

TSPLOST 2026 PROJECT SUBMISSION



**TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS
DEPARTMENT**



Safe Routes Programs



Safe Routes Programs

Project Description:

The Safe Routes Program creates a connected network of **safe** transportation options to **key community destinations** in Athens-Clarke County. Using crash data and equity metrics, this program implements systematic safety improvements around schools, transit stops, and parks.

Improvements include enhanced crossings, lighting, sidewalks, and other proven safety measures. Project selection prioritizes areas with demonstrated safety needs and focuses on creating continuous, accessible connections for all users.

- **This program is divided into three sub-projects:**

- Safe Routes to Schools
- Safe Routes to Parks
- Safe Routes to Transit

Safe Routes Programs

Project Justification

Creates safer, more appealing connections between residential areas and community destinations.

Enhanced crossings, lighting, and continuous sidewalks make transit a more viable option for more residents.

Connected networks to schools, parks, and transit stops encourage walking and cycling while reducing barriers to physical activity

Safe Routes Programs

Summary of need:

- On roadways in ACC, we have had on average 14 fatalities and 1,200 injury crashes per year in the last five years.
- Key community destinations such as schools, parks, and transit stops are especially important for everyone to be able to travel to safely.

Safe Routes Program

Project Request:

- **Safe Routes to Schools (\$3,000,000)**
 - Enhanced crossings: \$40,000-60,000 each
 - RRFB/PHB signals: \$150,000-200,000 each
 - School zone improvements: \$25,000-40,000 per location
 - Sidewalk construction: \$150-200 per linear ft
 - ADA ramps: \$2,500-3,500 each
 - Lighting: \$8,000-12,000 per pole
- **Safe Routes to Transit (\$1,500,000)**
 - Bus stop improvements: \$15,000-25,000 per stop
 - Enhanced crossings: \$40,000-60,000 each
 - Sidewalk connections: \$150-200 per linear ft
 - Lighting improvements: \$8,000-12,000 per pole
- **Safe Routes to Parks (\$1,500,000)**
 - Trail connections: \$250-300 per linear ft
 - Enhanced crossings: \$40,000-60,000 each

| Project Costs (round to thousand) | Amount |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Land Acquisition / ROW / Easement: | \$200,000 |
| 2. Design Fees: (Minimum of 12% of Construction costs for new construction) | \$720,000 |
| 3. Miscellaneous Fees: (Minimum of 3% of Construction costs – used for permitting, etc. Utilize minimum of 10% if land acquisition is necessary) | \$180,000 |
| 4. Construction: (Provide a detailed cost estimate of this component) | \$6,000,000 |
| 5. Construction Contingency: (Calculate at 10% of the Construction line item. If additional Construction Contingency is needed, use one of the “Other” below) | \$600,000 |
| 6. Acquisition of Capital Equipment: | \$0 |
| 7. Testing: (Minimum of 3% of construction costs for project whose construction component if over \$1 million and 5% for those whose construction component between \$1 million and \$500,000 and 10% of construction costs for projects less than \$500,000. | \$180,000 |
| 8. Project Management: (Calculate at 4% of total budget line items above) | \$315,000 |
| 9. Project Contingency: (Calculate at 10% of the total budget line items above. If additional Project Contingency is needed, use one of the “Other” below) | \$820,000 |
| 10. Public Art: (Calculate at 1% of the Construction line item) | \$60,000 |
| 11. Other (describe): Wayfinding | \$100,000 |
| 12. Other (describe): Education/Outreach | \$75,000 |
| Project Subtotal: | \$9,250,000 |
| 14. Program Management (Calculate at 2% of Project Subtotal): | \$185,000 |
| TSPLOST 2026 Project Total: | \$9,435,000 |

Safe Routes to School

- Projects that promote safer walking or biking to schools could include:
 - Infrastructure improvements
 - Enforcement
 - Safety education
 - Incentives to encourage active transportation
- Locations could be determined by:
 - Proximity to schools
 - Percentage of existing safe routes
 - Population density
 - Social equity scores from the AiM Plan
 - Number of schools served

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs work



today, few kids actively travel to school

TRAFFIC SPEED AND VOLUME, AND LACK OF SIDEWALKS, ARE THE MAIN BARRIERS

compared to 48% in 1969

13% walk or bike now

among those living within ¼ mile of school
just 56% walk or bike

kids are more active when walking and biking are safe

AFTER IMPLEMENTING SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAMS:



OF THE RECOMMENDED 60 MINUTES OF DAILY ACTIVITY:



SOURCES: McDonald NC, et al. (2011). U.S. school travel, 2009: an assessment of trends. *Am J Prev Med*. 41:146-151. Chaufen C, et al. (2012). The safe routes to school program in California: an update. *Am J Public Health*. 102(6):e8-e11. Ahlert DK, et al. (2008). Barriers to and facilitators of walking and bicycling to school: formative results from the non-motorized travel study. *Health Educ Behav*. 35(2):221-244. Timperio A, et al. (2006). Personal, family, social, and environmental correlates of active commuting to school. *Am J Prev Med*. 30(1):45-51. Bassett DR, et al. (2013). Estimated energy expenditures for school-based policies and active living. *Am J Prev Med*. 44(2):108-113. Stewart D, et al. (2014). Multistate evaluation of safe routes to school programs. *Am J Health Promot*. 28(3 Suppl):S89-S96. DiMaggio C and U G. (2013). Effectiveness of a safe routes to school program in preventing school-aged pedestrian injury. *Pediatrics*. 131(2): 290-296.

Learn more about why Safe Routes to School programs work at activelivingresearch.org/SRTSreview.

Safe Routes to Parks

- Projects that promote safer walking or biking to parks and could include:
 - Sidewalk improvements
 - On-Street Multi-use Paths
 - Safety Education
 - Incentives to encourage alternative transportation
- Locations could be determined by:
 - Park Type
 - Population served
 - Percentage of existing safe routes
 - Population density
 - Historical Neglect
 - Social equity scores from the AiM Plan
 - Number of parks served

Five Essential Elements to Safe Routes to Parks

When people can safely walk to parks, it provides more opportunity for physical activity and greater access to open space.



Safety

Safety elements (e.g., lighting, traffic) must be included for pedestrian routes.



Convenience

Walking routes to parks should be no longer than a 10-minute walk.



Access & Design

Proper design, signage, ADA compliance, and multiple entry points benefit all users.



Conditions

Sidewalks and trails should be inviting, comfortable, and safe for all users.



The Park

Facilities, amenities and programs at the park should reflect the needs of the community.

Safe Routes to Transit

- Projects that promote safer access to transit services could include:
 - Enhanced bus stop accessibility
 - Improved crossing opportunities near stops
 - Connected sidewalk networks
 - Lighting improvements
 - ADA-compliant access routes
- Locations could be determined by:
 - High transit usage
 - Demonstrated safety needs

Safe Routes Program

Impacts of Not Funding:

- Increased **Safety Risks** for Vulnerable Road Users
- Barriers to **Mobility & Equity**
- Negative **Health & Environmental** Impacts
- Traffic **Congestion & Pollution**
- Reduced **Quality of Life & Economic** Impacts



Equity Considerations

- This project serves diverse areas of Athens and will provide safe access for all road users to schools, parks, jobs, and neighborhoods; providing transportation equity to those who walk, bicycle, and take transit – whether out of necessity or by choice
- TP&W will ensure funds from this project are distributed in a fair and equitable way by incorporating selection processes relevant for each of the sub-projects.
- All proposed designs will follow the updated Complete Streets Policy which highlights the importance of equity in all parts of the design process, including close coordination with ACCGov People and Belonging in a dedicated effort to expand minority participation in ACC contracting.

SAFE ROUTES PROGRAMS

M&C Strategic Commitments:

- ✓ **Goal Area 1; Section D:** Drive community transformation with a focus on creating spaces that are respectful and welcoming
- ✓ **Goal Area 1; Section E:** Support & Promote healthy lifestyle: moving, eating, forming healthy relationships, physical and psychological care
- ✓ **Goal Area 5; Section A:** Improve, expand, and maintain sidewalks, shared-use paths, and bike facilities to provide greater opportunities for residents to use active transportation safely
- ❑ **Goal Area 5; Section B:** Pursue inter-city travel options to connect Athens with other cities
- ✓ **Goal Area 5; Section C:** Expand multi-modal Transit access to reduce auto dependency and provide greater mobility for Athens residents
- ✓ **Goal Area 5; Section D:** Create more usable and aesthetically pleasing corridor connections between residential and commercial areas
- ✓ **Goal Area 5; Section E:** Enhance safety for all modes of transportation
- ✓ **Goal Area 6; Section A:** Develop well-planned new infrastructure according to future land use values and framework
- ✓ **Goal Area 6; Section B:** Ensure equitable access to infrastructure to enhance safety and identity
- ✓ **Goal Area 6; Section C:** Provides adequate funding for maintenance of existing and newly constructed infrastructure
- ✓ **Goal Area 6; Section D:** Follow through on commitment to 100% Clean and Renewable Energy resolution
- ✓ **Goal Area 6; Section E:** Address ecosystem health, infrastructure sustainability, and resilience

Thank you

ATHENS-CLARKE COUNTY