

VIELD

EAST CENTRAL WISCONSIN

Regional Planning Commission

BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION TO AND FROM SCHOOL STUDY

FINAL REPORT, SUBMITTED May 30, 2025



ONDUEL ELEMENTARY SALES

Acknowledgments

Regional Planning Commission (RPC) East Central Wisconsin RPC

Cities/Villages/Townships

City of Oshkosh Town of Algoma Town of Neenah Village of Bonduel Village of Fox Crossing

Prepared by

Traffic Analysis and Design, Inc.

Derek Hungness, P.E., PTOE, AICP, PMP Angela Rinaldi, E.I.T., RSP₁ Christian Sternke, P.E., RSP₂ John Campbell, P.E., RSP₂

Revelation LLC

Brian Lee, APR

Special Thanks

Bonduel Elementary School Bonduel School District Neenah High School Neenah Joint School District Oakwood Elementary School Oshkosh Area School District Read Elementary School

Additional Sources

Select images and screenshots in this report were sourced from Google Maps. These visuals are used for illustrative purposes under fair use. Screenshots from Google Maps are denoted with a custom symbol **G**.

Background

This document was prepared in support of the Built Environment and Active Transportation To and From School Safe Routes to School Study.

Information contained in this document is for planning purposes and should not be used for final design of any project. All results, recommendations, concept drawings, and commentary contained herein are based on limited data and information, and on existing conditions that are subject to change.





Preface

Background

In accordance with the objectives set forth by federal, state, and local initiatives to improve transportation safety and accessibility, this study examines the intersection of the built environment and active transportation for school-age children in Wisconsin. The study seeks to identify existing conditions, barriers, and opportunities for enhancing walking and biking to and from school. By evaluating infrastructure, policies, and travel behaviors, this study aims to inform data-driven decision-making that supports safe, convenient, and equitable transportation options for students. Findings from this study will contribute to broader statewide and municipal planning efforts, aligning with Wisconsin's commitment to fostering active transportation and improving public health outcomes.

Definition of Active Transportation

Active transportation, as defined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), refers to human-powered modes of travel, including walking, bicycling, and the use of non-motorized conveyances such as scooters and skateboards. In the context of school travel, active transportation plays a crucial role in reducing traffic congestion, improving air quality, and promoting physical activity among children. While electric bicycles and other low-speed electric mobility devices are increasingly utilized, this study primarily focuses on non-motorized transportation, emphasizing infrastructure and policies that facilitate safe pedestrian and bicyclist movement within school zones and surrounding neighborhoods.

Definition of Built Environment

The built environment refers to human-made or modified structures that provide spaces for living, working, and recreation. It encompasses buildings, transportation infrastructure, public spaces, and essential utilities. The built environment plays a critical role in shaping human interactions, economic activity, public health, and environmental sustainability.

Collaborative Approach

The development of this study was guided by a collaborative approach, engaging stakeholders across East Central Wisconsin, including representatives from school districts, municipal planning agencies, public health departments, advocacy organizations, and community members. Input from these diverse perspectives was instrumental in assessing local needs and priorities, identifying best practices, and shaping recommendations for enhancing active transportation infrastructure and policies. By working together, we aim to create safer, healthier, and more connected communities, ensuring that every student has the opportunity to travel to and from school safely and actively.

TABLE of CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction	5
2. Data Collection Methodologies	8
3. Case Study Schools	13
4. Comparative Analysis	30
5. Best Practices & Recommendations	34
6. Policy Implications	39
7. Economic Implications	45
8. Strategies Moving Forward	54
Appendix	58
A. Case Study School Risk Assessments	59
B. Survey Results	64
C. Funding Sources	116



Introduction

In East Central Wisconsin, like many places across the country, fewer children are walking and biking to school than ever before. This shift has led to more traffic congestion near schools and safety concerns for students. But the good news? Communities across our region are stepping up to change that. The Built Environment and Active Transportation to and from School (BEATS) Study takes a close look at what's working, what's not, and how we can make getting to school safer, easier, and more enjoyable for students and families.

The way our neighborhoods, roads, and sidewalks are designed has a big impact on how students get to school. When kids have safe and accessible routes, they're more likely to walk or bike, which means healthier habits, less traffic, and stronger connections within our communities. The BEATS study evaluates student transportation in East Central Wisconsin, focusing on case studies from Neenah High School, Read Elementary School, Oakwood Elementary School, and Bonduel Elementary School to identify local barriers and opportunities for improving active transportation.





These schools were selected to represent a diverse range of urban, suburban, and rural communities, each with unique barriers to active transportation. Common concerns heard throughout the study include busy roads with fast-moving traffic, gaps in sidewalk networks, and the need for safer street crossings. But there are also great opportunities. By focusing on the needs of our schools and neighborhoods, we can take meaningful steps toward creating safer, more welcoming routes for students.

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) is a program designed to make walking and biking safer and more accessible for students of all ages. Through improved pedestrian facilities, wellmarked crosswalks, bike-friendly infrastructure, and community education, SRTS helps students travel to school safely while building lifelong healthy habits. SRTS Programs involve partnerships among municipalities, school districts, parks and recreation departments, public health agencies, community members, parent volunteers, and community groups.

Objective of Assessment

In East Central Wisconsin, SRTS initiatives have already demonstrated success in reducing traffic hazards, increasing student physical activity, and strengthening neighborhood connections. Schools and local leaders are working together to improve crossings, reduce traffic hazards, and encourage more students to walk and bike. If we invest in smart, people-focused transportation solutions, more students will have the opportunity to get to school safely, actively, and confidently.

The success of this effort depends on collaboration. The East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (ECWRPC) plays a critical role in supporting schools and communities by offering technical expertise, coordinating multi-jurisdictional efforts, and assisting partners in identifying and pursuing funding opportunities. Their leadership ensures that SRTS initiatives are not isolated projects but part of a sustained, region-wide movement to prioritize student safety and health.

Schools that engage with ECWRPC gain access to detailed planning and tools to build stronger community support. Through partnerships with ECWRPC, schools can move beyond single events and implement lasting changes—whether that's securing infrastructure grants, implementing traffic calming solutions, or adopting school travel policies that support walking and biking. With the right support and shared commitment, every school in East Central Wisconsin can become a safer, healthier place to learn and grow. By focusing on regional needs and solutions, this study provides a framework for schools and municipalities to implement effective strategies that create safer, more accessible routes for students. The following chapters will dive deeper into what we've learned, what we can improve on, and how we can work towards a future where walking and biking to school is a safe and realistic choice for more families in East Central Wisconsin. The next page outlines the structure of this document with key components of the study and the organization its findings.



CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Structure of Document

	01 Introduction
	02 Overview of Data Collection & Analysis
	03 Case Studies
	04 Comparative Analysis
	05 Best Practices & Recommendations
	06 Policy Implications
	07 Economic Implications
	08 Conclusion

Data Collection Methodologies

Effective decision-making for Safe Routes to School programs relies on a foundation of data collection and analysis. Understanding how students travel to and from school, identifying barriers to safe walking and biking, and evaluating traffic safety conditions are essential steps in developing targeted strategies to improve safety and accessibility. This chapter outlines the methodologies used to gather and interpret data, including both community input and empirical evidence.

Four main elements made up the data collection process: surveys, stakeholder meetings and engagement meetings, crash analysis and risk analysis. The following pages provide a detailed look at each data collection element, explaining its role and summary of findings. When combined, the methods created a comprehensive picture of current conditions.



Data Collection Process

Community Survey Feedback

Polling students and parents of the case study schools on a variety of topics relating to traffic safety.

Stakeholder & Engagement Meetings Public meetings to get feedback on a variety of topics

Crash Analysis

Collecting the past 5 years of crash data and analyzing the crashes, especially the school -related crashes.

Risk Analysis

Using TADI's approach to risk analysis.

BEATS Community Survey

The Built Environment Active Transportation To and From School Safe Routes to School community survey had 439 respondents, primarily parents and guardians of students at Read (Oshkosh), Oakwood (Oshkosh), and Bonduel Elementary Schools (Bonduel), and Neenah High School (Neenah).

A survey was developed and data was analyzed to look at travel behaviors, perceived safety, and barriers to walking and biking. In addition, they assisted with all public relations efforts related to the survey.

The survey methodology included both quantitative and qualitative components. Open-ended questions allowed participants to provide specific feedback on unsafe intersections, infrastructure gaps, and other concerns. The survey included demographic questions, helping to contextualize responses and identify trends among different demographic groups.



The results provided insights into factors such as sidewalk availability, traffic conditions, and school pick-up and drop-off logistics, which influence walking and biking participation.

> 423 of 439 survey participants currently have, or have had a student enrolled in Read Elementary School, Oakwood Elementary School, Bonduel Elementary School or Neenah High School.

439 total survey participants

> 423 have had or currently have a student in a case student school

Once collected, the survey responses were analyzed to identify key themes and areas for improvement. Findings revealed that a significant portion of students rely on cars or school buses for transportation, with only a small percentage walking or biking regularly. Safety concerns, including high vehicle speeds, insufficient sidewalks, and unsafe crossings, were frequently mentioned as barriers to active transportation. The full results of the community survey are provided in **Appendix B**.

Meetings

Three virtual stakeholder meetings and two in-person engagement sessions were conducted during the study. Participants in the meetings included residents, students, crossing guards, school officials and city officials. The primary objectives of these meetings were to gather stakeholder input on key issues related to:

- Traffic safety near schools
- Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure
- Built environment around schools
- School pick-up and drop-off safety
- Walking and biking participation

Stakeholder and engagement meetings are critical to a Safe Routes to School study because they help ensure the approach is collaborative and community-driven. The participants' insight contributes to the recommendations by making sure the project aligns with their goals.

Stakeholder Meetings

At the virtual stakeholder meetings, participants discussed the built environment through guided questions. Stakeholders also had the opportunity to voice concerns and provide feedback on the study. Attendees included students from Neenah High School, school and city officials, community health strategists from the Winnebago County Health Department, and Directors of Transportation.

Engagement Meetings

During the engagement meetings, participants received a brief presentation on the risk analysis conducted at the case study school(s), followed by three breakout discussions. One group engaged in a focused discussion with prepared questions, joined by Brian Lee from Relevation. The other two groups gathered around a roll plot of the school district, with consultant team members Derek Hungness and Angela Rinaldi guiding discussion.



Key Ideas Shared by Stakeholders

Use social media, school communication platforms and parent meeting to educate about safety.

Stagger dismissal times to prioritize active transportation. Include sidewalks and bike lanes in road reconstruction projects to enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety.

Crash Analysis

To assess traffic safety, pedestrian and bicyclist crashes within each school boundary over the past 5 years were analyzed using WisTransPortal data.

There were 5 pedestrian and bicyclist crashes within the Bonduel Elementary School attendance boundary (the area the school serves), 19 in Oakwood, 50 in Read, and 73 in the Neenah High School boundary. A graphic of these crashes is shown to the right.

Out of those total vulnerable road user (VRU) crashes for each school, the crashes involving student aged VRUs were analyzed. The number of pedestrian and bicyclist crashes with 3 different age categories are shown below. Neenah High School, which serves a broader area than the elementary schools leads in most VRU incidents. Read also shows a higher number of crashes, particularly for bicyclists aged 14-18, while Bonduel and Oakwood have relatively lower counts across all categories.



School Aged Pedestrian & Bicyclist Crashes



There were various actions contributing to the crashes involving student-aged VRUs such as driver or VRU failing to yield, speeding, and distracted driving. Crash severity was examined to determine the proportion of incidents resulting in injuries. Across all case-study schools, the majority of pedestrian and bicyclist crashes resulted in property damage only (PDO) or minor injury crashes. It is important to note that eight crashes were hit-and-runs, meaning the data may be slightly skewed due to incomplete crash details.



Risk Assessments

Recognizing the limitations of traditional crash-history-based safety analysis, TADI's certified Road Safety Professionals (RSP) developed a proprietary innovative, proactive approach to evaluating pedestrian safety.

This method uses objective, science-based criteria to calculate pedestrian crash risk by assessing a pedestrian's exposure to potential hazards while walking along and crossing roadways. Grounded in research on how roadway and traffic characteristics impact safety, this data-driven approach enables the identification of high-risk areas before crashes occur. The assessment incorporates specific criteria, such as walking distance, traffic volume, vehicle speeds, and the presence of safety features, to provide a comprehensive evaluation of pedestrian risk.

By analyzing key factors such as vehicle speeds, crossing distances, and pedestrian exposure before and after improvements, we can quantify the impact of safety measures. For example, a corridor with high-risk ratings due to excessive crossing distances and high traffic volumes may show a substantial reduction in risk scores after the installation of a pedestrian refuge island, enhanced crosswalk markings, or speed management treatments.

This data-driven approach allows communities to prioritize improvements based on measurable safety benefits rather than relying solely on crash history. By proactively assessing risk and tracking changes over time, decision-makers can implement strategies that prevent crashes before they happen.

A risk assessment was conducted for each of the case study schools. The following chapter presents a detailed analysis for each school and provides specific recommendations for each school. The risk assessments are provided in **Appendix A**.



Case Study Schools

To understand how the built environment affects student travel in East Central Wisconsin, this study examined four case study schools: Neenah High School, Read Elementary School (Oshkosh), Oakwood Elementary School (Oshkosh), and Bonduel Elementary School. These schools were selected to represent urban, suburban, and rural communities.

Below is an approximate graphical representation of the case study schools on a map of the state of Wisconsin.

The profiles on the following pages highlight each school's specific transportation challenges, existing infrastructure, risk factors, and community context.

Each case study includes:

- Key transportation and safety challenges
- · Built environment context
- Risk assessment and stakeholder insights
- Recommended infrastructure or policy improvements

As part of this analysis, data from Strava [1] is used to supplement understanding of walking and biking activity. Strava is a fitness app that collects GPS data from walking, running, and biking trips, providing insight into commonly used routes and general active transportation patterns. Additional safety countermeasures that can be applied more broadly across schools are presented in Chapter 7.



[1] Strava. (Year). Strava Global Heatmaps – All Activities [Screenshots]. Retrieved from https://www.strava.com/heatmap.

Neenah High School

Neenah High School Community and School Context

Neenah High School, serves nearly 2,000 students in grades 9-12, and is situated in a transitional area between suburban and semi-rural landscapes. After relocating in 2023 to 500 Rocket Way, the new campus brought with it both opportunities and challenges for student travel. The surrounding area includes a mix of residential neighborhoods, commercial property, and higher-speed arterial roads, creating a somewhat disconnected environment for those walking and biking to school. Although the school sees some participation in active transportation, with an estimated 20-40 students walking and about 10 biking daily, many factors limit these numbers. Wide, fast-moving roads and infrastructure gaps contribute to a sense of risk among families and students, despite the school's modern facilities and community support.

Built Environment

A key issue facing Neenah High School is the disconnect between residential neighborhoods and safe, continuous pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. While some sidewalks and bike lanes exist along nearby streets, these facilities do not consistently connect to the school. Crosswalks at major intersections are long, and the corridors surrounding the school carry high volumes of traffic at high speeds. These factors create safety risks for cyclists and pedestrians.

Traffic calming measures, such as reducedspeed school zones, are noticeably absent. High traffic volumes on the major collector, County Road II / Winchester Road during



school drop-off and pick-up times increase the chances of conflict between vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists. Although the north access point (Rocket Way & County Road II) includes some pedestrian safety features, besides the sidewalk along Rocket Way, the south access point is primarily designed for car and bus traffic. The south access road, Rocket Way, is long and straight, allowing vehicles especially during off-peak hours to exceed safe speeds. While this design benefits bus circulation, it does not contribute to pedestrian comfort and safety.

MEDIUM LEVEL OF ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION (COMPARED TO OTHER CASE STUDY SCHOOLS)

This area shows a moderate level of walking and biking compared to other case study schools. The Strava heatmap (described on the previous page) indicates activity along main roads and nearby neighborhoods, but usage is less concentrated than in higher-activity zones.

CHAPTER 3

Areas of Concern

The high scoring intersections and roadways were identified in the assessments based on factors such as posted speed limit, average annual daily traffic (AADT), crossing distances, and presence of safety features. Below are the high scoring crossings or roadways around Neenah High School with the key reasons for their elevated risk. This format will be used for the other case study schools in the following pages.

Top Infrastructure Concerns

Based on Risk Assessment

County Road CB at Winchester Road

01. Concern: Crossing of 122-feet on north leg, with a 45-mph posted speed limit.

Larsen Road

Concern: Absence of sidewalks and narrow road.

Winchester Road at Rocket Way

03. Concern: 77-feet crossing on west leg and 45-mph posted speed limit.

Clayton Avenue

04.

Posted speed of 45-mph and no sidewalks.





Stakeholders from across the Neenah community including students, school staff, parents, and public safety shared consistent concerns about speed, traffic congestion, lack of connectivity, and safe crossings. In fact, traffic congestion and lack of safe crossings discourage parents from allowing their teens to walk or bike, even if the distance is manageable. There was broad agreement that reducing traffic speed and improving crossings would significantly increase the likelihood of more students engaging in active travel.

The next page provides recommended improvements for the top concerning locations listed here, identified through the **risk assessment**, as well as additional locations highlighted through community **engagement** including stakeholder meetings, a survey, and public input sessions.

G Map source: Google Maps. Used under fair use for illustrative, non-commercial purposes.

Infrastructure Improvements



NOTE: Future evaluation of traffic calming measures along Rocket Way, south of Neenah High School, is recommended if excessive vehicle speeds are observed.

Policy, Cost, and Future Direction

Page Overview

This page outlines additional factors of transportation safety at Neenah High School. It includes a cost comparison, showing how safety features can be implemented for approximately the same cost as a single pedestrian or bicyclist fatality, a policy review, and highlights opportunities for moving forward. With higher traffic volumes and more complex travel patterns, improvements near the school should balance practicality with longterm impact.

Economic Comparison

Context: This section shows the societal cost of a fatal crash, illustrating how safety improvements (listed below) can save approximately **\$15 million** for each crash prevented. This cost-benefit analysis was conducted for each case study school to demonstrate the economic value of implementing these safety measures.

\$15,079,215 Comprehensive Crash Cost of a Fatality

For an equivalent investment, we can proactively prevent crashes and injuries through safety improvements – enough to implement the following measures 7 times:

- 8 High-Visibility Crosswalks**
- **1** Leading Pedestrian Interval Timings
- 4 LED No RTOR Signs & Installation
- 2 Miles of Asphalt Paved Shoulder*
- 2 Miles of Multi-Use Paved Path*
- 2 Miles of Street Lighting
- 4 No RTOR Signs
- 6 School Signs
- 1 Speed Study

* Estimated for one side of street. **Includes paint & maintaining for 20yrs. (Cost estimate excludes ROW acquisition costs)

Policy Review

Neenah High School's Unusually Hazardous Transportation (UHT) Plan has had only minor updates since the 1970's to reflect current conditions at the new campus. This presents a key opportunity for the district to reassess eligibility for busing and prioritize safe walking and biking routes using today's best practices.

Additionally, Neenah High School and the surrounding area could benefit from updated pedestrian safety measures and integrating more community engagement strategies, such as driver awareness to support safe, active transportation. Chapter 6 provides further discussion on relevant policy implications.

Moving Forward: Economic Comparison Neenah High School stands at a unique intersection of growth and evolving transportation needs. As the community continues to develop, proactive planning and collaboration will be critical to ensure that students can access their education safely, whether they walk, bike, drive, or take the bus.

Investing in these improvements now will not only improve student safety but also promote long-term health, equity, and environmental benefits for the broader community. With the support of ECWRPC, school officials, municipal partners, and families, Neenah High School has the potential to become a model for how new campuses can integrate seamlessly with active transportation networks.

The following page focuses on Bonduel Elementary School with pages for Read and Oakwood Elementary Schools to follow in a similar format.

Bonduel Elementary School

Bonduel Elementary School Community and School Context

Bonduel Elementary School, nestled in the Village of Bonduel in Shawano County, serves approximately 329 students in grades Pre-K through 5. The school sits near County Road BE, a main thoroughfare that also supports middle and high school campuses just a quarter mile to the north. While this compact educational corridor offers convenience, the surrounding road network presents major challenges for active transportation.

Like many rural schools, Bonduel Elementary School experiences very low rates of walking and biking. Most students are bused or driven by caregivers. Infrastructure in the area reflects this reality. Sidewalks are limited, roads are narrow, and traffic speeds tend to be higher due to the rural context. But with targeted investments and strong community support, Bonduel Elementary School and the surrounding area can improve safety and encourage more walking and biking.

Built Environment

Bonduel's street network includes several well-traveled roads, including Green Bay Street, Cecil Street, and Shioc Street. These roads serve dual purposes as community connectors and school access route. However, they lack the features typically associated with safe school zones. One of the most pressing concerns is the curve along Shioc Street near the elementary school. During engagement sessions, school district staff reported frequent near-misses and unreported crashes at this location, often involving high school drivers. Winter



conditions worsen the issue, as snowbanks further reduce visibility and width, increasing the risks. Green Bay Street west of the High School illustrates the challenges pedestrians and cyclists face. The speed limit increases from 25 to 40 mph and there is a lack of sidewalks to alert drivers to potential school activity. Students walking from neighborhoods like Whitnee Way must navigate a narrow, informal path to reach Shioc Street. Future developments, including new businesses and housing, will increase traffic, making pedestrian improvements even more critical.

LOW LEVEL OF ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION (COMPARED TO OTHER CASE STUDY SCHOOLS)

Bonduel Elementary shows a low level of walking and biking activity compared to the other case study schools. The Strava heatmap displays minimal recorded pedestrian or bicycle. While some students may walk or bike from nearby neighborhoods, most rely on school buses or vehicles.

CHAPTER 3

Areas of Concern

The main concerns, shown below, around Bonduel Elementary School are roads with no sidewalk or path, consisting of a posted speed of 40-mph or higher, and high average annual daily traffic (AADT) crossings.





05. Concern: AADT of 7,300.







G Map source: Google Maps. Used under fair use for illustrative, non-commercial purposes

Infrastructure Improvements

Location(s) Identified Through Risk Assessment 1 Green Bay Street - Shioc Street to Whitnee Way Cost a. Install a paved path of 4 feet **\$**\$\$\$ or greater or sidewalk. Cost b. Conduct a speed study to **\$**\$\$\$ 1. Shioc Street reduce posted speed limit from 40 mph to 35 mph. **Cecil Street at South Street** Cost a. Add temporary curb extension **\$**\$\$\$ on the northwest corner of the intersection if/when continuing sign. sidewalk on Cecil Street. 2. W Mill Street **Cecil Street at State Street** Cost a. Install high-visibility **\$**\$\$\$ crosswalks on all legs. install a RRFB. b. Install a paved path of 4 feet or greater or sidewalk. **Cecil Street at E Mill Street** Cost a. Install a high-visibility **\$**\$\$\$ crosswalk and RRFB at existing north crosswalk location. **Cecil Street at Green Bay Street** Cost a. Install high-visibility **\$**\$\$\$ crosswalks. Cost b. Install temporary curb **\$**\$\$\$ extensions.

(Continued)

c. Add "No Right Turn On Red when Pedestrians are Present" electric signage.



Location(s) Identified Through Engagement

- Cost a. Install a paved path of 4 feet \$\$\$\$ or greater or sidewalk.
- b. Install speed humps before the curve by the school.



- Cost c. Install a "Sharp Curve Ahead" \$\$\$\$
- Cost a. At the existing crosswalk **\$\$**\$\$ connecting to the playground,
 - Cost SSSS

Policy, Cost, and Future Direction

Page Overview

This page focuses on transportation safety considerations around Bonduel Elementary School, including a cost comparison showing how safety features can be implemented for approximately the same cost as a single pedestrian or bicyclist fatality. It also includes a review of existing policies and shows a path on how to move forward. The information presented reflects local conditions and helps guide decisions that support safer travel near the school.

Economic Comparison

Context: This section shows the societal cost of a fatal crash, illustrating how safety improvements (listed below) can save approximately \$15 million for each crash prevented. This cost-benefit analysis was conducted for each case study school to demonstrate the economic value of implementing these safety measures.

\$15,07<u>9,215</u> **Comprehensive Crash Cost** of a Fatality

> For an equivalent investment, we can proactively prevent crashes and injuries through safety improvements - enough to implement the following measures 6 times:

- "Sharp Curve Ahead" Signs 2
- 4 Asphalt Speed Humps
- High-Visibility Crosswalks**
 LED No RTOR Signs & Installation
 Miles of Multi-Use Paved Path*
- No RTOR Signs 4
- 8 **Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon Crossings**
- Speed Study
- Temporary Curb Extensions w/ Bollards***

Policy Review

Bonduel Elementary School relies on strong bus transportation policies, including eligibility for students beyond two miles, designated bus stops, and an UHT plan ensuring busing for students residing in areas classified as transportation hazards due to unsafe walking conditions. However, pedestrian and bicycle safety measures are minimal. Sidewalks are limited, there is minimal bike parking, transportation policies and health and wellness policies do not encourage active transportation as a safe and viable option.

The Village of Bonduel's Comprehensive Plan identifies pedestrian safety as a priority, creating a strategic opportunity to align school infrastructure needs with broader municipal goals. A mix of infrastructure upgrades, education efforts, community partnerships, and policy planning updates could bring meaningful improvements over the next few years.

Moving Forward: Economic Comparison Bonduel Elementary School may be the most rural of the case study schools, but its challenges are far from unique. Across East Central Wisconsin, many small towns are facing similar issues. But Bonduel's proactive community, compact school siting, and potential for future growth make it a perfect candidate for rural Safe Routes to School transformation. With small investments, Bonduel can become a model of how even small villages can support active travel and improve quality of life.

* Estimated for one side of street. **Includes paint & maintaining for 20yrs. ***Assumes 10 Bollards (Cost estimate excludes ROW acquisition costs)

Read Elementary School

Read Elementary School Community and School Context

Read Elementary School, located in the heart of Oshkosh, serves around 300 students from kindergarten through fifth grade. The school is surrounded by a dense network of residential streets, community spaces, and local streets with moderate traffic volumes. The University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh and student housing are also in close proximity.

This urban location gives Read Elementary School a distinct advantage in terms of walkability. Many families live within a halfmile of the school, and sidewalks are common in the surrounding neighborhoods. As a result, Read Elementary School has the highest rate of active transportation among the case study schools, with approximately 30 students walking or biking to school on a regular basis.

Despite its relatively strong foundation for walking and biking, Read Elementary School faces several safety challenges tied to traffic speed, visibility, and perceptions of personal safety. Nonetheless, the school community has shown significant enthusiasm for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) efforts like the Walking School Bus program, creating a promising environment for future improvements.

Built Environment

The area around Read Elementary School is characterized by a grid-style street network with mature trees, access to sidewalks and crosswalks, and several controlled intersections. These assets support walkability but are undermined by



long crossing distances, a lack of crossing guards, missing pedestrian signals, and high volumes of vehicle traffic.

Despite a walking school bus starting this year, parents receive more guidance on drop-off/pick-up than safe walking routes to school. Pedestrian-vehicle conflicts are a concern, especially at dismissal. Parents queue along Algoma Boulevard, and while a crossing guard is at Spruce Street and New York Avenue, visibility issues (e.g., tree obstructions at Bent Avenue and Algoma Boulevard) pose risks. Busy intersections like Congress Avenue/ WIS 21 and Arboretum Drive/Summit Avenue create turning conflicts, even with traffic controls in place.

Survey responses also highlighted concerns about personal safety. While only a small number of respondents raised these issues, they highlight the importance of considering both physical and emotional safety in travel planning.

Areas of Concern

HIGH LEVEL OF ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION (COMPARED TO OTHER CASE STUDY SCHOOLS)

Read Elementary demonstrates a high level of walking and biking compared to the other case study schools. The Strava heatmap shows concentrated pedestrian and bicycle activity across the surrounding neighborhood, with strong connectivity to residential areas and nearby destinations.

Below are the high scoring crossings and roadways surrounding Read Elementary School. The main concerns are roads and crossings with high AADT, long crossings, and a lack of safety features at key intersections.

Top Infrastructure Concerns Based on Risk Assessment

Congress Avenue at Algoma Boulevard.

Concern: West leg has a AADT of 10,100 and a 60-foot crossing.

Congress Avenue at Arboretum Drive

02. High volume (greater than 800 hourly traffic) & unsignalized intersection.

Congress Avenue at High Avenue

03. Concern: AADT of 5,100, no pedestrian countdown timers.

Algoma Boulevard at New York Avenue

04. **Concern:** East leg has a crossing greater than 50 feet and low visibility.







G Map source: Google Maps. Used under fair use for illustrative, non-commercial purposes

Infrastructure Improvements

Location(s) Identified Through Risk Assessment Congress Avenue at Algoma Boulevard Cost a. Add "No Right Turn On Red when Pedestrians are Present" \$\$\$\$ signage. Cost b. Implement a Leading **\$**\$\$\$ Pedestrian Interval (LPI) for all pedestrian phases. **Congress Avenue at Arboretum** b. Install temporary curb **Drive** extensions. Cost a. Assign a crossing guard if **\$**\$\$\$ not provided already. **Congress Avenue at High Avenue** Cost a. Install high-visibility **\$**\$\$\$ crosswalks on all legs. Cost b. Install pedestrian countdown **\$\$**\$\$ timers. Cost c. Program a Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) for all \$\$\$\$ pedestrian phases. 4) Algoma Boulevard at New York **Avenue** Cost a. Install high-visibility \$\$\$\$ crosswalks on all legs.

Cost

\$\$\$\$

b. Apply Curb Radius Reduction on east leg.

(Continued)

c. Consider using signage and striping to prohibit the cut-through movements on east leg from west leg.



Location(s) Identified Through Engagement

1. Vine Avenue Crossings at Algoma **Boulevard & High Avenue**

- Cost a. Install high-visibility **\$**\$\$\$ crosswalks on all legs.
 - Cost **\$**\$\$\$
- Cost c. Install RRFB on north leg at **\$\$**\$\$ Vine Avenue and High Avenue

Policy, Cost, and Future Direction

Page Overview

The economic comparison is shown below for Read Elementary School. A policy review is also shown to describe the transportation programs currently at the elementary school and identify opportunities for improvement. This page closes out with a look into the school and community can move forward effectively.

Economic Comparison

Context: This section shows the societal cost of a fatal crash, illustrating how safety improvements (listed below) can save approximately **\$15 million** for each crash prevented. This cost-benefit analysis was conducted for each case study school to demonstrate the economic value of implementing these safety measures.

\$15,079,215 🗰 **Comprehensive Crash Cost** of a Fatality

> For an equivalent investment, we can proactively prevent crashes and injuries through safety improvements - enough to implement the following measures 28 times:

- **Crossing Guard for 15 years**
- Curb Radius Reductions
- 12 High-Visibility Crosswalks**
 2 Leading Pedestrian Interval Timings
 4 LED No RTOR Signs & Installation
- 4 No RTOR Signs
- 4 Pedestrian Signals (Countdown Timers)
- Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon Crossing
- Temporary Curb Extensions w/ Bollards*

*Assumes 10 Bollards **Includes paint & maintaining for 20yrs.

Policy Review

Read Elementary School already participates in Safe Routes to School programming and benefits from proximity to GO Transit public transportation routes. These resources provide a solid foundation for expanding efforts related to active transportation. In 2024, the school began piloting a walking school bus program. Implementing the walking school bus program reflects the school's commitment to student well-being. However, several policy areas could be improved. For example, the school could formalize its drop-off and pick-up circulation plan to reduce vehicle congestion and improve pedestrian flow. There is a policy in the handbook on bikes, skateboards, and scooters that could be updated to encourage active transportation. While crossing guards are stationed at key intersections, their coverage could be expanded or supplemented with temporary infrastructure, such as cones, signage, and curb bump-outs.

Moving Forward: Economic Comparison

Read Elementary School already has a strong foundation in place. Sidewalks, a walkable grid, and supportive staff and families working towards creating a culture of walking and biking. Safety enhancements are needed to build on that success. The school's urban setting provides a unique chance to model best practices for other city schools in the region. By combining strategic infrastructure upgrades with supportive policies and community engagement, Read Elementary School can continue to grow its active travel participation while ensuring every student gets to school safely and confidently.

Oakwood Elementary School

Oakwood Elementary School Community and School Context

Oakwood Elementary School, located in the Town of Algoma, serves approximately 300 students in grades K-5. Situated in a suburban neighborhood with pockets of open space and residential development, the school sits at the crossroads of suburban design and transportation challenges. Unlike its urban counterpart Read Elementary School, Oakwood Elementary School's surroundings are less walkable by design, with wider roadways, fewer intersections, and less dense housing patterns. These characteristics make active transportation more difficult, but not impossible.

Currently, the School District offers busing to the entire student population, however, around 25 students choose to regularly walk or bike to school. The presence of two walking school buses shows strong community interest in safe active travel, even in the face of infrastructure gaps and traffic-related concerns. For families who live within walking distance, the right improvements can increase interest and help families feel confident in choosing to walk or bike daily.

Built Environment

Omro Road serves as the main corridor near Oakwood Elementary School area and sees significant congestions in the morning and afternoon hours. While sidewalks and bike lanes exist along Omro Road, key connectors lack sidewalks, pushing students onto narrow road shoulders or grassy ditches.



Recent crashes around the school reinforce concerns. Congestion during dismissal times and the 35-mph speed limit on Omro Road suggest a need for enforcement or a speed study. Long-term safety improvements-particularly for students crossing WIS 21-should be prioritized. Although the risk assessment identified the WIS-21 crossings as too hazardous for students to cross, the fact that students are regularly crossing here makes it essential to review for potential safety upgrades.

Parents, staff, and members of the community report that traffic volumes spike during drop-off and dismissal and that driver behavior becomes unpredictable. Some motorists ignore the presence of children or fail to yield at marked crosswalks. Without strong visual or physical cues to slow down, drivers often maintain high speeds or disregard the school zone creating risks for students.

Areas of Concern

MEDIUM LEVEL OF ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION (COMPARED TO OTHER CASE STUDY SCHOOLS)

Oakwood Elementary exhibits a moderate level of walking and biking activity. The Strava heatmap shows consistent pedestrian and bicycle movement along neighborhood streets and nearby corridors. While not as concentrated as high-activity zones, the area supports a noticeable level of active transportation.

Below are the high scoring crossings and roadways surrounding Oakwood Elementary School. The main concerns are roads with no sidewalk or path with a posted speed of 40-mph or higher and high average annual daily traffic (AADT) crossings.

Top Infrastructure Concerns Based on Risk Assessment

Omro Road at Oakwood Road

Concern: AADT of 4,600, few safety features, 35-mph posted speed limit.

North Oakwood Road

02. Concern: No sidewalk, narrow road, 30-mph posted speed limit.

Valley Road

03. Concern: No sidewalk, narrow road,

Crossings on Omro Road

04. Concern: Only a crosswalk at Honey Creek Dr. and Snowdon Dr, 35-mph.







G Map source: Google Maps. Used under fair use for illustrative, non-commercial purposes

Infrastructure Improvements



4 Crossing on Omro Road at Honey **Creek Drive & at Snowdon Drive**



b. Install a RRFB with advance



Cost

Cost

Cost

Cost

\$\$\$\$

\$\$\$\$

\$\$\$\$

ŠŠŠŠ

Location(s) Identified Through Engagement

- a. Add speed feedback signs.
- b. Assign crossing guards as determined by the
- c. Add dashed bike lane markings (from Leonard Point Road to Brooks Lane.
- d. Paint advance yield lines at high volume pedestrian

Policy, Cost, and Future Direction

Page Overview

The economic comparison below outlines potential safety improvements for Oakwood Elementary School. A policy review highlights the school's current transportation programs and identifies areas where updates or enhancements could be made. The page concludes with considerations for how the school and community can move forward in a meaningful and effective way.

Economic Comparison

Context: This section shows the societal cost of a fatal crash, illustrating how safety improvements (listed below) can save approximately **\$15 million** for each crash prevented. This cost-benefit analysis was conducted for each case study school to demonstrate the economic value of implementing these safety measures.

\$15,079,215 🞰 **Comprehensive Crash Cost** of a Fatality

> For an equivalent investment, we can proactively prevent crashes and injuries through safety improvements - enough to implement the following measures 11 times:

- Advance Yield Lines** 8
- **All-Way Stop Control Study**
- 2 Crossing Guards for 15 Years
- 60 Dashed Bike Lane Markings (per intersection)
- 8 High-Visibility Crosswalks**
- 4 Miles of Concrete Sidewalk*
- **Raised Crosswalk***
- **Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon Crossings** 2
- 2 Speed Feedback Signs Speed Study
- * Estimated for one side of street. **Includes paint & maintaining for 20yrs. (Cost estimate excludes ROW acquisition costs)

Policy Review

Currently, Oakwood Elementary School buses all students, and there is no designated Unusually Hazardous Transportation (UHT) Plan in place—likely because walking is not formally encouraged due to existing hazards. However, this offers a fresh opportunity: as development continues and neighborhood connectivity improves, the school could evaluate its transportation policies and introduce updated eligibility zones or walking incentives.

Additionally, Oakwood Elementary School has established designated zones and structured procedures for parent and busdrop-offs to enhance traffic management. Oakwood Elementary School has made strides by encouraging helmet use and providing bike racks, signaling a culture open to active transportation. What's missing is the infrastructure and enforcement to match that intent.

Moving Forward: Economic Comparison

Oakwood Elementary School is at the border of suburban development and open space making it a testing ground for how suburban schools can support active transportation in environments traditionally designed for cars.

By closing infrastructure gaps, calming traffic, and building on its strong community foundation, Oakwood Elementary School can evolve from a bus-only environment to one that actively supports walking and biking. Doing so will help reduce congestion, increase physical activity, and foster deeper community connections.

Comparative Analysis

The purpose of this chapter is to identify common trends and unique challenges across case study schools. After gathering data from the stakeholder meetings, engagement meetings, survey, crash analysis and risk assessment, there seemed to be common trends between the schools. Common trends are listed below:

Common Trends Across the Schools

- Speeding & Driver Behavior
- Infrastructure Challenges
- Congestion During Pick-Up/Drop-Off
- Education & Engagement Needs
- Potential for "Walking School Buses"



Across the case study schools, active transportation—walking and biking—remains relatively low, with most students traveling by car or school bus. However, survey results, stakeholder discussions, and field observations reveal a shared opportunity to increase walking and biking participation. While schools differ in their specific conditions, common trends in student travel behavior and community attitudes highlight both challenges and areas for improvement.





Current Active Transportation

Active transportation, including walking and biking, remains an essential mode of travel for students. Understanding the common trends among case study schools and current mode choices help identify patterns, barriers, and opportunities for improving active transportation options to and from school.

The survey provided important insights into the current walking and biking culture at the case study schools.

Results show that the number of students who walk or bike is relatively low, with the majority relying on cars or school buses. Shown below, findings highlight a strong driving culture: 55% of students travel by car, 38% by bus, 2% walk, and 1% bike. Some use a mix of modes, such as busing one way and driving the other. Even with the proper infrastructure provided, 39% and 42% of survey respondents prefer a car and school bus, respectively. This emphasizes the need for a shift in societal behavior if active transportation is to be increased. Only 6% of respondents prefer walking and 12% prefer biking.

The graphic below shows how comfortable students and parents feel walking or biking.

On a scale of 1 to 5, how safe do you or your child currently feel walking to and from school?



Mode Choice for Case Study Schools (from Survey Respondents)



What would be your preferred option of getting to school if provided with the proper infrastructure?



Key Barriers

Although all four case study schools are located in East Central Wisconsin and share common trends, they also face key barriers to active transportation. The most frequently discussed challenges—identified through surveys, stakeholder meetings, engagement sessions, and field observations—include:

Top Barriers for Active Transportation

- 1. Deficiencies in Infrastructure
- 2. Traffic Safety Concerns
- 3. Residence Distance to School
- 4. Speed of Traffic

The survey echoes these barriers in the question and chart listed below:

Would you let your child walk or bike to/from school if the following factors were changed/improved?

Note: Out of the total survey respondents, 372 answered this question.



1. Deficiencies in Infrastructure

A lack of sidewalks, crosswalks, and bike lanes were noted as a concern. Some schools have missing sidewalks, faded crosswalks, or no bike lanes, forcing students and cyclists into traffic.

2. Traffic Safety Concerns

Drivers near school entrances sometimes fail to yield to pedestrians or make unsafe maneuvers, especially during pick-up and drop-off times.

3. Residence Distance to School

A students proximity to school greatly impacts mode choice. The survey showed that 29% of respondents reside within 2 miles of their school, 12% within 1 mile (chart shown below). However, only 3% walk or bike to school. See survey results below.



What is the distance from your residence to your school? Note: Out of the total survey respondents, 416 answered this question.

4. Speed of Traffic

Speeding in school zones is a major concern, which makes respondents feel the areas are unsafe to students walking or biking.

Opportunities for Improvement

Despite challenges, all schools have opportunities to increase walking and biking. Addressing deficiencies in pedestrian and bicyclist infrastructure, traffic safety concerns, distance, and traffic speed can make active transportation safer and more accessible. By building on these opportunities, schools can create safer, healthier, and more active environments for students. Opportunities for improvement are shown on the right.







Increase Connectivity Add sidewalks, pathways, and bike infrastructure that connect schools to housing.



Speed & Traffic Management Evaluate the drop-off and pick-up flow of traffic. Increase signage to enhance awareness and driver yielding.



Decrease Distance from School Build housing developments close to the school. Incorporate walking school buses that meet close to school.



Speed Management Add temporary or permanent traffic calming (i.e. raised islands, speed humps, & curb bumpouts).





Best Practices

The East Central Wisconsin Regional Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program supports local communities and school districts by providing the tools, guidance, and expertise needed to advance safe, active travel to school. Grounded in the goal of improving safety while encouraging healthy habits, the program helps reduce traffic congestion, promote sustainability, and create healthier communities. Central to this approach is the nationally recognized Six E's framework, developed by the Safe Routes Partnership, which outlines best practices for developing effective, equitable, and community-driven SRTS initiatives.

While every school has unique circumstances, common strategies can be applied to enhance safety and encourage more students to walk and bike. By combining infrastructure improvements, awareness efforts, community involvement, and data-driven planning, schools can create long-lasting changes that benefit students and the broader community. Each of the Six E's represents a critical strategy for success:



6 E's

Six E's of Safe Routes to School

This page takes a closer look at what each "E" means in practice and how it supports safe, active school travel. From infrastructure improvements to community partnerships and, where appropriate, coordinated enforcement efforts, each E plays a distinct role in shaping a comprehensive Safe Routes to School program. Together, they provide a well-rounded framework for improving safety, encouraging healthy habits, and ensuring that all students have access to safe routes—regardless of their background, ability, or neighborhood.

Education

ECWRPC's SRTS efforts empower students, families, and drivers with the knowledge to travel safely. Lessons on crossing streets, riding bikes, wearing helmets, and staying alert are paired with reminders for drivers to slow down and watch for students in school zones. Activities like safety clinics, walk audits, and classroom sessions help build lifelong safety habits.

Engagement

Engagement means building strong, two-way relationships with families, school staff, and local partners. ECWRPC listens to community experiences and collaborates to develop school-specific strategies. Engagement also includes participating in events, meetings, and conversations to ensure every voice shapes the program.

Encouragement

Encouragement makes active travel fun and motivating. ECWRPC supports initiatives like Walk to School Day, Bike to School Day, and walking school buses to build excitement and community participation. Recognizing progress and sharing success stories helps sustain energy and involvement over time.

Equity

Equity is central to ECWRPC's SRTS work. The program prioritizes historically underserved areas and ensures that efforts support students of all abilities, backgrounds, and income levels. Equity also means listening to those most affected and designing programs that remove barriers to safe, active travel.

Engineering

ECWRPC helps communities identify and implement street, sidewalk, and intersection improvements that increase safety. Whether it's crosswalks, lighting, traffic calming, or filling sidewalk gaps, even small changes can significantly improve how safe and confident students feel walking or biking to school.

Evaluation

Evaluation ensures that strategies are datadriven and responsive. ECWRPC uses tools like family surveys, student tallies, and crash analysis to track progress and identify areas for improvement. This commitment to continuous learning helps refine approaches and guide future investments.

The following strategies build on the Six E's, offering steps schools and communities can take to support safe, active travel. Evaluation can also highlight where enforcement may be needed to address ongoing safety concerns.

Short-term Strategies (0-2 Years)

Even small changes can make a big difference. Short-term strategies are designed to deliver quick safety improvements with minimal funding or disruption. These actions help build momentum, address urgent concerns, and lay the groundwork for broader, long-term improvements. ECWRPC and its partner communities support locally organized efforts such as Walk to School Days, Walking School Bus programs, and school-based safety education—tailored to the needs of each district. These immediate actions require minimal funding and can be implemented quickly to enhance student safety:

Enhance School Zone Signage

- Install high-visibility signs and pavement markings.
- Use speed feedback signs to alert drivers and reinforce limits.

Increase Crossing Guard Coverage

- Identify and staff high-risk intersections near schools.
- Expand existing programs where feasible.

Community Education Campaigns

- Promote driver awareness through East Central WI SRTS initiatives.
- Focus on slowing speeds and improving pedestrian yielding.

Temporary Traffic Calming

- Pilot low-cost measures like bollards, curb bump-outs, and median islands.
- Monitor results to guide permanent improvements.



Expand Walking School Buses

- Expand walking groups in walkable neighborhoods.
- Partner with parents, volunteers, or local organizations (ECWRPC SRTS).

Traffic Flow Management at Schools

- Establish clear drop-off and pick-up procedures.
- Use staggered dismissal times to reduce congestion.


Medium-term Strategies (3-5 Years)

As communities build on short-term successes, medium-term strategies help create lasting changes that require funding, planning, and policy support. These actions strengthen walking and biking infrastructure, update outdated plans, and foster collaboration across agencies. The following initiatives set the stage for transformative, sustainable improvements:

Sidewalk and Trail Expansion

- Close gaps in pedestrian and bicycle networks to create safe, continuous routes.
- Prioritize access to schools, parks, and neighborhoods.

Intersection Enhancements

- Install curb extensions, pedestrian refuge islands, and improved signal timing.
- Reduce crossing distances and increase driver visibility.

SRTS Policy Updates

- Revise Safe Routes to School Action Plans and Unusually Hazardous Transportation (UHT) plans.
- Reflect current traffic patterns and school travel needs.

Public Transit Partnerships

- Coordinate with transit agencies to support student access.
- Explore student pass programs, stop improvements, and shared planning.







Long-term Strategies (5+ Years)

Long-term strategies create a foundation for generational change. These actions involve larger investments and sustained policy alignment to support walking and biking as routine travel options for students. Through regional coordination and future-focused planning, communities can make active transportation a lasting priority.

Major Infrastructure Upgrades

- Build pedestrian bridges, protected bike lanes, and multi-use trails.
- Focus on high-volume or high-speed corridors.

Speed Limit Reductions and Enforcement

- Work with municipalities to reduce speed limits in school zones.
- Implement enforcement strategies to reduce unsafe behavior.

Complete Streets Policies

- Advocate for policies requiring streets to serve all users.
- Ensure future projects prioritize safety and multimodal access.

Mixed-Use Neighborhood Development

- Encourage housing near schools through collaboration with city planners.
- Support family-friendly, walkable community design.

Sustained Community Engagement

- Establish ongoing Safe Routes to School task forces.
- Maintain focus on school travel safety and long-term progress.







Policy Implications

This chapter offers a detailed overview and recommendations related to student safety policies for school travel at Bonduel Elementary School, Read Elementary School, Oakwood Elementary School, and Neenah High School.

The content is based on school district transportation policies, municipal planning documents, law enforcement guidelines, and Safe Routes to School (SRTS) initiatives. Table 1 [2] provides a policy comparison highlighting differences in how the four case study schools seek to improve safe student travel in their respective areas. The three schools located in urban areas tend to have more pedestrian and biking infrastructure, access to public transportation, and local government support of safe routes to school planning. Conversely, schools in rural settings often focus more on school bus policies and planning for hazardous travel conditions.

	Table 1.	RURAL		URBAN	
Category	Safety Policy	Bonduel Elementary School	Read Elementary School	Oakwood Elementary School	Neenah Hig School
	Walking & Biking Safety Measures		1	1	1
PEDESTRIANS	Crossing Guards at Critical Intersections		1	1	1
	Sidewalk & Crosswalk Improvements		1	1	
DIGVOLED	Bike Racks Available		1	1	1
BICYCLES	Helmet Usage Encouraged		1	1	1
	Bus Transportation Eligibility (2+ miles)	1	1	1	1
	Authorized Bus Stops	1			
2010	Transportation Provider (Kobussen Buses)	1	1	~	1
PEDESTRIANS BICYCLES TRANSIT AUTOMOBILES PLANNING COMMUNICATION & REGULATION	School Bus Laws Enforcement	1	1	1	1
	Public Bus Transit Access (GO TRANSIT)		1	1	
	Bus Driver Training & Conduct Policies	~	1	1	1
	Traffic Flow Plan for Drop-Off/Pick-Up				1
AUTOMOBILES	Infrastructure Assessments		1	1	1.
	Unusually Hazardous Transportation Plans	1	1	*	1
PLANNING	Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program		1	1	1
COMMUNICATION &	Community Engagement & Education		1	1	1
REGULATION	Collaboration with Law Enforcement	1	1	1	1

* Provides busing for all students.

Comparisons to Best Practices

National best practices, as outlined by organizations like the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the Safe Routes to School National Partnership, provide a framework for developing effective transportation policies.

When comparing these best practices to the policies implemented in various schools, several key areas emerge:

1. Comprehensive Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Policies

National guidelines emphasize the importance of policies that support safe and accessible routes for students who walk or bike to school. Urban schools, such as Neenah High School, Read Elementary School, and Oakwood Elementary School, have adopted elements of this best practice by participating in the SRTS program, implementing designated crosswalks, and working with municipal agencies to improve pedestrian access. These schools benefit from well-developed sidewalk networks and marked crossings. In contrast, rural schools like Bonduel Elementary School face different challenges, where long distances and the lack of connected sidewalk infrastructure make walking or biking less practical for many students. Policies in rural areas tend to focus more on risk reduction and alternative transportation options.

2. Policies for Deployment of Crossing Guards

The presence of trained crossing guards at critical intersections is a widely recognized best practice. Urban schools, which often

experience higher traffic volumes, have policies in place to position crossing guards at key locations, improving safety for students walking or biking to school. Neenah High School, Read Elementary School, and Oakwood Elementary School lack documented crossing guard programs. Additional verification may be needed for informal community-based crossing efforts. Rural schools like Bonduel Elementary School, where pedestrian traffic is lower, may not require crossing guards at the same level as urban locations, but could benefit from policies that provide designated school zone signage and speed enforcement measures near school entrances.

3. Bicycle Infrastructure and Safety Education Policies

Encouraging students to bike to school safely requires policies that incorporate infrastructure and education. Urban schools have policies supporting designated bike lanes, bike racks on school grounds, and bicycle safety education programs. Neenah High School, Read Elementary School, and Oakwood Elementary School have policies that facilitate bicycle commuting by providing bike parking and encouraging helmet use and reflective gear. Rural schools, where biking to school is less common due to greater distances and highway conditions, may focus policies on improving off-road bike trail access and ensuring safe bike racks for students who do bike to school.

Comparisons to Best Practices

4. School Bus Transportation Policies

Structured school bus policies are essential in both urban and rural settings, but their implementation varies based on the built environment. In rural areas, school bus transportation is often the primary means of student travel, as distances between homes and schools can be significant. Bonduel Elementary School, for example, contracts with Kobussen Buses Ltd. and follows policies that ensure coverage for a large rural geographic area. All case study schools are served by Kobussen buses within their school service boundaries.

5. Integration with Public Transit Policies

In regions where public transportation is available, integrating these services into school transportation plans provides students with additional commuting options. Read Elementary School and Oakwood Elementary School have free public transit access through a partnership with GO Transit.

6. Traffic Flow Management Policies

Managing vehicular traffic during school drop-off and pick-up times requires structured policies that address congestion and safety risks. These policies help regulate traffic in dense urban environments. Rural schools often face different challenges, such as managing student drop-offs along highways or narrow roads. Policies in these areas could focus on creating safer rural drop-off points with clear sightlines and reduced speed limits.

7. Infrastructure Assessment Policies

Regular evaluation of transportation infrastructure allows schools to adjust policies related to sidewalks, crosswalks, bike lanes, and bus stops. Urban schools, where students walk and bike more frequently, conduct assessments to identify areas needing maintenance or upgrades, as seen at Read Elementary School and Oakwood Elementary School. Rural schools, where infrastructure gaps may be more significant, require policies that prioritize funding for improved bus stops, road shoulders, and safer pedestrian access where feasible.

8. Community Engagement and Transportation Safety Policies

A strong transportation safety culture depends on policies that promote collaboration between schools, families, and local authorities. Best practices include policies requiring traffic safety education for students and parents, formalized collaboration with law enforcement, and active community participation in transportation discussions. Schools in urban settings, such as Neenah High School, Read Elementary School, and Oakwood Elementary School, have policies that engage law enforcement in pedestrian and cycling safety programs. Bonduel Elementary School, recognizing the challenges of rural travel, may benefit from policies that emphasize driver awareness campaigns and partnerships with county officials to improve road safety near schools.

Policy Recommendations

To meaningfully improve student travel safety and encourage more walking and biking, schools and districts must move beyond reactive measures and begin embedding active transportation into everyday policy decisions. The following strategies offer practical, scalable actions that schools can adopt now to better support safe, healthy, and connected school commutes. These recommendations reflect national best practices and are intended to help schools respond quickly to current needs while building toward long-term, systemic improvements.

School Policy Recommendations to Promote Active Transportation

Promote Walking and Biking Through School-Led Policies

- Set specific, measurable objectives to grow active transportation mode share.
- Integrate walking school buses and bike trains as standard transportation options, not just occasional events.
- Build momentum from Walk to School Day by initiating recurring programs such as Walking Wednesdays challenges or Trail Tuesdays for a rural bike challenge.

Improve Drop-Off and Pick-Up Area Safety

- Prioritize safe access for students walking and biking through designated entry points or time-restricted windows.
- Develop and communicate formal traffic circulation plans that reduce vehicle congestion, idling, and pedestrian-vehicle conflicts near school entrances.
- Designate safe drop-off locations where students can be dropped off nearby and walk to school.

Implement Bicycle-Friendly School Practices

- Provide secure, highly visible bike racks near main school entrances to encourage daily use.
- Partner with East Central Wisconsin's Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program to integrate bicycle and pedestrian safety instruction into physical education or health classes.

Align with Complete Streets and Local Planning Efforts

- Support policies that incorporate, where feasible, sidewalks, bike lanes, shoulders, trails, and safe crossings with all new construction, renovations, and nearby road improvements.
- Coordinate with county highway departments to address school travel in road projects.
- Collaborate with municipal staff and regional planners to ensure student travel safety is incorporated into comprehensive plans and transportation updates.
- Encourage compact, mixed-use development near schools to promote walkable, bikeable neighborhoods.
- Reinforce school zone safety by advocating for reduced speed limits and integrating Complete Streets principles into local street design and capital improvement planning.

Policy Recommendation Timeline

A phased implementation timeline accompanies the recommendations on the previous page to help districts take immediate action while planning for longterm, system-wide improvements. This chapter reviewed school transportation safety policies at Bonduel Elementary School, Read Elementary School, Oakwood Elementary School, and Neenah High School, comparing rural and urban contexts and their alignment with national best practices. Urban schools often benefit from greater access to pedestrian infrastructure and transit partnerships, while rural schools focus more on bus transportation and risk reduction due to longer travel distances. Despite these differences, all schools can adopt effective strategies to improve safety and support active transportation.The following timeline outlines short-, medium-, and long-term actions districts can take to implement these strategies and build a safer, more equitable transportation system for students. Funding opportunities to support these actions are provided on the next page.

Implementation Timeline

Short-Term (0-2 Years)

Adopt an Active Transportation Policy district-wide

Update Unusually Hazardous Transportation plans to reflect walking/biking safety

Medium-Term (3-5 Years)

Partner with planners and traffic engineers to create School Zone Complete Streets policies

Conduct annual student commute audits to monitor trends

Long-Term (5+ Years)

Encourage mixed-use developments near schools

Establish intergovernmental agreements for sustained infrastructure funding

Funding

Funding Opportunities for School Transportation Safety

Securing funding for school transportation improvements can be a challenge, but various federal, state, and local programs provide financial support for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, safety initiatives, and active transportation projects. Many of these programs such as the Transportation Alternative Set-Aside Program (TAP) and the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), offer grants to enhance student safety and encourage walking and biking to school. Schools and municipalities should explore these opportunities to develop safer routes, install crossing infrastructure, and implement educational programs.

For schools unfamiliar with the funding process, a good starting point is to collaborate with the regional planning commission, municipal officials, and state transportation agencies to identify eligibility and application requirements. Many funding sources require data-driven justification, so conducting a school transportation assessment—like this study—can strengthen applications.

Additionally, schools can seek technical assistance from state Department of Transportations or Safe Routes to School coordinators to navigate the grant process. A full list of funding sources and application links is provided in **Appendix C** to help schools take the next steps in securing resources for safer, more accessible transportation options.

Key Programs

Transportation Alternative Set-Aside Program (TAP): Supports projects that improve non-motorized transportation, including sidewalks, bike lanes, trails, and Safe Routes to School initiatives. Provides funding for infrastructure improvements, education, and encouragement programs to make it safer and easier for students to walk and bike to school.

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP): Funds projects aimed at reducing traffic-related fatalities and serious injuries, including pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements near schools.

Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) Grants: Provides competitive funding for large-scale infrastructure projects, including active transportation and school safety enhancements.

Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG): Offers flexible funding for a wide range of transportation projects, including pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure that improves school access.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ): Supports projects that reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality, such as bike paths and pedestrian-friendly street designs near schools.

Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A):

Provides grants to develop and implement comprehensive safety action plans aimed at preventing roadway deaths, including those affecting students walking or biking to school.

Economic Implications

Nationally, pedestrian crashes are a leading cause of death for children under 14 years old. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) reported that in 2022, 244 child pedestrians and bicyclists were killed in traffic crashes. Seventy-six percent of child pedestrian fatalities occurred in urban areas, and 24 percent in rural areas. Eighty-four percent of child bicycle fatalities occurred in urban areas, with 16 percent occurring in rural areas.

Cost of Fatalities vs. Safety Investments

From an economic perspective, pedestrian crashes in school zones lead to substantial losses. The U.S. Department of Transportation estimates the Value of a Statistical Life (VSL) at \$13.2 million as of 2023, which represents society's valuation for preventing a single fatality. This figure includes tangible costs (medical expenses, lost productivity, emergency response) and intangible costs (pain, suffering, and quality of life).

It is notable that this estimate is not adjusted for age, meaning that the VSL is applied uniformly regardless of whether the individual lost was a child or an older adult. While VSL remains consistent across age groups, the lost future earnings (LFE) component of an economic analysis would likely be much higher for a 10-year-old student than for a 60-year-old pedestrian. For younger individuals, the potential lifetime earnings loss is substantial, given that they have yet to enter the workforce. A child fatality could result in the loss of decades of productivity, wages, and



economic contributions to society. For older adults, while their lives are equally valued, their remaining earning years are fewer, resulting in a lower lost productivity estimate in financial terms.

This distinction is particularly relevant for school zone safety, where investments that reduce child pedestrian fatalities have amplified long-term economic benefits compared to general traffic safety measures. Lost future earnings factors include age, work-life expectancy, education level, career advancement path, and inflation rates. LFE estimates are inherently speculative.

However, if LFE estimates were included in addition to VSL, the true economic cost of a child fatality could exceed \$15 million, reinforcing the high return on investment for school zone safety enhancements. This highlights the substantial safety enhancements a community could achieve for the cost of one fatal crash.

Impact of School Safety Investments

One of the most significant benefits of school safety investments is the reduction in crash-related costs. The Highway Safety Manual (HSM) and FHWA provide welldocumented cost estimates for various crash types. By implementing targeted countermeasures such as high-visibility crosswalks, pedestrian hybrid beacons, and curb extensions, communities can expect a 20–60% reduction in pedestrian crashes, depending on the treatment and sitespecific conditions.

For example, in Wisconsin, the installation of flashing beacons near school crossings has reduced pedestrian crash rates by 47% over a five-year period. Similarly, speed management measures, such as reduced school zone speed limits, have demonstrated crash reduction rates exceeding 50% in cities that have implemented systematic school zone safety improvements. Beyond direct crash-related cost savings, investments in reliable bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure also deliver notable economic benefits by reducing vehicle congestion around schools. Enhanced walking and biking infrastructure not only improves safety for children but also substantially reduces vehicle trips, alleviating local congestion and associated economic burdens.





Community & Property Value

The introduction of well-planned safety improvements can also result in higher property values, benefiting local homeowners and municipalities through increased tax revenues. Investments in SRTS programs have been associated with increased property values in surrounding communities. A study highlighted by the Safe Routes Partnership found that homes in areas with above-average walkability scores commanded \$4,000 to \$34,000 more than those in average walkability areas, with higher premiums observed in denser cities. These findings suggest that safety improvements promoting walkability, such as SRTS initiatives, can have a positive impact on community property values.

Beyond impacts on property values, unsafe school environments impose indirect economic burdens on communities. A Safe Routes to School study [3] found that 50% of parents cite traffic safety as a primary reason for driving their children to school—even for distances under one mile. This behavior increases vehicle miles traveled (VMT), fuel consumption, and congestion delays.

According to the Texas A&M Transportation Institute [4], school-related congestion accounts for 10–14% of morning commute delays in urban areas, adding economic inefficiencies to local transportation systems. Other studies have found similar results. The Safe Routes to School National Partnership [5] reports that as much as 20–30% of morning traffic may be parents driving their children to school.



- Pedroso, Margo. (2017). Investing in Walking, Biking, and Safe Routes to School: A Win for the Bottom Line. Safe Routes to School National Partnership. Retrieved from: https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource_files/121117-sr2s-investing_report-final.pdf
- Schrank, D., Eisele, B., Lomax, T., & Bak, J. (2021). 2021 Urban Mobility Report. Texas A&M Transportation Institute.
 Retrieved from: https://mobility.tamu.edu/umr/
- Safe Routes to School National Partnership. (2015). Using Title 23 Funds for Safe Routes to School Projects. Retrieved from.
 https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/pdf/title 23 memo FINAL.pdf

Health, Productivity, & Business

Improving school zone safety contributes to better public health outcomes and economic productivity. Injuries sustained in pedestrian crashes can lead to long-term disability, loss of work time for parents, and higher medical expenditures. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), child pedestrian injuries in 2022 accounted for over \$310 million in direct medical costs and child bicycle injuries for over \$260 million.

Total combined costs for bike/ped child nonfatal hospitalization incidents averaged \$543,000. A reduction in these injuries translates into lower emergency healthcare spending, reduced insurance payouts, and fewer lost workdays for parents who must care for injured children.

Safe and accessible walking and biking routes encourage active transportation, which has been linked to lower obesity rates and improved cardiovascular health. Data from the National Center for Safe Routes to School indicated that schools with pedestrian- and bike-friendly infrastructure experienced substantial increases in walking and biking rates, leading to measurable improvements in student fitness and academic performance.

A study of 801 schools in Washington DC, Florida, Texas, and Oregon [6] showed an average 25 percent increase in walking and bicycling to school over a five-year period associated with education and encouragement programs, and an average 18 percent increase associated with infrastructure improvements. This means that a school that combines infrastructure improvements with education and encouragement programs is likely to see increases in walking or biking of up to 43 percent.

A study of 53 schools in four states (FI, MS, WA, and WI) found that schools with Safe Routes to School funded projects increased walking and bicycling to school by 37 percent.

These increases in walking and biking highlight the importance of creating safer, more inviting environments for students traveling to school. To support such improvements, a broader menu of proven countermeasures for other schools and communities to consider is provided on the following pages. This section builds on the site-specific recommendations in Chapter 3 and expands the opportunities for action. The goal is to provide practical guidance by summarizing each countermeasure's estimated cost, crash reduction potential (CRF), and key benefits. These countermeasures are organized into three categories: Crossing Visibility & Priority Enhancements, Speed Management & Traffic Calming, and Route Improvements.

The CRF estimates are drawn from wellestablished sources, including the CMF Clearinghouse, FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures, and the FHWA Pedestrian Safety Guide and Countermeasure Selection System (PEDSAFE), ensuring that the recommendations are grounded in national research and best practices.

^[6]

McDonald, N. C., Steiner, R. L., Lee, C., Rhoulac Smith, T., Zhu, X., & Yang, Y. (2014). Impact of the Safe Routes to School Program on Walking and Bicycling. Journal of the American Planning Association, 80(2), 153–167. Retrieved from https://mcdonald.web.unc.edu/wpcontent/uploads/sites/8583/2014/12/McDonald_etal_ImpactsSRTS_JAPA2014.pdf

Crossing Visiblity & Priority Enhancements

Countern	neasure	*Potential Crash Reduction	Benefit
	Advance Yield Lines (Paint & Maintaining 20 yrs)	11% to 25%	Encourages early driver yielding.
	High-Visibility Crosswalk (Paint & Maintaining 20 yrs)	40%	Leads to increased foot traffic.
	Leading Pedestrian Interval Timing	13%	Reduces pedestrian-vehicle conflict.
	LED No Right Turn On Red Sign & Installati	ion 41%	Boosts compliance through increased visibility & clarity.
	No Right Turn On Red Sign	3% to 41%	Prohibits turning during red signal.

Crossing Visiblity & Priority Enhancements

Countern	neasure	*Potential Crash Reduction	Benefit
	Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon	55%	Enhances visibility and encourages safe walking trips.
	Pedestrian Refuge Island	56%	Allows safer two- stage crossings on wide roads.
EIGHT LIMIT 3 TONS	Pedestrian Signal (Countdown Timers)	70%	Reduces crossing uncertainty.
	Raised Crosswalk	45%	Slows vehicles while prioritizing pedestrians.
	Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon	47%	Alerts drivers to crosswalk users, improves chance of drivers yielding.

Speed Management & Traffic Calming

Counterr	neasure	*Potential Crash Reduction	Benefit
	Chicane	11% to 25%	Forces drivers to slow down.
	Curb Extensions / Bump Outs	40%	Safer crossings & reduced congestion.
	Curb Radius Reduction	13%	Slows down turning vehicles.
SLOW	Slow Zones & Reduced Speed Limits	41%	Decreases vehicle speed.
	Speed Feedback Sign	3% to 41%	Provides drivers with digital speed feedback.
SPEED	Speed Hump/Bump	55%	Decreases vehicle speed.

Route Improvements

Counterm	easure	*Potential Crash Reduction	Benefit
	Flex Posts / Bollards	56%	Creates protected space for bicyclists and pedestrians.
	Paved Shoulder (Asphalt)	70%	Separates non- motorized users from traffic.
	Sidewalk (Concrete) per mile	45%	Slows vehicles while prioritizing pedestrians.
	Street Tree	47%	Narrow perceived roadway width that decreases driver speeds.

Equity & Policy Consideration

Equity is a critical consideration when evaluating investments in school zone safety. Low-income communities frequently experience higher pedestrian crash rates due to inadequate infrastructure, limited access to public transit, and greater exposure to traffic hazards. A 2022 study published in the Transportation Research Record highlighted that walking and bicycling to school provide substantial health benefits for K-12 students who participate. Safe Routes to School programs, which combine education and encouragement initiatives with infrastructure improvements, have successfully increased active transportation behaviors and enhanced safety in numerous U.S. communities.

Numerous barriers exist to reaching these communities, including leadership challenges, the grant application process, and safety project implementation at the community level. Targeted investments aimed specifically at addressing these barriers are a crucial policy priority.



Strategies Moving Forward

The BEATS Study has identified critical infrastructure gaps, policy needs, and opportunities to enhance student safety and promote active transportation across East Central Wisconsin. These findings are clear: meaningful change is needed—and possible—if communities act together. By examining local conditions and highlighting both challenges and successes, the study equips schools and municipalities with the insight needed to make data-informed decisions and implement practical, lasting solutions. Achieving these outcomes, however, will require coordinated action and strategic investment.



Key Findings From This Study

1 Infi

Infrastructure

deficiencies—such as missing sidewalks, unsafe crossings, and high-traffic areas—remain major deterrents to walking and biking.

- **Traffic safety concerns,** including high vehicle speeds and congestion, create physical and perceived barriers.
- Distance and network connectivity influence mode choice; many students live beyond a safe, walkable range from school.

- Community engagement and education are essential to shift behaviors and support a culture of safety.
- Funding and policy updates are needed to implement solutions that are sustainable and equitable.



CHAPTER 8

Next Steps

What Schools and Communities Can Do

Creating safe, active routes to school will require a coordinated response from schools, municipalities, parents, and community partners. The following roles and actions are essential:

Schools & School Districts

- Launch walking school buses and bike trains.
- Provide student safety education in classrooms.
- Review and update UHT plans.

Municipalities & Regional Planning Commissions

- Address infrastructure gaps.
- Enforce speed limits near schools.
- Integrate SRTS priorities in planning and budgets.

Law Enforcement

- Increase patrol presence in high-risk zones.
- Support traffic calming and speed enforcement campaigns.
- Assist with community education during arrival & dismissal.

Parents & Community Organizations

- Promote active transportation.
- Advocate for safer infrastructure and policies.
- Join school planning teams and public meetings.



UNUSUALLY HAZARDOUS TRANSPORTATION (UHT) PLANS





Call to Action

The Path Forward

The time to act is now. Enhancing student safety and supporting active transportation must be a shared priority. Without commitment, the issues identified in this study will persist. With coordinated effort, measurable progress is within reach.

To Move Forward:

- Convene local stakeholders to identify shared goals and implementation priorities.
- Pursue funding opportunities—federal, state, and local—to support short- and long-term projects.
- Pilot quick-build solutions and evaluate effectiveness through feedback and field observation.
- Establish ongoing monitoring using student counts, speed data, and stakeholder input.

These next steps provide a roadmap for turning study findings into real-world improvements. By aligning community priorities, securing resources, and tracking progress over time, schools and municipalities can build momentum toward safer, more connected environments for students.







A Shared Path Forward





Creating safer, healthier school travel is not the work of one agency—it's a shared responsibility. The findings of this study are just the beginning. Now, schools, municipalities, law enforcement, and community members must take coordinated action to bring these strategies to life.

By investing in proven safety improvements, updating policies, and sustaining public engagement, communities can proactively prevent crashes and support long-term change. For the cost of a single fatality, we can implement multiple impactful solutions. With continued collaboration and a commitment to putting students first, East Central Wisconsin can build a future where walking and biking to school is not only possible—but safe, supported, and expected.







Appendix A

Case Study School Risk Assessments





BONDUEL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (PK-5th) PRELIMINARY THRESHOLD ANALYSIS **BONDUEL, WISCONSIN**







Risk Score: High Scoring Crossing or Roadway (>25)





Risk Score: Notable Crossing or Roadway







EXHIBIT 2b READ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (4k-5th) THRESHOLD ANALYSIS OSHKOSH, WISCONSIN





Appendix B

Survey Results

Q1 Do you currently have, or have you ever had a student enrolled in Read Elementary School, Oakwood Elementary School, Bonduel Elementary School or Neenah High School?



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Yes	96.36% 423
No	3.64% 16
TOTAL	439



ANSWER CHOICES		RESPONSE	S	
Parent or gua	ardian of a current student	95.43%		397
Parent or gu	ardian of a past student	4.09%		17
Current stude	ent	0.00%		0
Past student		0.24%		1
Other (who?)		0.24%		1
TOTAL				416
#	OTHER (WHO?)		DATE	
1	Retired teacher		9/26/2024 7:18 AM	



Q3 What is the distance from your residence to your school?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
1/2 mile or less	3.37%	14
Between ½ and 1 mile	9.13%	38
1-2 miles	16.83%	70
3-5 miles	41.59% 1	73
6+ miles	29.09% 1	21
TOTAL	4	16



Q4 How do you/your student typically get to/from school?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Walk	2.40% 10)
Bicycle	0.48%	
By both biking and walking	0.24%	
Ride in a car or self-drive	54.57% 227	,
School bus	37.98% 158	;
Other (please specify)	4.33% 18	,
TOTAL	416	j

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Vehicle in morning, bus in the afternoon	10/3/2024 1:15 PM
2	Carpool	10/3/2024 11:30 AM
3	Walk when warm. Have to drive her at the same time my son has to get on the bus at my house during the winter. She stands in the cold a lot.	10/3/2024 2:08 AM
4	Sometimes school bus	10/2/2024 4:26 PM
5	Both bus and ride in car	10/2/2024 4:12 PM
6	Also bus	10/2/2024 3:59 PM
7	I drive my 3 freshmen to school and they carpool home after sports. Next season they will ride	10/2/2024 3:57 PM

Build Environment and Active Transportation (BEATS) To and From School Study

	the bus home.	
8	Ride to school, bus home from school.	10/2/2024 3:53 PM
9	walks almost 2 miles opposite way of the high school to the now middle school then transported to the neenah high school . While kids that live by the new high school 3 blocks meet at a bus stop. They should have bus stops for the kids that walk 1 to 2 miles to the middle school	10/2/2024 3:33 PM
10	Bus to school, car home from school	10/2/2024 3:27 PM
11	Bus & parent	10/2/2024 3:16 PM
12	ride in car or walk	9/30/2024 3:48 PM
13	Bus/Ride in car	9/30/2024 2:54 PM
14	School bus to school pick up after school	9/30/2024 2:00 PM
15	Car to school-bus home	9/28/2024 3:15 PM
16	Ride to school, bus back home	9/28/2024 9:56 AM
17	Bus, walk, bike	9/25/2024 1:48 PM
18	I drive them to school. They take the bus home.	9/25/2024 8:55 AM



Q5 Who does your child walk to school with:

ANSWER CHOICES		RESF	PONSES	
By themselv	es	57.14	%	4
With parent(s	3)	28.57	%	2
With sibling(5)	14.29%		1
With another student		0.00%	ó	0
With several other students		0.00%	ó	0
With multiple other students and at least one adult		0.00%	Ó	0
Other (please specify)		0.00%	ó	0
TOTAL				7
#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)		DATE	

There are no responses.

Q6 How often does your child walk as their primary mode of transportation to or from school?



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Daily	85.71%	6
Several times a week	14.29%	1
Weekly	0.00%	0
Occasionally	0.00%	0
TOTAL		7

Q7 Is your child more likely to walk TO school or FROM school?



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
To school (AM)	0.00%	0
From school (PM)	14.29%	1
No difference	85.71%	6
TOTAL		7
Q8 During adverse weather conditions (e.g., snow/ice/rainy conditions or poor air quality), how often do your children walk as their primary mode of transportation?



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Always	28.57%	2
Sometimes	42.86%	3
Occasionally	0.00%	0
Rarely	14.29%	1
Never	14.29%	1
TOTAL		7

Q9 On a scale of 1 to 5, how safe do you or your child currently feel walking to and from school?

Answered: 7 Skipped: 433



 \star \star \star \star

	NOT SAFE AT ALL	(NO LABEL)	(NO LABEL)	(NO LABEL)	VERY SAFE	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
☆	14.29%	14.29%	14.29%	28.57%	28.57%		
	1	1	1	2	2	7	3.43

Q10 Please select the top three elements that impact your/your child's sense of safety while walking to/from school.



ANSWER CH	RESPONSES		
Number and/	Number and/or speed of vehicles		
Proximity to	vehicles	37.50%	3
Unsafe or un	predictable driver behavior	75.00%	6
Lack of dedic	37.50%	3	
Lack of safe	62.50%	5	
Bicycles		0.00%	0
Overgrown vegetation, snow, debris, etc.		0.00%	0
Other (please	0.00%	0	
Total Respor			
#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE	
	There are no responses.		

Q11 What obstacles have you/your child faced while walking to or from school? Check all that apply.



ANSWER CH	IOICES	RE	SPONSES	
Unsafe traffic conditions (e.g., vehicles speeding/not obeying traffic signs/speed limits)				6
Insufficient s	idewalks	71.	.43%	5
Unsafe cross	ings	42.	.86%	3
Lack of side	valk interconnectivity	42.	.86%	3
Uncleared snow from sidewalks/curb ramps			.57%	2
Insufficient street lighting			.29%	1
Personal saf	ety concerns	14.	.29%	1
ADA concerr	S	0.0	00%	0
I do not face	obstacles when traveling by foot	0.0	00%	0
Other (please specify)				0
Total Respor	dents: 7			
#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE		
	There are no responses.			

Q12 What areas can be improved for you/your child's safety when walking to/from school? (choose up to two)



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONS	ES
Improved street signage	0.00%	0
Improved vehicle and traffic enforcement	75.00%	6
Improved school zones (e.g., increased crossing guards, vehicle drop-off/pick-up, improved pedestrian crossings)	75.00%	6
Improved street design (e.g., high visibility crosswalk markings, pedestrian-activated signals, flashing beacons, raised crosswalks, pedestrian islands, curb extensions)	25.00%	2
Total Respondents: 8		

Q13 What is the longest distance you think your child and/or yourself would comfortably walk to school?



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
¼ mile or less	14.29%	1
Between ¼ and ½ mile	14.29%	1
Between ½ and ¾ miles	42.86%	3
Between ¾ and 1 mile	28.57%	2
Between 1-2 miles	0.00%	0
More than 2 miles	0.00%	0
TOTAL		7

Q14 Are there any specific intersections in your community that you feel especially unsafe walking near the schools? If so, please list them below, and be specific about their location and what makes you feel unsafe.

Answered: 6 Skipped: 434

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	The crosswalk by the high school parking lot on Green Bay Street. I have seen people drive through even if the sign is flashing.	10/3/2024 2:59 PM
2	Clayton Ave and II. Clayton Ave has no sidewalks	10/2/2024 4:16 PM
3	New school parking lot in front of the school creates high traffic. Youthful drivers are not always respectful of speed limits or pedestrians	9/30/2024 5:42 PM
4	The corners of first and mill Street. There are no side walks/ incomplete sidewalks on mill street.	9/30/2024 3:51 PM
5	Lack of a sidewalk on west state st. Between 1st and 2nd street	9/30/2024 2:54 PM
6	Omro rd and Oakwood rds - tons of speeding no lights little to no school zone signage - drivers passing cars in bike lanes from no patience school has no crossing guards and the speed limit of the road is 35 which people drive in presence of children and when police patrol people still speed. These issues have been presented to both school and school board with no response or resolution.	9/27/2024 6:15 PM



Q15 With whom does your child bike to school:

ANSWER CHOICES			ES
By themselves			4
With parent(s)			0
With sibling(s)			1
With another student		0.00%	0
With several other students		0.00%	
With multiple other students and at least one adult			0
Other (please specify)			3
TOTAL			8
#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DAT	E

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Didn't ride bike to school.	10/3/2024 3:03 PM
2	Doesn't bike	10/2/2024 4:18 PM
3	No biking	9/30/2024 3:53 PM



Q16 How often does your child bike to or from school?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Daily	28.57%	2
Several times a week	0.00%	0
Weekly	0.00%	0
Rarely	42.86%	3
Occasionally	28.57%	2
TOTAL		7

Q17 During adverse weather conditions (e.g., snow/ice/rainy conditions or poor air quality), how often does your child use a bike as your primary mode of transportation?



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Always	0.00%	0
Sometimes	12.50%	1
Occasionally	0.00%	0
Rarely	25.00%	2
Never	62.50%	5
TOTAL		8

Q18 On a scale of 1 to 5, how safe do you/your child currently feel biking to and from school?

Answered: 7 Skipped: 433



	NOT SAFE AT ALL	(NO LABEL)	(NO LABEL)	(NO LABEL)	VERY SAFE	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
☆	28.57%	28.57%	28.57%	0.00%	14.29%		
	2	2	2	0	1	7	2.43

 $\star \star \star \star \star$

Q19 Please select the top three elements that impact your sense of safety while biking to/from school.



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Number and/or speed of vehicles	88.89%	8
Proximity to vehicles	66.67%	6
Unsafe or unpredictable driver behavior	77.78%	7
Lack of dedicated biking facilities	11.11%	1
Lack of safety amenities (e.g. crosswalks)	22.22%	2
Overgrown vegetation, snow, debris, etc.	0.00%	0
I do not bike to school	33.33%	3
Total Respondents: 9		

Q20 What obstacles have you/your child faced while biking to/from school?



ANSWER CHOICES			RESPONSES	
Insufficient d	edicated bike lanes		37.50%	3
Unsafe traffic	conditions (e.g., vehicles speeding/not obeying traffic signs/speed limits)		25.00%	2
Uncleared sn	ow from streets		12.50%	1
I do not face	obstacles when bicycling		12.50%	1
Other (please	e specify)		12.50%	1
Unsafe cross	ings		0.00%	0
Personal safe	ety concerns		0.00%	0
Mobility acco	mmodations concerns		0.00%	0
Lack of bicyc	ele storage		0.00%	0
Lack of bike lane interconnectivity			0.00%	0
TOTAL				8
#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DA	ΓE	
1	Do not bike to school.	10/3	3/2024 3:03 PM	

Q21 Do you feel that you/your child is safe while biking to/from school?



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	28.57%	2
No	71.43%	5
TOTAL		7

Q22 What areas can be improved for you/your child's safety when bicycling to/from school? (choose up to two)



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONS	ES
Improved street signage	11.11%	1
Improved vehicle and traffic enforcement	44.44%	4
Improved school zones (e.g., increased crossing guards, vehicle drop-off/pick-up, improved pedestrian crossings)	44.44%	4
Improved street design (e.g., high visibility crosswalk markings, pedestrian-activated signals, flashing beacons, raised crosswalks, pedestrian islands, curb extensions)	44.44%	4
Total Respondents: 9		

Q23 What is the longest distance you think your child and/or yourself would comfortably bike to school?



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
¼ mile or less	0.00%	0
Between ¼ and ½ mile	28.57%	2
Between ½ and ¾ miles	14.29%	1
Between ¾ and 1 mile	28.57%	2
Between 1-2 miles	14.29%	1
More than 2 miles	14.29%	1
TOTAL		7

Q24 Are there any specific intersections in your community that you feel especially unsafe biking near the schools? If so, please list them below, and be specific about their location and what makes you feel unsafe.

Answered: 3 Skipped: 437

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Larsen road	10/3/2024 6:04 PM
2	There are no bike lanes on Oakridge Rd in Neenah. It is unsafe for my child between high school drivers, the sun and inattentive drivers. Going down II is just as unsafe because he has to go across the busy road twice.	10/3/2024 5:42 PM
3	Omro rd and Oakwood rds - tons of speeding no lights little to no school zone signage - drivers passing cars in bike lanes from no patience school has no crossing guards and the speed limit of the road is 35 which people drive in presence of children and when police patrol people still speed. These issues have been presented to both school and school board with no response or resolution.	9/27/2024 6:16 PM



Q25 Do you often walk/bike near a school?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	60.87%	14
No	39.13%	9
TOTAL		23

Q26 What obstacles have you faced while walking near a school? (choose up to three)



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Unsafe traffic conditions (Vehicles speeding/not obeying traffic signs/speed limits)	64.29%	9
Insufficient sidewalks	57.14%	8
Unsafe crossings	42.86%	6
Uncleared snow from sidewalks/curb ramps	21.43%	3
Lack of sidewalk interconnectivity	21.43%	3
I do not face obstacles when traveling by foot	7.14%	1
N/A	7.14%	1
Personal safety concerns	0.00%	0
Mobility concerns	0.00%	0
Total Respondents: 14		

Q27 What obstacles have you faced while biking near a school? (choose up to three)



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Unsafe traffic conditions (Vehicles speeding/not obeying traffic signs/speed limits)	50.00%	7
Insufficient dedicated bike lanes	28.57%	4
Uncleared snow from streets	0.00%	0
Unsafe crossings	21.43%	3
Personal safety concerns	21.43%	3
Mobility concerns	0.00%	0
Lack of bike lane interconnectivity	21.43%	3
N/A	42.86%	6
Total Respondents: 14		

Q28 Are there any specific intersections that you feel especially unsafe walking near the schools? If so, please list them below.

Answered: 8 Skipped: 432

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Ma	10/3/2024 6:06 PM
2	The corner of Elm and Mill Street. Cross walk on Green Bay Street.	10/3/2024 3:05 PM
3	State St & HWY 117	10/3/2024 1:20 PM
4	Green Bay St and Shioc Rd just to the north of the Football field during drop off and pick up or evening events. Roads are narrow and traffic is going too fast in or out of town.	10/1/2024 9:09 AM
5	Not at intersections themselves but BE and Mill st both have issues with vehicles not using care when driving is very high. The crosswalk to walk to the playground for the elementary students is unsafe and the safety is reliant on a staff having to stand there for safety which takes away from support and instructional times they could have to stand around most of the time it is not a good situation	10/1/2024 6:02 AM
6	W. Green Bay Street, right in front of the High School	9/30/2024 4:35 PM
7	Oakwood rd between highway 21 and omro rd Highway 21	9/27/2024 6:18 PM
8	6th & Milwaukee lack of sidewalks on both sides	9/23/2024 6:58 AM

Q29 Are there any specific intersections that you feel especially unsafe biking in near the schools? If so, please list them below.

Answered: 8 Skipped: 432

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Larsen road	10/3/2024 6:06 PM
2	II and cb The entirety of Oakridge Rd	10/3/2024 5:43 PM
3	N/a	10/3/2024 1:20 PM
4	Green Bay St and Shioc Rd just to the north of the Football field during drop off and pick up or evening events. Roads are narrow and traffic is going too fast in or out of town.	10/1/2024 9:09 AM
5	See above	10/1/2024 6:02 AM
6	W. Green Bay Street, right in front of the High School	9/30/2024 4:35 PM
7	Oakwood rd between highway 21 and omro rd. Hwy 21	9/27/2024 6:18 PM
8	Midway & Oneida Midway & Appleton Rd no/insufficient bike lanes, 4 lanes of traffic, no signal detection for bikes	9/23/2024 6:58 AM

Q30 What would be your preferred option of getting to school if provided with the proper infrastructure?



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Walking	6.45% 24	
Biking	11.83% 44	
Car	38.71% 144	
School bus	41.94% 156	
Other (please specify)	1.08% 4	
TOTAL	372	

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	I don't know what you mean by proper infrastructure	10/2/2024 4:37 PM
2	Biking, but unsafe to do so.	10/2/2024 4:22 PM
3	Teleportation	9/30/2024 8:58 PM
4	N/A	9/30/2024 4:36 PM

Q31 Which of the following issues affect your decision to walk or bike to/from school? Check all that apply.



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Distance	65.32%	243
Sidewalks or pathways	55.11%	205
Safety of intersections	54.03%	201
Speed of traffic	46.77%	174
Weather or climate	44.35%	165
Time	37.63%	140
Participation in after-school activities	25.81%	96
Convenience of driving	21.24%	79
Crossing guards	20.70%	77
Street lighting	18.01%	67
Adult to walk with	5.91%	22
Violence or crime	5.38%	20
Total Respondents: 372		

Q32 Would you let your child walk or bike to/from school if the following factors were changed/improved? Check all that apply.



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Sidewalks or pathways	61.63%	204
Safety of intersections	58.31%	193
Distance	53.17%	176
Speed of traffic	47.73%	158
Crossing guards	26.59%	88
Street lighting	25.08%	83
Time	20.24%	67
Participation in afterschool activities	12.08%	40
Convenience of driving	9.37%	31
Adult to walk with	8.16%	27
Total Respondents: 331		

Q33 Are there any specific safety concerns this survey did not address? If so, please list them below. If listing a location, please specify the area or town.

Answered: 118 Skipped: 322

#	PESDONSES	DATE
#		DATE
1	We live off of hwy 76 which is a safety hazard to cross at the Larsen intersection. Plus Larsen Rd is an absolutely nightmare and not safe	10/7/2024 7:21 AM
2	Oakridge Road right by the Neenah High School. Needs a sidewalk for bikers and walkers. Speed needs to be 25.	10/6/2024 12:17 PM
3	Larson Road is in horrible condition. It is a tight two-lane road that is barely drivable. Kids are walking along the side of the road with barely room to maneuver. It's VERY UNSAFE. With the current road conditions, I would never let my child walk or bike to school. I fear for their safety every day when driving. It's terrible and disappointing that routes were not thought out.	10/5/2024 7:47 AM
4	No crossing guard at Bonduel School District.	10/4/2024 9:29 PM
5	Larsen road entrance to the high school is not safe for kids biking to school. Needs a bike lane.	10/4/2024 4:22 PM
6	school cross walks are not painted, do like the new speed signs	10/4/2024 3:23 PM
7	Oakridge st going to high school is horribly unsafe. Kids that bike or walk have no where but the street to do so. And traffic is so busy . It is unsafe for the kids to be on the same street as the vehicles	10/4/2024 2:51 PM
8	Distance to the bus stop, busses should stop on every corner or every other corner throughout the neighborhood.	10/4/2024 1:25 PM
9	The school is accessible on a 2 lane road with no shoulder and giant ditches on each side. While my students get a ride from me, there are other kids attempting to bike under these incredibly unsafe conditions. Winter driving will not be fun on this road and deer running out are already an issue and the road is not lit well.	10/4/2024 1:21 PM
10	My daughter did not take the bus before she turned 16 because the bus stop is so far away and the pick up time was an hour before school starts.	10/3/2024 10:12 PM
11	Concerns with CB & extra traffic due to road construction. Stop lights at Intersection CB & Winchester is not great for crossing roads.	10/3/2024 9:44 PM
12	Crossing the intersection at CB/Winchester is a major safety concern, and is a prohibiting factor in my children walking to Neenah High School.	10/3/2024 6:34 PM
13	Larsen intersection and road scary for biking or walking.	10/3/2024 4:12 PM
14	Traffic on II is too fast and is unsafe	10/3/2024 2:18 PM
15	School bus safety. Overcrowding and something three people to a seat. Additionally, my kids have to catch bus one hour before school and the bus stop is on a busy highway where it's dark during winter hours. Need to consider adding additional bus resources and researching bus stop locations.	10/3/2024 1:17 PM
16	W Larsen Road in Neenah is scary, especially the Hwy 76 intersection. It is scary in a car. I would never let a child walk or bike across it.	10/3/2024 11:34 AM
17	Larsen road is very dangerous for biking and walking. There is no sidewalk and a steep shoulder.	10/3/2024 11:12 AM
18	Aside from the fact the new high school is not located anywhere near where it is walk/bike accessible to all but a handful of students, the fact that it has virtually one access point is a	10/3/2024 11:05 AM

huge problem. Almost all access is limited to a the single intersection on II to Rocket Way. Creating traffic backups nearly 1/2 mile long. This 1 entry point is not enough to handle the over 2000 students and staff entering and exiting the campus both in the morning and at dismissal. Coupled with the fact that Rocket Way was poorly conceived with only 2 lanes of thru traffic and no turning lanes to accommodate both the volume of traffic and a pattern that requires continual vehicles crossing in front of oncoming traffic makes driving safety and efficiently a nightmare. This could be alleviated by a 2nd access point off of II since it is far to late to have located the facility to a more central location where not only access is available from multiple points, but it would also be accessible without vehicles.

19	Wish the drop off will be closer to home and not just one spot; which is the drop off pickup is at Neenah Middle School	10/3/2024 9:18 AM
20	The decision to locate the high school outside the city was unfortunate. Walking or biking to the new high school is effectively not an option. Those who do are limited in their ability to safely navigate to the campus due to the speed of traffic (35mph) in the surrounding area.	10/3/2024 9:15 AM
21	We live to the east of Neenah High school. There is no safe way to cross HWY 76 as there is limited to no shoulder, no sidewalks, etc. the intersection of Hwy 76 and Larson Road is so unsafethere have been multiple accidents including fatalities. Larson Road is narrow and has limited and/or unkept shoulders making biking/walking challenging.	10/3/2024 8:56 AM
22	THE NEW HIGH SCHOOL MAKES IT VERY HARD FOR KIDS TO WALK OR BIKE!!	10/3/2024 8:35 AM
23	No but I sure appreciate you looking into it. I cannot believe that the road to the south of Neenah High was not expanded to include a walking path or bike path BEFORE the school was built. It is an absolute safety hazard and I am worried somebody is going to be hurt or killed.	10/3/2024 8:22 AM
24	In the case of the Neenah High School, the Fox Crossing Police are part of the problem vs a solution. Their insistence on enforcing minor traffic violations create more challenging driving circumstances, instead of enhancing safety and traffic flow.	10/3/2024 8:20 AM
25	The flow of traffic in front of the school would be improved dramatically if a) all intersections on property were round about style intersections or b rocket way was turned into a one way with the entrance onto the property off Winchester road and exited onto Larsen.	10/3/2024 7:47 AM
26	There are a lot of neighborhoods being added along County Road G. It would be good to plan for a walk/bike path for teens who would like to bike to the high school. It is far too dangerous with traffic and steep shoulders today.	10/3/2024 6:51 AM
27	Two right turn lanes at the north exit would allow much better traffic flow and empty the parking lot quicker after school.	10/3/2024 6:22 AM
28	The New Neenah High School has major traffic flow issues. In campus, they need to review their flow and possible utilize one way flows to reduce delays and fender benders. Fox Crossing needs to add round-a-bouts at the entrances of campus as well as at the entrance and exits of the highways.	10/3/2024 6:00 AM
29	There is a major intersection my child has to cross and there is never a crossing guard there at that time.	10/3/2024 2:10 AM
30	The high school is in the country with vehicles travelling at 45 mph if doing the speed limit. NJSD did a shit job working with local governments to prepare the roads and infrastructure to safely move students.	10/3/2024 1:42 AM
31	The road to school has very little shoulder and not a lot of forgiveness for teenage drivers. This is a problem during winter months. Students also have to cross over a busy highway 76. A roundabout needs to be built.	10/2/2024 11:11 PM
32	1. Teenage drivers plus impatience due to extreme congestion in parking lot at dismissal is a safety concern. 2. After asking parents not to park on the service road north of the high school during pick-up time, seems like NHS and FCPolice have given up trying to prevent it. Parents' cars wait along that road, blocking the entire west-bound lane. If an ambulance, fire truck, or police vehicles needed to respond at NHS between 3:10 and 3:40, those vehicles would be impeded. 3. Extreme congestion at dismissal leads to a lot of exhaust emissions. Nearly 800 cars need to exit via only two, single-lane roads not even left-turn lanes. Hundreds of car engines idling and emitting air pollution. 4. It's good that there are walking/biking trails along both highway CB and along Winchester. The bummer is that that area of town is built for cars,	10/2/2024 10:18 PM

not bikes. From our house to NHS is only 2.8 miles by car. But to get there on bike via trails, the route is 4.2 miles.

33	crowding of buses with 3 to 4 kids per seat (not safe) and lack of supervision - difficult for drivers to maintain control of student behavior and drive.	10/2/2024 10:11 PM
34	Larsen Road is in terrible condition. Bus pick up locations are too few and far apart. Too few access points to Neenah High School campus. Poor traffic design on campus.	10/2/2024 9:51 PM
35	The traffic pattern at the high school is ridiculous. There are long lines getting in and getting out of school. Something needs to be done to change that.	10/2/2024 9:47 PM
36	We live 6 miles from Neenah H.S. and even if there were sidewalks or bike paths or extra crossing guards, etc, from our house to school, it's simply too far for a high school kid to ride a bike or walk. Plus I would guess that most teenagers do not want to get up at 6:15-6:30 (or earlier), shower, get ready, then ride a bike or walk 6 miles no matter how safe it is, to make it to school BEFORE 8 am.	10/2/2024 8:57 PM
37	Larsen Road at the back of the high school needs to be widened and it needs sidewalks or a trail. It is unsafe and realistically kids are using it to get to and from the school.	10/2/2024 7:38 PM
38	One of the main entry roads (which is closest to our house) is a narrow 2 lane road that would be dangerous to walk/bike along. Larsen Rd. in Neenah	10/2/2024 7:30 PM
39	We need a path on Larsen Road leading to Neenah High School.	10/2/2024 7:06 PM
40	Neenah / Friends x Crossing did not adequately plan for a school at this new location. With a high % of inexperienced drivers, relatively high speeds, and no sidewalks and even minimal shoulders it's in my opinion dangerous for anyone to travel there without a vehicle for protection	10/2/2024 6:53 PM
41	There needs to be a sidewalk/path along Larsen Road for the Neenah High School. It is not safe for kids to walk/bike on that road.	10/2/2024 6:50 PM
42	No sidewalks down Larsen Road from CB, which is the quickest way coming from the south to the High School.	10/2/2024 6:32 PM
43	There are a number of kids who will bike or walk on Larsen Road to get to the high school. The road is too narrow for these kids to be doing this safely. The road really needs to be repaved and widened if possible to accommodate more than just car traffic.	10/2/2024 6:24 PM
44	Sidewalk on larson road	10/2/2024 6:08 PM
45	Because we are out of the district boundaries (and have been for many years), my child is currently unable to be bused from the middle school building to the high school though I am able to get her to the middle school and there was no issue from the bus company for my student to ride the bus. Per the district's current guidelines, though we would need to pay for the service as we are out of district, we are still unable to partake in this service. (I work at the middle school and we have three schools to get to and from each day.)	10/2/2024 6:02 PM
46	A bike path from CB to Larsen rd to the High School is needed	10/2/2024 5:36 PM
47	No	10/2/2024 5:18 PM
48	There are no sidewalks or bike lanes on the Larsen Road entrance to school. There needs to be sidewalks on Larsen Road.	10/2/2024 4:54 PM
49	Amount of traffic (Larsen Road, coming off 76 onto Larsen eastbound)	10/2/2024 4:49 PM
50	A roundabout and 45 mph speed limit on most direct route.	10/2/2024 4:37 PM
51	We live about 4 miles from the school - an easy biking distance for a high school sports kid. But the school is on a 45 MPH road, and we live further out when it's 55 MPH - with no shoulder to the road and no sidewalk/bike path/lane.	10/2/2024 4:22 PM
52	The road infrastructure to the south and west is simply terrible and frankly unsafe.	10/2/2024 4:16 PM
53	The roads leading to campus are too narrow and too few.	10/2/2024 4:16 PM
54	The kids who are already driving are not paying attention they are looking down at the phones and not looking at others cars or stopping on time! I almost got hit because of a kid who was	10/2/2024 4:14 PM

	Build Environment and Active Transportation (BEATS) To and From School	Study
	driving but was on his phone. Enough is enough if they can't stay off the phone then they shouldn't be driving. Next time I'll be calling the cops	
55	In Neenah the intersections are extremely difficult to cross. Cars do not yield for kids or pedestrians. My kid was hit by a car when she was on her bike. It's not a good city for kids to commute in by themselves because the drivers are unsafe and some roads are too difficult to cross (Cecil and Winneconne	10/2/2024 4:13 PM
56	Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. Neenah High School is not on a city bus route, which is another cost effective option for families where distance plays a role in how a child gets to school. It also limits opportunities for kids at the school who may need to leave the school during the day for appointments, or other commitments. Essentially the high school is "on a transportation island" where unless the student has a car, a driver or a school bus ride the child's opportunities are extremely limited. One access point (Larsen Road which is going to be redone) is narrow with speeding traffic, and the main access point is County Hwy II with no sidewalks or even a bike path. In addition, there isn't enough parking at the high school nor are there handicap parking spots that provide a reasonable walking distance to get into the school for school events. Additionally, disabled students do not have close, safe or covered walkway that allows safe proximity to enter/exit the school from school bus drop off or pick up. They are dropped off on a narrow road next to the school and then have to walk or be wheeled in wheelchairs up to the school, which is a fair distance away particularly for an individual with challenges, such as a physical limitation, a cognitive impairment, a lack of safety awareness, etc.	10/2/2024 4:11 PM
57	Larsen Road is a safety concern	10/2/2024 3:57 PM
58	N/A	10/2/2024 3:57 PM
59	To call the parents when a child gets left behind and gets put on another bus without parents knowledge is concerning.	10/2/2024 3:55 PM
60	We haven't had any issues with safety concerns on the bus routes.	10/2/2024 3:53 PM
61	We live north of Neenah High School, so my son uses the Winchester Road entrance, which is fine. However, the south entrance (Larsen Road) is not safe, in my opinion. The ditches there are steep and the road is rough. There are many new drivers using this entrance every day, and during the winter, if that road becomes ice or snow covered, I can foresee cars going off the road and into those ditches. I think that road should be widened with curb and gutter, and probably sidewalks or paths for pedestrians or bicyclists.	10/2/2024 3:52 PM
62	NHS - Parking lot and ease of in/out access.	10/2/2024 3:48 PM
63	Safety of the cars in the parking lot/road after school (traffic flow is not good)	10/2/2024 3:47 PM
64	My son is in football at the high school, and it was a challenge to get him back and forth at all hours of the morning/afternoon, when there were no transportation options offered, he's too young to drive, we don't know the other students/parents to help, and we as parents are working in other cities throughout the day. At first there was talk of a carpool, but we never heard anything more about it. Perhaps that's my son not communicating with us, but I thought I'd throw it out there just in case! Thank you for sending this!	10/2/2024 3:46 PM

65 The time was a huge factor. Sometimes they were on the bus more than an hour before or after school. That was an extended period of time. My kids would sometimes share that the bus driver seemed be driving really fast as they were teenagers. I know that it is a hard job to fill seeing as you don't have an assistant or secondary person to watch out for the the kids that didn't follow the rules and maybe were not the best behaved kids. Honestly my kids were sometimes intimidated by riding the bus so I always took them to school and would pick them up when I could. I think that sometimes it is a hard role to fill as a bus driver. I also know some bus drivers are really old and some drivers are not kid friendly and I am concerned for my childs safety.
66 The bus is our best option 10/2/2024 3:45 PM

67	Dangerous bus stops due to traffic	10/2/2024 3:45 PM
68	Very difficult to get in and out of the parking lot for pick up. The bus gets her home to late for work most days.	10/2/2024 3:40 PM

69 Yes, the Neenah high school location is down right idiotic. It doesn't even reside within the city. 10/2/2024 3:39 PM

The school made transportation for those students that live in the inner city and have more economic troubles even worse. Had the school taken into account socioeconomic factors it would have never been built in the current location. The school was built to further the sports programs and enhance affluent people to Neenah. Way to go public school.

	programs and enhance affluent people to Neenah. Way to go public school.	
70	Neenah High School our child has to walk almost 2 miles to catch the bus 1 hour before school starts were people living right by the new high school get a bus right before school starts. Bus stops should be in place farther away from school a child has to walk . Traffic in that 30 mins my child is walking to the middle school has no crossing guards. 630 to 730 he is on the bus by 7am. It is just set up wrong.	10/2/2024 3:38 PM
71	Distance to walk in inclement weather and darkness and safety in the morning for middle/highschoolers	10/2/2024 3:35 PM
72	Current bus times are too early (morning) and comes home too late (afternoon). Bus route covers both HS and MS, so students in HS must ride first to MS and then go to HS. So ride is long for such a short distance.	10/2/2024 3:32 PM
73	Neenah high school. There is no sidewalk or bike lane on Larsoen road. CB and the round about is also not safe. This needs to be addressed asap!	10/2/2024 3:27 PM
74	There is no way to walk from our area to Neenah HS. Quite honestly their most likely t never will be and that is ok with bussing.	10/2/2024 3:26 PM
75	There needs to be a wider road and sidewalk on Larsen Rd. Children should be on the south side of Larsen Rd up to the stop light at Rocket way and Larsen. Kids should not be ongoing through round abouts. The south side of Winchester needs a side walk. Again kids coming from south of Neenah need safe options and fewer busy intersections to go through.	10/2/2024 3:26 PM
76	My grandson is Autistic and he has to Washington School now to get the bus, which he were walking around the corner to get on which the bus comes around the house	10/2/2024 3:24 PM
77	Railroad crossing	10/2/2024 3:23 PM
78	The parking lot is not safe	10/2/2024 3:22 PM
79	I don't consider the intersection of Larsen Road & Highway 76 to be safe to cross on foot or bicycle at commuting times.	10/2/2024 3:22 PM
 80	Hwy 76 and Larsen road is a horrible intersection that is dangerous for all people who go through it	10/2/2024 3:20 PM
81	Larson Rd is not safe for student to bike or walk. Students need to go all the way to II and will not take the extra time to do that.	10/2/2024 3:19 PM
82	We live on one side of a busy highway. Unless a walking bridge was built to cross that highway, we would likely Continue to bus.	10/2/2024 3:19 PM
83	No bike lanes or sidewalks on Larsen Road makes it very unsafe for anyone not in a car.	10/2/2024 3:18 PM
84	SAFETY ON THE BUSES!!	10/2/2024 3:18 PM
85	The flow of traffic around Neenah High School is a disaster	10/2/2024 3:16 PM
86	Larsen road definitely needs a bike lane	10/2/2024 3:15 PM
87	Too many people already driving/dropping off and picking up their kids from school. Mass chaos in the High School Parking lot every afternoon.	10/2/2024 3:15 PM
88	*Survey creators need to define infrastructure when asking the question. **Safety concerns not addressed include those on the bus. My children took the bus, a child threatened them with a scissors (student was a repeat offender that continued to ride the bus); I took my children off the bus.	10/1/2024 12:45 PM
89	no	10/1/2024 9:15 AM
90	The drop off and pick up area. There is way too much traffic in a small area. Another parking lot would be ideal	10/1/2024 9:03 AM
91	My son gets dropped off with a lot of kids about 3 blocks from are house there's nobody there to help with all the kids getting off at the one stop. Kids just scattered everywhere when they	10/1/2024 4:26 AM

get off. If drivers aren't paying attention there's going to be an accident. I don't know why there doing this this year. If they took a extra 5 mins and do 2 more stops there wouldn't be all getting off at one stop waiting for something bad to happen

92	N/A	9/30/2024 10:38 PM
93	The road that Bonduel elementary (Mill Street) is on that intersects with Cecil St/117 has a blind spot at the intersection when trying to turn onto Cecil St/117. Hard to see oncoming traffic coming over the slight hill unless you're pulled out further.	9/30/2024 10:10 PM
94	Layout of parking lots, pick up and drop off areas	9/30/2024 9:55 PM
95	Bonduel needs more sidewalks. The elementary school needs a different approach to drop off and pick up and the bus company needs more buses. It all boils down to money. No one wants to be a bus driver cause of the pay and they get treated like crap by the kids the pay isn't worth it. Now there isn't a lot of buses so kids are having to walk to bus stops. The walk to these bus stops often do not have sidewalks making them unsafe for smaller kids.	9/30/2024 8:58 PM
96	Cty Rd BE is very fast for a kid to ride a bike.	9/30/2024 8:40 PM
97	My biggest concern is the saftey of children on the buses. The children come home frequently asking about curse words they have heard on the bus as well as being hit/kicked while on bus.	9/30/2024 5:23 PM
98	In town all streets do not have sidewalks	9/30/2024 4:40 PM
99	We don't have any concerns at all.	9/30/2024 4:15 PM
100	My child is old enough to drive now but as a member of the community people do not pay attention to the crosswalk and the flow of traffic in and out of both lots isn't the safest	9/30/2024 3:36 PM
101	My kids lived about 2 blocks from Bonduel Elementary before we moved. Bonduel has terrible sidewalk coverage to the elementary school.	9/30/2024 3:35 PM
102	Crossing a very busy highway which is a main thorough fair people take to travel north	9/30/2024 2:47 PM
103	Issues with my children walking to the bus stop without sidewalks	9/30/2024 2:21 PM
104	In Bonduel, the sidewalk is only on 1 side of the road. We have to cross the highway to get to a sidewalk. The intersection is not safe to cross at for my kids without an adult. Once on the street school is on, there isn't a sidewalk for 2 more blocks.	9/30/2024 2:16 PM
105	We live outside the current school district. Along with MANY other students. Carpool or a bus for out of district students would be appreciated	9/30/2024 2:10 PM
106	The school system drop off and pick up	9/30/2024 2:09 PM
107	Just the horrible speed of the traffic in town and not stopping for crosswalks even with flashing lights.	9/30/2024 2:05 PM
108	Safety measures around school bus drivers. Seems like there are issues with speed with drivers. Causes concern so I will not be partaking in that transportation until improvement	9/30/2024 2:02 PM
109	no	9/30/2024 2:01 PM
110	There is no reduce speed signs or flashing lights by Oakwood school. Speed is 35 and just states it's a school zone. Not safe for traffic, bikers or pedestrians	9/28/2024 9:59 AM
111	Oakwood greatly improved the back parking lot, but there is still not much space for biking/walking if there are two lanes of traffic in the driveway.	9/27/2024 5:38 PM
112	The speed on Omro Rd is way to fast, there is not proper signage letting people know it is a school zone, and drivers do not yield to pedestrians trying to cross Omro Rd	9/27/2024 5:21 PM
113	The Town of Algoma community does not respect the school zone or the students leaving or coming from school. Cars honking and speeding by. Driving in the bike lane. Reckless and not patient. My kids are safest with me guarding them 1:1	9/25/2024 3:20 PM
114	My kids walk through the sheldon nature center, but will not walk down Oakwood as there are no sidewalks and traffic drives recklessly.	9/25/2024 1:49 PM
115	My children are very safe crossing streets but the driveway into/out of Oakwood is so dangerous for walkers/bikes. Cars coming out pull way past the stop line to see around each	9/25/2024 12:25 PM

and the bushes/weeds and can't see a child coming until they are on top of them. Not having the sidewalk in the new drop off lane continue all the way to the street was a huge mistake from OASD. I have addressed the plants with the principal and they mow/weed wack but not enough to increase visibility to what it really should be. This is all at Oakwood and students coming from the west on Omro Rd.

116	I am an active parent in the Oakwood school. We NEED better signage for our school zone. Possibly a better marked crosswalk area. The speed limit in front of the school on omro road is 35. People going at least 40. With all the school zones I've driven by, Oakwood is one of the worst followed, worst monitored and lacks signage telling people it's a school zone. Granted, students aren't running all over in the front of the school or a lot of walking traffic but it is still a school zone and should be treated as such during the before school and after school time frames. Please make this a priority that NEEDS to be changed. Please make this a priority. I'd even address the honey creek/21 intersection as someone who drives her kids to school across that daily. That's highway speed coming into town. Also a reason my kids don't bike/walk. People on the that side of 21 need a better crosswalk of some sort. Thank you.	9/25/2024 9:06 AM
117	People drive like maniacs no matter the speed limit no matter the roads. A sidewalk is fine but you still don't know your child makes it to school and wasn't abducted, hit by asshole driver, etc. These are real issues. Sex trafficking is real. I drop children off and see them with teacher. Only option.	9/25/2024 9:01 AM
118	The city of Oshkosh does not care about safety of students unless it's on the west side of town. Lack of crossing guards in high risk areas and the constant ignoring of the needs of all people in the community is horrible. For instance, the city of Oshkosh does not provide crossing guards for students going to private schools and other communities do. They are too busy wasting money on huge schools that are dangerous and hotbeds for infection and disease.	9/20/2024 8:17 PM


ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Female	78.51%	285
Male	16.80%	61
Non-binary	0.00%	0
Prefer not to say/other	4.68%	17
TOTAL		363



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Female	36.49%	131
Male	39.83%	143
Multiple genders (if answering for multiple students)	18.38%	66
Non-binary	0.28%	1
Prefer not to say/other	5.01%	18
TOTAL		359

Q35 What is your child's gender? (optional)



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Under 18	3.88%	14
18-24	0.00%	0
25-34	7.48%	27
35-44	40.72%	147
45-54	43.21%	156
55-64	4.16%	15
65+	0.55%	2
TOTAL		361



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Under 5	3.23% 11
5-8	8.80% 30
9-11	6.45% 22
12-15	46.63% 155
16+	34.90% 115
TOTAL	34

Q37 What is your child's age? (optional)



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Hispanic or Latino or Spanish Origin of any race	1.16%	4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.29%	1
Asian	1.74%	6
Black or African American	0.87%	3
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.00%	0
White	94.19%	324
Two or more races	1.74%	6
TOTAL		344

Q38 What is your race/ethnicity? (optional)



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
\$0 to \$19,999	0.89%	3
\$20,000-\$49,999	3.87%	13
\$50,000-\$89,999	13.39%	45
\$90,000-\$129,999	24.40%	82
\$130,000-\$149,000	8.93%	30
\$150,000+	28.27%	95
Prefer not to answer	20.24%	68
TOTAL	3	336

Q39 What is your annual household income? (optional)



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
None	1.43%	5
1	24.36%	85
2	44.41%	155
3	20.92%	73
4+	8.88%	31
TOTAL		349

Q40 How many children live in your home? (optional)

Appendix C Funding Sources

Pedestrian and Bicycle Funding Opportunities: U.S. Department of Transportation Highway, Transit, and Safety Funds

https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/funding/funding_opportunities.pdf -- December 30, 2024

This table indicates likely eligibility for pedestrian and bicycle activities and projects under U.S. Department of Transportation surface transportation funding programs. Activities and projects need to meet program eligibility requirements. See notes and basic program requirements below, with links to program information. Project sponsors should integrate the safety, accessibility, equity, and convenience of walking and bicycling into surface transportation projects.

	Pedestrian and Bicycle Funding Opportunities: Highway, Transit, and Safety Funds																										
		Rey: ϕ = Activity inkely engible. Restrictions may apply, see program notes and guidance. $-\phi$ = Eligible, but not competitive unless part of a larger project.																									
A stivity on Drojest Type	ATH												TIELA			102 405											
Activity of Floject Type	¢		¢	¢	<u>H3IF</u>	KHUI	¢	¢			KIF	5115	FLAN	TISDE ¢	rLIIF ¢	¢	11151	<u>21D8</u>	<u>пргка</u> Ф	CAISE ¢	¢	THIVE	¢	¢	¢		402 403
Access enhancements to public transportation (benches, bus pads, lighting, shade) Americans with Dissbilities A_{dt} (ADA)/504 Solf Evaluation (Transition Plan	\$		Э	\$			\$	\$	\$	\$				\$	2	\$	-	\$	\$	\$	~\$		~\$	~\$	\$	┥──┦	
development and updates	\$		\$						\$	\$	\$		\$		\$	\$					\$	TA			\$	~\$	
ADA compliance retrofits: removal of accessibility barriers	\$	\$	\$				\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	~\$		~\$	~\$	\$	+	
Bicycle plans	\$	Ψ	\$				Ψ	\$	\$	\$	Ψ	\$	\$	Ψ	\$	\$	\$	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ	\$		φ	φ	\$ \$	~\$	
Bicycle helmets (project or training related)	~\$		Ψ		\$			Ψ	\$	\$SRTS		\$	Ψ		Ψ	\$	Ψ				Ψ				ψψ		\$
Bicycle helmets (safety promotion)	~\$				\$				\$	\$SRTS		\$				\$											
Bicycle lanes on road	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	~\$	~\$	\$		~\$	~\$	\$	+	
Bicycle parking (see Bicycle Parking Solutions)	\$		\$	\$			\$		\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$		\$	~\$	~\$	~\$		~\$	\$	\$		
Bicycle racks on transit	\$		\$	\$					\$	\$					\$	\$		\$		~\$	~\$			~\$	\$		
Bicycle repair station (air pump, simple tools, electric outlets)	\$		\$						\$	\$					\$	\$		~\$		~\$	~\$		~\$	~\$	\$		
Bicycle share (capital and equipment including charging stations and outlets; not	¢		¢	¢			¢		¢	¢					¢	¢		¢	¢	¢	¢		¢	¢	¢		
operations)	ф		Ф	Ф			Э		ф	Э					Ф	Ф		Э	~⊅	~\$	~\$		~\$	~>	\$		
Bicycle storage or service centers (e.g. at transit hubs) including charging stations	\$		\$	\$					\$	\$					\$	\$		\$		~\$	~\$		~\$	\$	\$		
and outlets; not operations	ψ		Ψ	ψ					ψ	ψ					Ψ	Ψ		Ψ		φ	φ		·••	ψ	ψ		
Bridges / overcrossings for pedestrians and/or bicyclists	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$	\$!	
Bus stop enhancements (ADA compliance, benches, lighting, shelters, shade)	\$	_	\$	\$			\$	\$	\$	\$				\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	~\$		~\$	~\$	\$	<u> </u>	
Charging stations for electric bicycles and scooters	\$	_	\$	\$					\$	\$	\$				\$	\$		\$					~\$	~\$		<u> </u>	
Coordinator positions: State/local (<u>CMAQ/STBG limited</u>)	+			\$					\$	\$SRTS		\$	+			\$					~\$				-		
Community Capacity Building (develop organizational skills and processes)	~\$			-	+	-			+	-	+	+	\$	+	-	\$		+	-	+	~\$	TA		+	~\$	~\$	
Crosswalks for pedestrians, pedestrian refuge islands (new or retrofit)	\$		\$	~\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$	\$	<u> </u>	
Curb ramps	\$	\$	\$	~\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	<i>.</i>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$	\$	<u> </u>	
Counting equipment	\$		¢		\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	¢	\$	¢	~\$			~\$	\$		
Data collection and monitoring for pedestrians and/or bicyclists	\$		\$		\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	~\$	\$	\$	\$			~\$	\$ ~\$	~\$	
referred to as quick-build projects)	\$				\$	\$			\$	\$	\$	\$			\$	\$	\$	\$			\$						
Emergency and evacuation routes for pedestrians and/or bicyclists	\$		\$				\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$			\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	~\$			\$	\$~\$	~\$	
Encouragement and education activities related to safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians	~\$		~\$	\$	\$				\$	\$SRTS	\$	\$	\$			\$					~\$						
Equipment: specialized equipment for maintaining pedestrian and bicycle facilities (sweepers, miniplows).	~\$		~\$	~\$					\$	\$	\$				\$	\$	\$	\$			~\$						
Historic preservation (pedestrian, bicycle, transit facilities)	~\$		\$						\$	\$				\$	\$	\$		\$		~\$	~\$		~\$	~\$	\$		
Landscaping, streetscaping (pedestrian/bicycle route; transit access); related amenities (benches, lighting, shade, trees, water); usually part of larger project	\$		\$				~\$	\$	\$	\$					\$	\$		\$	~\$	~\$	~\$		~\$	~\$	\$		
Lighting (pedestrian and bicyclist scale with pedestrian/bicyclist project)	\$		\$	~\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$	\$		
Maps (for pedestrians and/or bicyclists) (see Idea Book)	\$		\$	\$					\$	\$		\$	\$	\$		\$					\$				\$		
<u>Micromobility</u> projects, including scootershare (capital and equipment, including values, charging stations and outlets; not operations)	\$		\$	\$					\$	\$					\$	\$		\$		\$	~\$		~\$	~\$			
Paved shoulders for pedestrian and/or bicyclist use	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	~\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$	~\$	+	
Pedestrian nlans	\$	Ψ	\$	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	Ψ	\$	\$	\$	Ψ	~\$	\$	\$		Ψ	Ψ	\$ \$	\$	
Public education and awareness programs to inform motorists and nonmotorized	Ψ	1	Ψ					Ψ	Ψ	Ψ		ψ	Ψ		Ψ	Ψ	Ψ		Ψ	Ψ	Ψ				ΨΨ	Ψ	
road users on nonmotorized road user safety	~\$			<i>•</i>	\$				\$	\$SRTS	.	\$				\$				_	\$	-		.			\$\$
Public involvement to inform decisionmaking	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	~\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	TA	\$	\$	\$\$	\$	\$

			Xev: \$	= Activ	vitv lik	elv elig	Pedes	<mark>trian a</mark> estrictio	nd Bic	ycle appl	Fund	ing O	pport	unities	: Hi	ghway ce. ~\$ =	, Tran Eligib	sit, an	d Safet	y Fu petitiv	1ds e unles:	s part (of a lar	ger n	roiect.		
		Federal Highway Administration Federal Lands Loan OST Grant OST Loan FTA NH												NHTSA													
Activity or Project Type	ATIIF	BRICRP	CMA	HSIP	RHCF	NHPP	PROT	STBG	TAP	RTP	SRTS	PLAN	NSBP	FLTTF	TTP	TTPSF	SIBs	INFRA	RAISE	SS4A	Thrive	RRIF	TIFIA	FTA	AoPP	TOD	402 405
Rail at-grade crossings	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	~\$		\$	\$	\$			
Recreational trails	\$						\$	\$	\$	\$			\$	\$	\$		\$		\$	~\$			~\$				
Resilience improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities or to protect or enhance use.	\$	~\$ ~\$	~\$			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	<u>note</u>	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	~\$		~\$	~\$				
Resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation for pedestrian and bicycle facilities, including preventive maintenance and bridge retrofits	\$	~\$\$	~\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	~\$				~\$			
Road Diets (pedestrian and bicycle portions)	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$		\$			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	\$	~\$			
Road Safety Assessment for pedestrians and bicyclists	\$			\$	\$			\$	\$			\$		\$	\$	\$	\$			\$	TA		~\$		~\$		
Safety education and awareness activities and programs to inform pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists on ped/bike traffic safety laws	~\$			\$				\$	\$SRTS		\$	\$			\$		\$			\$					~\$	~\$	\$\$
Safety education positions				\$				\$SRTS	\$SRTS		\$				\$					\$							\$
Safety enforcement (including police patrols)				\$				\$SRTS	\$SRTS		\$				\$					\$							\$\$
Safety program technical assessment (for peds/bicyclists)	~\$			\$				\$SRTS	\$SRTS		\$	\$		\$	\$					\$	TA						\$
Separated bicycle lanes	\$	\$\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$	\$			
Shared use paths, transportation trails, rail-trails, rails-with-trails	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$	\$			
Sidewalks (new, rehabilitation, or retrofit)	\$	\$\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$	\$			
Signs, signals, signal improvements (including accessible pedestrian signals). See Cross-cutting notes.	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$	\$			
Signing for pedestrian or bicycle routes	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$		\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$	\$			
Spot improvement programs (programs of small projects to enhance pedestrian and bicycle use or correct problems)	\$	\$	~\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$	\$			
Stormwater mitigation related to pedestrian and bicycle project impacts	\$			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	note		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	~\$		~\$	~\$	\$	note	note	
Technical Assistance (see Cross-cutting notes)	~\$		~\$	\$				\$	\$	\$	\$	note			\$	\$				~\$	TA						
Traffic calming	\$	\$		\$		\$	\$	\$	\$		\$			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$	\$			
Trail bridges	\$	\$	~\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	~\$		~\$	\$				
Trail construction and maintenance equipment; specialized equipment for trail safety education and trail assessments	\$	~\$						\$	\$	\$				~\$	~\$	~\$				~\$		~\$	~\$				
Trail/highway crossings and intersections	\$	\$\$	~\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		~\$	~\$				
Trailside and trailhead facilities (restrooms, water, electric charging, but not general park amenities)	\$	~\$						\$	\$	\$			\$	\$	\$		\$		~\$			~\$	~\$				
Training related to program goals	~\$		\$	\$				\$	\$	\$	\$	\$			\$					\$	TA				~\$	~\$	\$
Training for law enforcement on pedestrian and bicyclist safety laws	~\$		~\$	\$				\$SRTS	\$SRTS		\$				\$					\$					~\$	~\$	\$
Tunnels / underpasses for pedestrians and/or bicyclists	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	\$			
Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment (23 U.S.C. 148(1))	\$			\$				\$	\$		\$	\$			\$	\$	\$				TA				~\$	~\$	

Abbreviations (alphabetical order)

ADA/504: Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 / Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973	FTA: Federal Transit Administration Capital Funds
AoPP: Areas of Persistent Poverty Program	HSIP: Highway Safety Improvement Program
ATTIP: Active Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program [web link under development]	IIIA: Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 117-58), also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law
BIL: Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 117-58)	INFRA: Infrastructure for Rebuilding America Discretionary Grant Program
BRI: Bridge Programs, including: BFP: Bridge Formula Program; BIP: Bridge Investment Program; BRR: Bridge Replacement and	NHPP: National Highway Performance Program
Rehabilitation Program	NHTSA 402: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program
CMAQ: Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program	NHTSA <u>405(g)</u> : National Highway Traffic Safety Administration National Priority Safety Programs (Nonmotorized safety)
CRP: Carbon Reduction Program	NSBP: National Scenic Byways Program
FLTTP: Federal Lands and Tribal Transportation Programs: Federal Lands Access Program, Federal Lands Transportation	PLAN: Statewide Planning and Research (SPR) or Metropolitan Planning funds (FHWA and/or FTA funding)
Program, Tribal Transportation Program, Federal Lands Planning Program and related programs for Federal and Tribal lands such	PROTECT: Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost Saving Transportation
as the Nationally Significant Federal Lands and Tribal Projects program	RAISE: Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity

RHCP: Railway-Highway Crossings (Section 130) Program	TAP: Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside (formerly Transportation Alternatives Program, Transportation Enhancements)
RRIF: Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing (loans)	Thrive: Thriving Communities Initiative (TA: Technical Assistance)
RTP: Recreational Trails Program	<u>TIFIA</u> : Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (loans)
<u>SIBs</u> : State Infrastructure Banks	TOD: Transit-Oriented Development
SRTS: Safe Routes to School Program (and related activities)	TTP: Tribal Transportation Program
<u>SS4A</u> : Safe Streets and Roads for All	TTPSF: Tribal Transportation Program Safety Fund
STBG: Surface Transportation Block Grant Program	

Cross-cutting notes

This table indicates likely eligibility for pedestrian, bicycle, and micromobility activities and projects under U.S. Department of Transportation surface transportation funding programs. Activities and projects must meet program eligibility requirements. See notes and links to program information below. Although the primary focus of this table is stand-alone activities and projects, programs can also fund pedestrian and bicycle facilities as part of larger projects. Project sponsors are encouraged to consider <u>Complete Streets</u> and Networks that routinely integrate the safety, accessibility, equity, and convenience of walking and bicycling into surface transportation projects. The Federal-aid eligibility of the pedestrian and bicycle elements are considered under the eligibility criteria applicable to the larger highway project. Pedestrian and bicycle activities also may be characterized as environmental mitigation for larger highway projects, especially in response to impacts to a Section 4(f) property or work zone safety, mobility, and accessibility impacts on bicyclists and pedestrians.

- See FHWA's Policy on Using Bipartisan Infrastructure Law Resources to Build a Better America.
- See FHWA Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning, Program, and Project Development (Guidance), Publications, Pedestrian and Bicyclist Safety, and Bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways statute at 23 U.S.C. 217.
- Bicycle Project Purpose: 23 U.S.C. 217(i) requires that bicycle facilities "be principally for transportation, rather than recreation, purposes". However, 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(7) and 133(h) authorize recreational trails under <u>STBG</u> and <u>TAP</u>, therefore, 23 U.S.C. 217(i) does not apply to trail projects (including for bicycle use) using <u>STBG</u> or <u>TAP</u> funds. Section 217(i) applies to bicycle facilities other than trail-related projects, and section 217(i) applies to bicycle facilities using other programs (<u>NHPP</u>, <u>HSIP</u>, <u>CMAQ</u>). The transportation requirement under section 217(i) only applies to bicycle projects, not to any other trail use or transportation mode.
- Demonstration projects may include temporary installations to determine if a longer-term project is feasible.
- Signs, signals, signal improvements includes ensuring accessibility for persons with disabilities. See <u>Accessible Pedestrian Signals</u>. See also <u>Proven Safety Countermeasures</u>, such as <u>Bicycle Lanes</u>, <u>Crosswalk Visibility Enhancements</u>, <u>Leading Pedestrian Interval</u> signals, <u>Lighting</u>, <u>Medians and Pedestrian Refuge Islands</u>, <u>Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons</u>, and <u>Walkways</u>.
- Technical Assistance includes assisting local agencies and other potential grantees to identify pedestrian and bicycle safety and infrastructure issues, and to help them develop and implement successful projects. Technical assistance may be authorized under a program or sometimes as a limited portion of a program. See FHWA links to <u>Technical Assistance and Local Support</u>.
- The <u>DOT Navigator</u> is a resource to help communities understand the best ways to apply for grants, and to plan for and deliver transformative infrastructure projects and services.
- Aspects of DOT initiatives may be eligible as individual projects. Activities above may benefit safe, comfortable, multimodal networks; environmental justice; and equity.
- Occasional DOT or agency incentive grants may be available for specific research or technical assistance purposes.
- Operation costs: In general, ongoing and routine operation costs (such as ongoing costs for bike sharing or scooter sharing) are not eligible unless specified within program legislation. See links to program guidance for more information.

Non-Federal Matching: Most Federal transportation financial assistance programs require a non-Federal match, which means a portion of the project cost will not be reimbursed or paid with Federal funds (unless otherwise authorized by Federal statute). This amount, typically stated as a percentage of the total project cost, is referred to as the non-Federal share. The non-Federal share requirement may be provided as cash in the form of direct contributions from State budgets, financial contributions from municipal or county governments, or funding from private sector partners or stakeholders; or third party in-kind, in the form of non-cash contributions such as donated services, property, or equipment. A few programs have provisions to allow the use of other Federal funds to satisfy the non-Federal share. Resources exist to support applicants in identifying matching funds. The DOT Navigator includes a guide to understanding non-Federal match requirements. FHWA released a memorandum on non-Federal matching requirements in 2019. The Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility (CCAM) has a Federal Fund Braiding Guide to provide information on matching funds.

Program-specific notes

DOT funding programs have specific requirements that activities and projects must meet. Eligibility must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See links to program guidance for more information.

FHWA Programs

- ATHP (IIJA § 11529): Subject to appropriations. Projects costing at least \$15,000,000 to develop or complete active transportation networks and spines, or at least \$100,000 to plan or design for active transportation networks and spines.
- BRI: BFP, (IIJA, Div. J, title VIII, para. (1)), BIP (23 U.S.C. 124), BRR (Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 2022): For specific highway bridge projects and highway bridge projects that will replace or rehabilitate a bridge; project must consider pedestrian and bicycle access as part of the project and costs related to their inclusion are eligible under these programs.
- CRP (23 U.S.C. 175): Projects should support the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions from on-road highway sources.
- <u>CMAQ</u> (23 U.S.C. 149): Projects must demonstrate emissions reduction and benefit air quality. See the <u>CMAQ</u> guidance for a list of projects that may be eligible for CMAQ funds. CMAQ funds may be used for shared use paths, but not for trails that are primarily for recreational use.
- <u>HSIP</u> (23 U.S.C. 148): Projects must be consistent with a State's <u>Strategic Highway Safety Plan</u> and (1) correct or improve a hazardous road location or feature, or (2) address a highway safety projects. See also <u>Proven Safety Countermeasures</u>.
- <u>RHCP</u> (23 U.S.C. 130): Projects at all public railroad crossings including roadways, bike trails, and pedestrian paths.
- <u>NHPP</u> (23 U.S.C. 119): Projects must benefit National Highway System (NHS) corridors and must be located on land adjacent to any highway on the National Highway System (23 U.S.C. 217(b)).
- <u>PROTECT</u> (23 U.S.C. 176): Funds can only be used for activities that are primarily for the purpose of resilience or inherently resilience related. With certain exceptions, the focus must be on supporting the incremental cost of making assets more resilient.
- <u>STBG</u> (23 U.S.C. 133): Broad eligibility for pedestrian, bicycle, and micromobility projects under 23 U.S.C. 206, 208, and 217 (23 U.S.C. 133(b)(7)). Activities marked "\$SRTS" means eligible only as an SRTS project benefiting schools for kindergarten through 12th grade. Nonconstruction projects related to safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians (such as bicycle and pedestrian education) are eligible under STBG (23 U.S.C. 217(a)).
- <u>TAP</u> (23 U.S.C. 133(h)): Broad eligibility for pedestrian, bicycle, and micromobility projects. Activities marked "\$SRTS" means eligible only as an SRTS project benefiting schools for kindergarten through 12th grade. Also eligible under STBG.

- RTP (23 U.S.C. 206): Projects for trails and trailside and trailhead facilities for any recreational trail use. RTP projects are eligible under TA Set-Aside and STBG.
- SRTS (23 U.S.C. 208): Projects for any SRTS activity. FY 2012 was the last year for dedicated funds, but funds are available until expended. SRTS projects are eligible under TA Set-Aside and STBG.
- PLAN (23 U.S.C. 134 and 135): Funds must be used for planning purposes, for example: Maps: System maps and GIS; Safety education and awareness: for transportation safety planning; Safety program technical assessment: for transportation safety planning; Training: bicycle and pedestrian system planning training. Transportation planning associated with activities would be eligible, SPR and PL funds are not available for project implementation or construction.
- <u>NSBP</u> (23 U.S.C. 162): Discretionary program subject to annual appropriations. Projects must directly benefit and be located on or near an eligible designated scenic byway.

FHWA Federal Lands Programs

- <u>FLTTP</u> (23 U.S.C. 201-204): Projects must provide access to or within Federal or Tribal lands. Programs include: Federal Lands and Tribal Transportation Program, <u>Federal Lands Access Program</u>, <u>Federal Lands Transportation Program</u>, <u>Federal Lands Planning</u> <u>Program</u>) and related programs for Federal and Tribal lands such as the <u>Nationally Significant Federal Lands and Tribal Projects</u> (NSFLTP) program.
- o Federal Lands Transportation Program (23 U.S.C. 203): For Federal agencies for projects that provide access within Federal lands.
- o Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) (23 U.S.C. 204): For State and local entities for projects that provide access to or within Federal or Tribal lands.
- TTP (23 U.S.C. 202): For federally recognized Tribal governments for projects within Tribal boundaries and public roads that access Tribal lands.
- TTPSF (23 U.S.C. 202(e)(1) and 23 U.S.C. 148(a)(4)): Grants available to federally recognized Indian Tribes through a competitive, discretionary program to plan and implement transportation safety projects.

FHWA Loan Program

- <u>SIBs</u> (23 U.S.C. 610): Loans for any highway, transit, or other transportation projects, including rail, aviation, and intermodal facilities, eligible for financing or aid under any Federal act or program. SIBs can make loans or provide other forms of credit assistance to public or private entities for eligible projects using funds from their highway, transit, or rail accounts. They can also make loans for rural infrastructure projects using funds from the rural projects fund. Loans or credit assistance can be subordinated to other debt financing. The maximum amount of assistance varies. Loans or credit from the highway, transit, or rail accounts can cover up to 100 percent of the project costs.
- The IIJA allows SIBs to borrow from TIFIA at a reduced interest rate to capitalize a Rural Projects Fund to lend to sponsors of rural infrastructure projects.

OST Grant Programs

- INFRA (IIJA § 11110): Funds projects that improve safety, generate economic benefits, reduce congestion, enhance resiliency, and hold the greatest promise to eliminate freight bottlenecks and improve critical freight movements.
- RAISE (IIJA § 21202): Funds capital and planning grants to help communities build transportation projects that have significant local or regional impact and improve safety and equity.
- SS4A (IIJA § 24112): Discretionary program funds regional, local, and Tribal initiatives through grants to prevent roadway deaths and serious injuries. Projects must be identified in a comprehensive safety action plan (§ 24112(a)(3)).
- Thrive (Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 2022 (Pub. L. 117-103, div. L, title I): Technical assistance, planning, and capacity-building support in selected communities.

OST Loan Programs

- <u>RRIF</u> (Chapter 224 of title 49 U.S.C.): Program offers direct loans and loan guarantees for capital projects related to rail facilities, stations, or crossings. Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure components of "economic development" projects located within ¹/₂-mile of qualifying rail stations may be eligible. May be combined with other grant sources.
- TIFIA (Chapter 6 of title 23 U.S.C.): Program offers secured loans, loan guarantees, or standby lines of credit for capital projects. Minimum total project size is \$10 million; multiple surface transportation projects may be bundled to meet cost threshold, under the condition that all projects have a common repayment pledge. May be combined with other grant sources, subject to total Federal assistance limitations.

FTA Programs

- <u>FTA</u> (49 U.S.C. 5307): Multimodal projects funded with FTA transit funds must provide access to transit. See <u>Bicycles and Transit Fact Sheet</u>, <u>Flex Funding for Transit Access</u>, and the FTA <u>Final Policy Statement on the Eligibility of Pedestrian and Bicycle</u> <u>Improvements Under Federal Transit Law</u>.
- Formula fund programs (49 U.S.C. 5303, 49 U.S.C. 5305, 49 U.S.C. 5307, 49 U.S.C. 5309, 49 U.S.C. 5310, and 49 U.S.C. 5311) such as the Urbanized Area Formula Grants and the Non-Urbanized Area Formula Grants may support bicycle improvements as Transit Enhancements, including bicycle and pedestrian access, historic preservation of transportation facilities, bus shelters, landscaping and scenic beautification, and public art, etc.
- o Bicycle infrastructure plans and projects must be within a 3-mile radius of a transit stop or station. If more than 3 miles, within a distance that people could be expected to safely and conveniently bike to the particular stop or station.
- Pedestrian infrastructure plans and projects must be within a 1/2 mile radius of a transit stop or station. If more than 1/2 mile, within a distance that people could be expected to safely and conveniently walk to the particular stop or station.
- o FTA funds cannot be used to purchase bicycles for bike share systems.
- <u>FTA AoPP</u> Provides funds to entities that are eligible recipients or subrecipients under 49 U.S.C. 5310, or 49 U.S.C. 5311 that are located in, and will assist Areas of Persistent Poverty or Historically Disadvantaged Communities ((Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Pub. L. 116-94); Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Pub. L. 116-260)). AoPP funds multimodal planning, engineering, and technical studies, or financial planning to improve transit services, facilities, and access in areas experiencing long-term economic distress. Only funds planning and related activities; capital project funding and purchases are not eligible. Funding last authorized in 2021; however, there is potential for additional future funding.
- <u>FTA TOD</u>: Provides planning grants to support community efforts to improve safe access to public transportation, services, and facilities, including for pedestrians and cyclists. The grants help organizations plan for transportation projects that connect communities and improve access to transit and affordable housing. Only funds planning activities: capital project funding and purchases are <u>not</u> eligible.

NHTSA Programs

- NHTSA <u>402</u> (23 U.S.C. 402): Project activity must be included in the State's Annual Grant Application. See: <u>https://www.nhtsa.gov/highway-safety-grants-program/highway-safety-plans-annual-reports-grant-applications</u>.
- NHTSA 402 (23 U.S.C. 402) Public Participation and Engagement (Involvement) to inform the State Highway Safety Office's decision-making must be paid from Section 402 Planning & Administration Funds
- NHTSA <u>405</u> (23 U.S.C. 405): Funds are subject to eligibility, application, and award. Project activity must be included in the State's Annual Grant Application. The <u>Bipartisan Infrastructure Law</u> expanded the eligible use of funds for a Section 405 Nonmotorized Safety grant beginning in FY 2024. <u>See 23 U.S.C. 1300.26</u>. For prior year grant awards, FAST Act eligible uses remain in place.
- Project agreements involving safety education, or any other positions must specify hours of eligible activity required to perform the project.