comes back with an authoritative report on how we spent the money and how it improved communities.

Comments and Q&A with meeting participants

Comment: It will be important to show results from the non-infrastructure in the task force report, to really show improvements, as many infrastructure projects won't be completed yet.

Q: What does the current pedestrian and bicycle clearinghouse do?

A: (PBIC) We have websites that we show programs, we have community courses, we provide technical information to states, we have Q&A, we have walk-to-school-day activities, outreach, technical assistance, training, and innovative projects.

Q: Will there be one clearinghouse or two?

A: (FHWA) Our goal is to maintain continuity of the Nation's Bike/Ped Clearinghouse, and we'll decide with the new contract whether we're going to make one new clearinghouse or two.

Discussion followed with meeting participants:

- The legislation states that there will be two separate clearinghouses—there's a mandate for two. What we need from the Safe Routes to School clearinghouse is promotion, advocacy, and development.
- John Fegan, FHWA: We're going to have to look into the advocacy issue a bit more, as we can't use federal money to advocate for a certain position.
- The program needs to be marketed. Let's replace advocacy with marketing. There needs to be a place where people can go to get their questions answered. Tools are also key. There are some tools that have to come from the local area, because they're unique, but there are some tools (CDs, tool kit, etc) that could be created on the national level that we could all use and will help people get started.
- Is training part of the clearinghouse? Training the coordinators is very important as it will have a major impact on how these coordinators perceive this program should be run. Who is going to drive that training agenda?
- PBIC has developed a national SR2S training course and in the coming months, they plan to teach the course at the local and regional levels. Details will be available on their website.

Conclusion by Andy Clarke, LAB:

Tim's priorities are exactly right. The LAB has a grant that will help produce a promotional piece that is aimed at introducing people to the Safe Routes to School concept. I'd like to work together on that project. During the middle day of the National Bike Summit (March 2, 2006), we'd like to bring together as many safe routes state coordinators as possible to provide guidance, background, and inspiration on the program. We'd be happy to collaborate on this with the partnership.

Goals of the Partnership and Tactics to Achieve the Goals

Discussion led by Deb Hubsmith, Coordinator, Safe Routes to School National Partnership

We've accomplished a lot already, but we need to set goals regarding what we need to accomplish for the next 10 years.

There are four main things I'm working on now for the Partnership through January 31, 2006:

- 1) Developing a structure for the Partnership, organizing a Steering Committee and planning this meeting.
- 2) Drafting recommendations and guiding principles to provide to FHWA, which will also help us to develop best practices and resources for States and DOTs.
- 3) Generating media attention for Safe Routes to School.
- 4) Providing resources for state and local groups through the Safe Routes pages on the Bikes Belong website.

Partnership Goals for the Future:

What types of goals should we have for the SR2S National Partnership?

Group Brainstorm

On Growing the Partnership:

- Build a broader partnership, including safety and enforcement folks, local health educators and others
- Include a broader range of education groups, including the Association of School Leaders and the School Board.
- Bring schools to the table. Attend their meetings and conferences.
- Focus on class and ethnic diversity—in the Partnership and in the program.
- Involve the Parks and Recreation executives, as their paths lead to many schools.
- Consider including faith-based organizations in the Partnership.
- Include AARP
- Get builders and planners involved.
- Be sure we have at least one nonprofit-group representation from every state in the country.
- Strengthen our outreach to pedestrian groups and get them involved.
- Encourage more Thunderhead, America Walks and other groups to participate.

Other Priorities:

- Within a certain timeframe (by 2015) the majority of children will walk or bike to school.
- Get communities involved: Safe Routes will spawn safe routes to . . .shopping, town, etc. It will be a gateway program.
- Get savvy on land use and development policies including school siting.
- Increase bicycling and decrease casualties. Come up with a challenging but realistic number.
- See parents become comfortable with their kids walking and biking to school.
- Leverage the funding that was just passed with more funding.
- See a shift in priorities, so that walking and biking become a high priority in communities, so we see more community funds used to further the cause.
- To encourage people to see it as their privilege to walk their kids to school. Sneakers instead of SUVs.
- Raise awareness of the importance of slower speeds, traffic calming, and safer street design.
- Raise awareness of the health benefits of walking and biking to school—they far outweigh the safety concerns.
- Develop a PowerPoint presentation that can be used at conferences throughout the U.S.
- Come up with a list of conferences and partner groups that can give Safe Routes presentations at these conferences.
- Reduce the “fear factor” hyped by the media.
- Tap into celebrity endorsements.
- Gather data now on the number of kids who arrive at school by car or bus, so we can measure success and so we can determine how many kids could bike or walk to school vs. how many are now.

- Secure FHWA funding for the Partnership.
- Secure funding from the Department of Education, the EPA, Health and Human Services.
- Create a national recognition program to highlight best practices, then use them as a carrot to help sustain Safe Routes programs over time.
- Focus on the traveler, not the trip. Kids who don't have the ability to walk or bike to school can still be part of the education. It's bigger than "home to school."
- Motivate kids to be part of the programming.
- Share the buzz about Safe Routes locally as well as regionally and national.
- Launch a national Safe Routes media campaign.
- Develop a mini-grant program where we can bundle private money to fund grassroots groups' pilot programs.
- Establish and publish best practices.
- Secure federal liability protection.
- Dispel liability fears for schools, so they won't be afraid to get involved.
- Thank the people who have helped us get this far.
- Create a structure among partner groups to facilitate interactive, dynamic communication.
- Find funding for a permanent staff person(s).
- Establish national and regional training programs for SR2S coordinators.
- Identify champions who can share best practices.
- Simplify our message with concise marketing and messaging tools.
- Have a presence at Pro Bike Pro Walk next September as well as at the six regional outreach and training conferences hosted by STPP.
- Create a guidebook on how to recruit and retain volunteers.
- \$117 billion was spent in the year 2000 due to problems related to inactivity and obesity. We need to collect research and data to show that establishing facilities for bicycling and walking will be cost-beneficial.
- Partner with International Walk to School Day, or make our own International Bike to School Day.

Andy Clarke's closing remarks

We need to pare down these goals and decide what the primary goals are. Reauthorizing the program with continued programming in the next bill should be a key goal. We can also go through the list to determine which goals the partnership is uniquely qualified to undertake, what the clearinghouse should tackle, and figure out which ones are time-sensitive so that we make tangible progress in the next four years.

Additional Comments

- Between now and the next transportation bill, we deal with short-term goals. What would Congress look at as tangible goals?
- We need to identify where we can provide a service that isn't provided efficiently at the state level.
- How can the partnership help local advocacy groups help their DOTs see how important this program is? Some DOTs are particularly reluctant to deal with the programmatic

issues, even more than the infrastructure issues. There's enthusiasm among the advocates and the schools, but the bureaucratic level isn't always on board.

Next Steps

Presented by Deb Hubsmith, Coordinator, Safe Routes to School National Partnership

Thoughts on Internal Communication:

We don't want to reinvent the wheel—let's interact efficiently and share information by:

- Possibly developing a list serve or on-line bulletin board
- Taking and distributing thorough meeting notes
- Posting Partnership contact information (web links are available to all partner groups now)
- Sending out monthly updates to partner members starting in November 2005

External Communication:

- Deb will send a press release about this meeting to media contacts

Funding:

Q: The Partnership seems like a perfect counterpart to the Clearinghouse and Task Force. Would it be eligible for FHWA funding? What kinds of strings would be attached to that funding?

A: (Tim Arnade) lots of strings.

Thoughts on sources of new money to fund Safe Routes to School and the National Partnership

- State Chambers of Commerce
- Non-endemic industries
- Health funding
- Corporate sponsors that will benefit from more kids walking and biking

We may have to show how our message works for these organizations. The Steering Committee can put together the goals and action agendas and then determine who might fund what.

SR2S resonates with politicians, no matter what the party. The lobbying effort will be addressed separately from the partnership.

Next Partnership Meeting:

There's a general interest in meeting face to face as a group a year from now. The Steering Committee for the Safe Routes to School National Partnership will meet on a more regular basis.

Closing Words

Tim Blumenthal: Thanks to everyone for coming. Tim Arnade, we wish you a lot of luck, and we promise to be supportive, inquisitive, and to keep pushing for the best interests of America. Thanks also to John Fegan and the rest of the Federal folks. And thanks to Deb for her investment in this process.

Deb Hubsmith: It's been an honor to help shape this meeting and to work with all the partner groups. Safe Routes to Schools is going to work because of partnerships. We want to continue to all work together, and we're going to rely on you as partners to help connect us with other groups. All of you are champions for SR2S efforts, and we will continue to look to you to help shape the movement. We have many goals and a lot of enthusiasm. We know where we want to go. There will be challenges, but we know to expect that, and we can overcome them! As we broaden the partnership further, and develop our message in a clear way, we will continue to move forward.

Attending

Partner Organizations	Last name	First name
Active Living by Design	Strunk	Sarah
Active Living by Design	Bell	Rich
Alta Planning + Design	McMillen	Barbara
America Bikes	Neufeld	Randy
America Walks	Flocks	Sally
Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals	Denney	Charlie
Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals	King	Michael
Austin Cycling Association	Tyree	Preston
Bicycle Coalition of Maine	Miller	Jeff
Bicycle Transportation Alliance	Bricker	Scott
Bikes Belong Coalition	Blumenthal	Tim
Bikes Belong Coalition	Train	Elizabeth
California Bicycle Coalition and CA Alliance for Transportation Choices	Fanslau	Justin
Chicagoland Bicycle Federation and Thunderhead Alliance	Neufeld	Randy
Connecticut Safe Routes to School	Gomes	Francisco
Cycles of Change	Contreras	Jill
League of American Bicyclists	Clarke	Andy
Marin County Bicycle Coalition	Kallins	Wendi
Metro Atlanta Safe Routes to School Coalition	Boykin	Fred
Michigan Fitness Foundation	Kokinakis	Lee
National Center for Bicycling and Walking	Wilkinson	Bill
Rails-to-Trails Conservancy	Gimmler	Franz
Safe Routes to School National Partnership	Hubsmith	Deb
Texas Bicycle Coalition Education Fund	Stallings	Robin
Toole Design Group	Toole	Jennifer
WalkBoston	Landman	Wendy

Stakeholders

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)	Oakley	Janet
American Traffic Safety Services Association (ATSSA)	Bizzozero	Peter
American Public Transit Association (APTA)	Guzzetti	Arther
Association for Commuter Transportation (ACT)	Pavluchuk	Jason
Delaware Department of Transportation	Cantelupo	Joseph
Delaware DOT, SR2S Coordinator		
Florida Department of Transportation	Pieratte	Pat
Jackson Hole, WY, Bike/Ped Program	Chandler	Jim
National Recreation and Park Association	Dolesh	Rich
National PTA	Meagher	Whitney

National PTA	Johnson	Sheri
Perils for Pedestrians	Wetmore	John
Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center (PBIC)	Zegeer	Charlie
Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center (PBIC)	Marchetti	Lauren
Surface Transportation Policy Project (STPP)	McCarty	Kevin

Federal Agencies

FHWA	Arnade	Tim
FHWA	Fegan	John
FHWA	Redmon	Tamara
FHWA	Rousseau	Gabriel
EPA	Nelson	Kevin
National Park Service	Golden	Steve
NHTSA	Wigle	Diane
NHTSA	Bawer	Paula
NHTSA	Kirinich	Susan
US DOT / Volpe Center	Plosky	Eric