

DEDICATED STAFF POWER UP STATE-LEVEL SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAMS



www.saferoutespartnership.org



State-level Safe Routes to School programs benefit from dedicated staff time. As of 2022, 25 states have one or more full-time equivalent (FTE) employees or contracted consultants who focus on Safe Routes to School. The [Making Strides 2022 State Report Cards](#) found that these states provide a strong foundation of examples that other states can learn from as they strive to implement Safe Routes to School using both funding and programming best practices. See the Table at the end of this factsheet for details from the 25 states currently staffing their Safe Routes to School Programs with one or more FTE staff on Safe Routes to School. This factsheet is meant for staff at state departments of transportation (DOTs) and other walking and rolling champions to understand how other states currently staff their Safe Routes to School programs and what supportive activities they manage to achieve with that support. For simplicity, this factsheet will refer to staff working on Safe Routes to School as Safe Routes to School Coordinators and full-time can mean one full-time staff member or the equivalent amount of time from multiple staff.

New Provisions in the Transportation Alternatives Program Support Safe Routes to School Coordinators

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is one of the main sources of federal funding for walking, bicycling, and Safe Routes to School. Every state receives funding that it awards through a competitive process to local communities. Learn more [here](#).

The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law made many positive changes to TAP, including a new flexibility for states to use up to five percent of their TAP funds to provide technical assistance to applicants.¹ Guidance from the Federal Highway Administration states that funding can support State Safe Routes to School coordinators as part of TAP's five percent of funding for technical assistance. As a result, states do not need pre-approval to use this five percent of funds to staff a statewide Safe Routes to School coordinator. A Safe Routes to School coordinator can be housed within a DOT or contracted out to another government agency, a nonprofit organization, or a private sector entity.² To find out how much money your state has for [technical assistance and state-specific information on TAP](#).

States with a State-Level Safe Routes to School Coordinator



State-Level Safe Routes to School Coordinators Promote Funding and Support Best Practices

Under the original federal Safe Routes to School program created in 2005 (SAFETEA-LU), each state DOT was required to have a full-time staff person focused on administering Safe Routes to School funding. When the federal Safe Routes to School program was folded into the new TAP in 2012 (MAP-21), states were allowed, but no longer required, to dedicate a full-time staff person to Safe Routes to School.

State DOT Safe Routes to School coordinators and other staff play an important role in making sure that Safe Routes to School funding is accessible, liaising between school systems and transportation professionals, and providing technical assistance to schools and communities.

States with at least one full-time staff or consultant dedicated to Safe Routes to School have been shown to implement more best practices that advance Safe Routes to School initiatives. These best practices have been found to help allocate more funding for the implementation of infrastructure changes near schools, support comprehensive education for walking and biking, and reduce barriers to funding. According to our [2022 State Report Cards](#), states with at least one full-time Safe Routes to School coordinator (or equivalent) were the only ones to do the following best practices:

- hold separate competitions or set aside TAP funding specifically for Safe Routes to School projects
- allocate Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure projects such as education or engagement activities extra points in TAP application scoring criteria or set aside TAP funding for Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure projects
- offer communities both Safe Routes to School planning grants and mini-grants
- allocate at least \$1,000 per year of state funding to Safe Routes to School projects (10 states allocated \$500,000 or more per year)



States with one or more Safe Routes to School coordinator(s) were also more likely to do the following:

- promote equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming and funding by providing support to programs to engage underrepresented demographic groups such as low-income students, English learner students, or students in rural communities
- provide curricula to incorporate Safe Routes to School into school lesson plans
- offer technical assistance and/or a resource center to help schools initiate Safe Routes to School programs and run effective programs
- adopt a state Safe Routes to School plan or incorporate it into a state active transportation plan

Making Strides: State Report Cards on Walking, Bicycling, and Active Kids and Communities

The 2022 full report, [Making Strides: State Report Cards on Walking, Bicycling, and Active Kids and Communities](#), provides a detailed explanation of how the states were graded; an overview of the research that supports walking, bicycling, and physical activity as ways to improve health; a discussion of the rationale for state-level report cards; and reflections on support for physical activity in different regions and our country as a whole.

State-Level Best Practices to Support Safe Routes to School

There are a variety of ways that states can support Safe Routes to School applications and implementation. Below is a list of best practices separated into funding and supportive practices. The correlation with state Safe Routes to School staff is noted for each strategy. With each best practice, review the examples of what it looks like in different states across the country to help envision what it could look like in your state.

FUNDING

A 2019 national census of Safe Routes to School programs found that insufficient funding was one of the biggest hurdles experienced by Safe Routes to School programs.³ From 2005 to 2012, the federal Safe Routes to School program allocated \$1.1 billion to state DOTs for Safe Routes to School projects. Since 2013, Safe Routes to School has been eligible for funding through TAP and it may also be funded through state or local sources.

Here are examples of what state DOTs can do to increase Safe Routes to School resources and how state Safe Routes to School coordinators help make that happen.

- **Special Consideration in TAP:** State DOTs can affect whether Safe Routes to School projects are funded with TAP dollars by prioritizing these projects in TAP competitions. Decisions by state DOTs around how to prioritize and structure funding for Safe Routes to School have an enormous effect on local Safe Routes to School work and student walking and bicycling numbers and safety. When state DOTs prioritize Safe Routes to School for funding they enable more street safety improvements to be constructed near schools and on school routes and the education and encouragement to walk or bike to school safely.

Out of all 50 states and the District of Columbia, eight states hold separate competitions or set aside TAP funding specifically for Safe Routes to School projects. All eight of those states have one or more coordinator(s) supporting Safe Routes to School. Eleven states allocate extra points, incentivize, or prioritize Safe Routes to School in TAP competitions. Of those eleven states, six have at least one full-time Safe Routes to School coordinator. Examples from states with Safe Routes to School coordinators include:

- Illinois sets aside \$3 million annually for Safe Routes to School out of their TAP funds.
- Maine gives 20 extra points for Safe Routes to School projects on TAP applications plus extra points for projects within 2 miles of a school (3 points) and connecting neighborhoods/schools/before & after school programs (5 points).
- **Funding Non-infrastructure Projects:** State DOTs can influence whether state and federal funds only go to Safe Routes to School infrastructure projects, or whether these funds also go to non-infrastructure programs. By law, Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure is eligible for a broad array of federal funds, including TAP, Highway Safety Improvement Program, Surface Transportation Block Grant, and more. Supporting evaluation, education, engagement, and encouragement through non-infrastructure grants can jumpstart Safe Routes to School efforts and keep different communities engaged. When state DOTs ensure that funding flows to non-infrastructure Safe Routes to School projects, they support the programming activities that change habits and improve safety.⁴





Out of all 50 states and the District of Columbia, only six states give Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure projects extra points or have funding set aside for them within TAP. All of them have one or more Safe Routes to School coordinator(s) staff dedicated to Safe Routes to School.

- Ohio holds separate Safe Routes to School infrastructure and non-infrastructure competitions. The Ohio DOT hosts an annual application period where requests can be made for infrastructure projects, non-infrastructure projects, and School Travel Plan Development Assistance (funding or consultant assistance).
- In Colorado, Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure projects are not eligible for TAP, but the state has set up a standalone Safe Routes to School competition where non-infrastructure projects are eligible for funding. Additionally, each Safe Routes to School infrastructure application within the state program has to include an education component that can be funded up to \$3,500 under the infrastructure application.⁵
- **Allocating State and/or Other (Non-TAP) Federal Funding:** Federal TAP funding only meets a fraction of the funding needs for Safe Routes to School infrastructure and programming, which is evidenced by high numbers of funding applications in many states. As a result, some states created standalone Safe Routes to School funding from state

revenue sources such as annual appropriations, state gas tax revenues, and increases to school zone traffic fines. State Safe Routes to School funding may also be included in a larger active transportation or general transportation funding package. Additionally, some states direct federal funding outside of TAP toward Safe Routes to School, using sources such as federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds or other sources.

All of the states allocating additional money beyond TAP toward Safe Routes to School have at least one full-time Safe Routes to School coordinator supporting the program. There are 13 states currently allocating more than \$100,000 of state funding toward Safe Routes to School projects. Ten of those states are allocating at least \$500,000 per year. The highest is \$10 million annually, allocated by Oregon.

- Florida provides additional funding for Safe Routes to School by covering the 20 percent local match required of TAP projects with toll credits. Learn more about [toll credits](#) and [how states are using toll credits as the match for Safe Routes to School programs](#).
- Minnesota's state legislature allocated \$1 million every two years for non-infrastructure Safe Routes to School projects and \$5 million over two years beginning in 2021 for Safe Routes to School infrastructure.

- **Planning and mini-grant programs:** Providing Safe Routes to School planning grants and/or mini-grants, can remove or ease financial and administrative barriers to communities identifying or developing Safe Routes to School Projects. Planning grants help communities identify needs and develop projects for future funding opportunities. Mini-grants that do not require a large application or complex administration can help support low-cost projects that may not be as competitive in larger grant competitions.

14 states are offering Safe Routes to School planning grants and/or mini-grants. 11 of those 14 states have at least one full-time Safe Routes to School coordinator. Among these 11 states with one or more full-time coordinators, five of them offer both planning and mini-grant programs.

- In Kansas between 2007 and 2021, approximately 50 Safe Routes to School Planning grants were awarded to communities to develop a Safe Routes to School Master Plan, and over 50 awards were made to communities to implement components of their Plan, mostly infrastructure projects.⁶
- Massachusetts established the [SRTS Signs and Lines Program](#). This mini-grant program provides design services and up to \$6,000 for constructing low-cost infrastructure improvements around public elementary, middle, and high schools.

A 2017 study from the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health reviewed practices states used to award federal Safe Routes to School funds to low-income communities. This research identified several practices states implemented to successfully support low-income communities to receive and utilize these federal funds. Provision of funding match and awarding additional points to applications from low-income communities in project scoring were the most frequent strategies reported by states that were successfully funding low-income communities.⁷

SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES

While funding for Safe Routes to School is critical, state DOTs can engage in additional supportive practices that further advance Safe Routes to School initiatives. With appropriate staffing resources to provide support, state DOTs can ensure that schools and local governments implement comprehensive Safe Routes to School initiatives based upon best practices and tailored to local needs and challenges.

- **Resource Center or Technical Assistance:** Safe Routes to School technical assistance or resource centers, can support more competitive Safe Routes to School applications and stronger and more effective Safe Routes to School programs on the ground. Of the 25 state DOTs that provide Safe Routes to School technical assistance or resources centers, 20 of them have one or more Safe Routes to School coordinator(s).
 - Virginia uses consultants as Local Technical Assistance Coordinators to provide day-to-day assistance to local Safe Routes to School coordinators. The LCA Coordinators also provide trainings twice per year along with monthly coordinator calls where they provide information, available resources, and idea sharing.
 - In Vermont, the Vermont Agency of Transportation funds Local Motion, the statewide active transportation advocacy organization, to support Safe Routes to School programming. Local Motion provides guidance to partner schools, sends out newsletters about upcoming events and opportunities, provides support with activities and events, and helps create and update School Travel Plans.⁸



- **Standalone State Safe Routes to School Plan or State Active Transportation Plan that Incorporates Safe Routes to School:** States can develop statewide Safe Routes to School plans which, similar to state active transportation plans, outline a vision, goals, and strategies to coordinate activities and resources to support active travel to school. Including Safe Routes to School in plans helps ensure more consistent program implementation over time. Of the nine states that have a standalone Safe Routes to School strategic plan, eight of them have one or more Safe Routes to School coordinator(s). 22 states mention Safe Routes to School in another state plan and 12 of those states have one or more Safe Routes to School Coordinator(s).

 - Florida Safe Routes to School [Strategic Plan](#)
 - Oregon Safe Routes to School [Strategic Needs Assessment](#)
- **Equitable Safe Routes to School Programming:** State DOTs have a tremendous influence over where transportation resources go and have the opportunity to prioritize support for the communities that need it most. Safe Routes to School programs can provide funding, publications, or other support to help local programs engage demographic groups who have not traditionally been reached. A 2019 national census of Safe Routes to School programs found that fewer than one-third of responding programs had any outreach or tailored programming aimed at increasing participation by girls, students with disabilities, students who are immigrants, or others, but that more than a quarter of programs wanted to move into this area.⁹ As of 2022, 13 states are taking actions to make access to Safe Routes to School resources more equitable. Of those 13 states, 12 of them have at least one full-time Safe Routes to School coordinator.

 - Colorado provides Safe Routes to School promotional materials for events such as Bike and Walk to School Day and the statewide bicycle manual in both Spanish and English.

- In Minnesota, individuals who have gone through the state's Safe Routes to School [Walk!Bike!Fun!](#) ambassadors training program have access to helmets and a fleet of bicycles, including adaptive bicycles.¹⁰
- Ohio DOT emphasizes community involvement activities when developing school travel plans. Their new Active Transportation Plan Development Guide (which can be used for Safe Routes to School if it demonstrates an appropriate level of school partner involvement) emphasizes the engagement of disproportionately affected groups and provides guidance on how to focus time and resources on hearing from the people who are underserved by traditional outreach methods. Ohio DOT also has a program called Girls in Gear which engages and empowers young girls to build their skills and confidence to bike. Communities can apply for and receive training on starting a Girls in Gear program at no cost through the Ohio DOT.
- **Safe Routes to School Curricula:** States can encourage Safe Routes to School educational programming inside and outside of classrooms by developing curricula and other materials to incorporate into school lessons. Of the 24 states that provide Safe Routes to School curricula, 20 of them have at least one full-time Safe Routes to School coordinator.
 - California developed the [California Pedestrian and Bicycle Curriculum for Grades 4 and 5](#).
 - Minnesota developed the [Walk!Bike!Fun!](#) curriculum for school and youth education programs. It meets Minnesota education standards and helps children ages five to 13 learn traffic rules and regulations, the potential hazards to traveling by foot or bike, and handling skills needed to bike and walk effectively, appropriately and safely through their community.



Conclusion

The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law has funding and flexibility to support state Safe Routes to School coordinators who can advance a variety of research-backed best practices for getting more kids walking and biking safely. By integrating best practices for appropriate staffing resources to provide support, state DOTs can ensure that schools and local governments implement comprehensive Safe Routes to School initiatives based upon best practices and tailored to local needs and challenges. Strong state supportive practices can allow for more effective Safe Routes to School programming and more children safely walking and bicycling to school.

Safe Routes to School Program Details by State

STATE	SRTS SPECIAL CONSIDERATION	SRTS NON-INFRASTRUCTURE (NI)	STATE/OTHER FUNDING	EQUITABLE ACCESS	CURRICULUM	PLAN/MINI-GRANT FUNDING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)/RESOURCE LIBRARY	STRATEGIC PLAN
California	1 point for projects that demonstrate they will increase walking and biking among students	NI is eligible, but not given special consideration	-	Info briefs on rural and tribal communities; parent flyers in different languages (Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Hmong); factsheet on equity	4th/5th grade curriculum ; middle school engagement guide	-	Webinars, publications, TA through the Active Transportation Resource Center	Part of State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (2017)
Colorado	Extra points within TAP for infrastructure projects that give access to schools	Not eligible for TAP, but each SRTS infrastructure project must include an education component. State also has a standalone SRTS competition where NI is eligible	\$2.5 million from Statewide Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program.		K-8 lesson plans	-	TA through consultants, online resources and training materials on website	Standalone SRTS Strategic Plan (2017)
Delaware	\$400,000 from TAP for SRTS projects which are evaluated separately from other TAP applications. Proximity to schools is a factor in ranking other TAP applications	Non-infrastructure projects are funded with state or other funding sources	\$100,000 for TAP match on SRTS projects	SRTS promotional material such as bike and walk to school day, and the statewide bicycle manual are produced in Spanish and English	-	-	Uses state funding for educational outreach such as bike rodeos	Part of the Bike and Pedestrian Plan (2018)
D.C	-	Non-infrastructure projects are eligible for TAP	-	-	Provides bike education to all 2nd graders	Planning assistance with schools	They provide TA	In Pedestrian Masterplan (2009)
Florida	SRTS projects are part of TAP competition and they hold a stand-alone competition with other federal funds	Some SRTS NI programs are funded through TAP; statewide educational program reaches all 67 counties	Provides at least \$500,000 per year, with federal Highway Safety Improvement Program funds and Toll Credits	SRTS Adapted Guide for students with disabilities	All 67 counties (school districts) in Florida have staff trained in using the curriculum as well as trailers with both bicycle and pedestrian equipment to assist with training	Mini-grants available to create school district master plans for safe biking and walking	Provides annual technical training for applicants, SRTS workshops through the Florida LTAP; Use website, district coordinators, and PedBike Safety Resource Center	Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan (2019)

Safe Routes to School Program Details by State

STATE	SRTS SPECIAL CONSIDERATION	SRTS NON-INFRASTRUCTURE (NI)	STATE/OTHER FUNDING	EQUITABLE ACCESS	CURRICULUM	PLAN/MINI-GRANT FUNDING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)/RESOURCE LIBRARY	STRATEGIC PLAN
Georgia	-	-	-	Materials in Spanish	-	-	Safe Routes GA Resource Center has guides and toolkits, resource center provides TA including assistance with school travel plans	-
Hawaii	-	SRTS non-infrastructure is eligible for TAP	\$940,000 from the Safe Routes to School Special Fund	Materials in Spanish	Uses PATH curriculum and has educator resources	-	SRTS workshops on each island and county coordinators	In State Pedestrian Master Plan (2013)
Illinois	\$3 million annually for SRTS from TAP	-	-	-	-	-	-	Part of Bike Transportation Plan (2014)
Iowa	-	TAP application specifically mentions non-infrastructure but no special consideration	-	-	Safe Routes to School Education Curriculum	-	-	Part of Bike and Pedestrian Plan (2018)
Kansas	-	Separate application for SRTS planning and NI	-	-	Yes	Planning grants to develop SRTS Master Plans and to implement components of the plan (usually infrastructure)	-	Part of State Active Transportation Master Plan (2023)
Maine	20 extra points for SRTS in TAP plus extra points for projects near schools and/or serving kids	-	\$156,000 for Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Education Program in schools and communities	-	Youth education through Bicycle Coalition of Maine	Planning Partnership Initiative (PPI) program funds planning projects up to \$50,000 at a 50/50 municipal/state split. Bicycle Coalition of Maine manages SRTS mini-grants	Maine bike coalition is funded to provide SRTS support with state dollars	(In progress) Statewide Active Transportation Plan to include Safe Routes to School

Safe Routes to School Program Details by State

STATE	SRTS SPECIAL CONSIDERATION	SRTS NON-INFRASTRUCTURE (NI)	STATE/OTHER FUNDING	EQUITABLE ACCESS	CURRICULUM	PLAN/MINI-GRANT FUNDING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)/RESOURCE LIBRARY	STRATEGIC PLAN
Maryland	-	SRTS non-infrastructure projects are eligible but no special consideration	-	-	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts	Sets aside TAP funding for SRTS infrastructure	SRTS non-infrastructure is eligible for TAP (in standalone SRTS competition). School partnership and participation in non-infrastructure components is required to submit an application for infrastructure	Covers all of the non-federal match for TAP with state funds	Tip sheets in different languages; All abilities guide for schools and SRTS, defines terms around inclusivity and equity; Sustainability guide talks about what can be done with policy at the school level, municipal level, statewide level to make things more equitable	SRTS Program is an approved MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Professional Development (PD) provider. There are 12.5 hours of approved PD credits available with in-person, online, and experiential learning for faculty and staff to incorporate SRTS programming and education in curriculums. Lesson plans here	SRTS signs and lines program for infrastructure improvements under \$6,000	Has a team of 6 outreach coordinators to provide TA plus website and e-news	No a public-facing/adopted SRTS strategic plan. They have an annual work plan/contract and a long term scope of work
Michigan	-	Sets aside funding for non-infrastructure; major infrastructure projects are only competitive when there is a non-infrastructure component included	Toll credits cover non-federal match requirement for SRTS/TAP grants; \$750,000 annual average toll credits used	Resources for engaging students with disabilities; promoting equitable engagement practices	Make Trax program	SRTS planning grants and mini-grants	Contract with Michigan Fitness Foundation	(In progress) State Active Transportation Plan
Minnesota	-	Eligible in TAP but no special preference; Use TAP funds for part of planning solicitations, strategic plan implementation, and salaries related to SRTS	\$1 million per biennium for non-infrastructure; \$3 million for 2019 biennium for SRTS infrastructure; \$5 million for 2021 biennium for SRTS infrastructure	Adaptive bike fleet with Walk!Bike!Fun! Also implementing with an equity focus on planning assistance	Walk! Bike! Fun! Program	Planning and mini-grants	Safe Routes Academy workshops plus direct TA	Standalone SRTS Strategic Plan (2020)

Safe Routes to School Program Details by State

STATE	SRTS SPECIAL CONSIDERATION	SRTS NON-INFRASTRUCTURE (NI)	STATE/OTHER FUNDING	EQUITABLE ACCESS	CURRICULUM	PLAN/MINI-GRANT FUNDING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)/ RESOURCE LIBRARY	STRATEGIC PLAN
New Jersey	Standalone SRTS competition using \$5.6 million set aside from TAP	-	NJ Safe Routes Resource Center at Rutgers University funded with \$600,000 a year in federal Statewide Planning and Research (SPR) money	Provides training on working with kids with disabilities and other best practices	NJ Bike School curriculum based on Bikeology; K-8 lesson plans	Provides design and planning assistance through New Jersey Safe Routes Resource Center and the state's eight Transportation Management Associations	Statewide resource center; design assistance provided pro bono by firms; TAP workshops	Standalone SRTS Strategic Plan (2020)
North Carolina	-	Sets aside \$1.5 million/year from TAP for SRTS NI	-	-	Let's Go NC	-	The Health department has a 3-year contract for technical assistance through the Highway Safety Resource Center	Part of Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan (2013)
Ohio	Separate SRTS competition with \$4 million of TAP annually; Infrastructure, non-infrastructure, and School Travel Plan Development Assistance are eligible	NI eligible for TAP, but no preference given	Provides at least \$500,000 per year of state or other federal funding to SRTS projects	Technical assistance and planning guides emphasize engagement with people underserved by traditional outreach; Girls in Gear program engages and empowers young girls to bike	Host Lesson Plans and funding opportunity for communities to develop lesson guides or materials that will fit their needs	School Travel Fund grants and school travel planning assistance through reimbursement or a state contract for planning services	TA; online resources ; mapping assistance; free workshops through Active Transportation Academy	Part of Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (2021)
Oregon	-	SRTS NI is eligible for funding through TAP and there is a standalone SRTS NI competition using set aside TAP funds. For FY21-24, \$1 million in TA funds are set-aside for the separate SRTS NI competition	\$10,300,000	Materials in Spanish ; Focus TA on equity trainings, professional development for SRTS coordinators, racial equity and accessibility	Lesson Plans	Project identification grant program	TA through Commute Options and Alta	Standalone SRTS Strategic Needs Assessment (2021)
Rhode Island	Selection committee's framework includes need, equity, utility, and location of schools (among other land uses); SRTS projects fare very well	-	-	-	-	-	-	Part of Long Range Transportation Plan, Transit Master Plan, and Bicycle Mobility Plan (2020)

Safe Routes to School Program Details by State

STATE	SRTS SPECIAL CONSIDERATION	SRTS NON-INFRASTRUCTURE (NI)	STATE/OTHER FUNDING	EQUITABLE ACCESS	CURRICULUM	PLAN/ MINI-GRANT FUNDING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)/ RESOURCE LIBRARY	STRATEGIC PLAN
South Carolina	-	-	-	-	Refer to NHTSA curriculum and document how it is aligned with state standards	-	-	-
Utah	Sets aside TAP funding specifically for SRTS project (\$1.3 million)	-	\$400k/year Transportation Solutions funds the Safe Routes Utah program that supports education, encouragement, and mapping	-	Available through Safe Routes Utah program	-	Provide assistance with school plans, free assemblies, rock and roll challenge plus a fleet of bikes	-
Vermont	10 points for projects with access to school or other key center	SRTS NI is eligible but no special consideration	-	-	Curriculum	-	Through Local Motion (bike advocacy group) funded by VTRANS	Part of Bike Plan (2021)
Virginia	SRTS Infrastructure projects receive 1 extra point in TAP competition	NI eligible for TAP, no special consideration	-	Provide info on serving students with disabilities; equity is part of program goals; offer training on equitable programs locally; number of Title 1 schools served is part of scoring	-	Provide both planning and mini grants ; up to 48 \$1k mini-grants per year and walkabout mini-grants	Five Local Technical Assistance Coordinators contracted through a consulting firm to manage day-to-day assistance, training twice per year, and monthly coordinator calls	Standalone SRTS Strategic Plan (2021)
Washington	\$4 million set aside every two years from TAP for SRTS	NI eligible in the standalone SRTS competition	\$3.5 million from Connecting Washington; WA Traffic Safety Commission School Walk Route Improvement Project awards approximately \$250,000 each year; \$7.75 million/biennium of state funding; and \$7.25 million/biennium from Highway Safety Improvement Program	-	Provides curriculum	-	TA for project planning and development is available to public agencies (cities, counties, tribes, schools and school districts). Office of Superintendent for Public Instruction provides TA on education component	Standalone within Active Transportation Plan (2020)



References

1. 23 U.S.C. § 133(h)(6)(C)(C) Improving accessibility and efficiency.—(i) In general.—A State may use an amount equal to not more than 5 percent of the funds set aside for the State under this subsection, after allocating funds in accordance with paragraph (2)(A), to improve the ability of applicants to access funding for projects under this subsection in an efficient and expeditious manner by providing— (I) to applicants for projects under this subsection application assistance, technical assistance, and assistance in reducing the period of time between the selection of the project and the obligation of funds for the project; and (II) funding for 1 or more full-time State employee positions to administer this subsection. (ii) Use of funds.— Amounts used under clause (i) may be expended— (I) directly by the State; or (II) through contracts with State agencies, private entities, or nonprofit entities.
2. Gloria M Shepherd (Federal Highway Administration), accessed March 21, 2023, https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/transportation_alternatives/guidance/ta_guidance_2022.pdf.
3. Zimmerman, S. and M. Lieberman, "The Safe Routes to School Program Census Project: 2019 National Program Assessment Report," Safe Routes Partnership, 2020, https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource_files/national_srts_census_report_final.pdf
4. Noreen C. McDonald et al., "Impact of the Safe Routes to School Program on Walking and Bicycling," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 80, no. 2 (March 2014): pp. 153-167, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2014.956654>.
5. "FY 23 Safe Routes to School Request for Applications Guidelines and Instructions," Colorado Department of Transportation, accessed April 19, 2023, <https://www.codot.gov/programs/bikeped/saferoutes/assets/fy-2023-guidelines-and-instructions-accessibility-draft-21723.pdf>.
6. Kramer, Jenny, Kansas Department of Transportation, email, 2022.
7. AL Cradock et al., "Examining Practices That Promote Access to Safe Routes to School Programs in Vulnerable Communities," January 2017, <https://hsph.me/prc-srts-practices>.
8. "Vermont Safe Routes To School & Bike Smart," Local Motion, accessed April 19, 2023, https://www.localmotion.org/safe_routes_to_school_vt.
9. Zimmerman, S. and M. Lieberman, "The Safe Routes to School Program Census Project: 2019 National Program Assessment Report," Safe Routes Partnership, 2020, https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource_files/national_srts_census_report_final.pdf
10. Minnesota Department of Transportation, "Safe Routes to School," <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/saferoutes/education.html>