



## California Safe Routes to School State and Regional networks Action Plan

The [Safe Routes to School National Partnership](#) (National Partnership) is a fast growing network of more than 500 organizations, government agencies and professional groups. Our mission is to advocate for safe walking and bicycling to and from schools, and in daily life, to improve the health and well-being of America's students and to foster the creation of livable, sustainable communities.

The California state and regional networks (nine-county Bay Area network and seven-county Southern California network) support the National Partnership's work and are tasked with:

1. Changing policy and built environment infrastructure investments to support increases in physical activity for children, especially on the route to school.
2. Implementing Complete Streets/street-scale improvements.
3. Fostering joint use policies.
4. Increasing the capacity for data collection and evaluation.
5. Building the capacity for leadership.
6. Advancing social equity.
7. Assuring sustainability.

Funding for the California team comes primarily from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (statewide work through 2014) and Kaiser Permanente (regional work through 2013). We are grateful for our funders' generous support. The California team is comprised of:

- [Rye Baerg](#), Southern California Regional Policy Manager
- [Pauline Chow](#), Southern California Regional Policy Manager
- [Deb Hubsmith](#), National Partnership Director and California network Chair
- [Dave Janis](#), State Network Manager
- [Kristine Kessel](#), Network Director
- [Marty Martinez](#), Bay Area Regional Policy Manager
- [Jessica Meaney](#), Southern California Policy Director
- [Stephanie Weber](#), Regional Network Manager

## **The Plan**

The California state network has been in existence since spring 2007. In early 2012, three new full time regional staff positions were added, thereby significantly expanding the National Partnership's reach throughout California. This plan is intended to guide the National Partnership's California staff, to share our goals and objectives with external partners, and to facilitate collaboration and mutual support of our agreed-upon targeted efforts to develop equitable, walkable and bikeable communities and access to schools in California.

## **Partners**

Implementation of the California state action plan requires the coordination of partners at local, county, regional and state levels to ensure the coordinated implementation of our policy goals. The California State network is grateful for the leadership and efforts of many individuals and organizations who participate in monthly meetings, action teams and more. The success of the network rests on successful collaborative efforts.

## **National Partnership's 2011-2015 Strategic Plan**

[The National Partnership's Strategic Plan](#) guides the national efforts of the National Partnership and was crafted after much public outreach and careful analysis of what is need to support and lead the overall Safe Routes to School movement. The five-year plan prioritizes five strategic focus areas, these are:

1. Opening Minds through Research and Communication
2. Changing Policies and Infrastructure
3. Building Capacity for Leadership
4. Advancing Social Equity
5. Assuring Sustainability

These five national strategic focus areas guide and shape the California team's efforts in order to create a comprehensive strategy infused at all staffing levels - these are the goals of all National Partnership staff.

For work in California, essential State and Regional network tasks for each of the five focus areas comprise our California Action Plan.

### **1. Opening Minds through Research and Communications**

The California state network seeks to continuously educate our partners and the public about the need for and the benefits of Safe Routes to School. This is done by highlighting cutting edge research and best practices from around the country. We seek to share the stories of our partners and Safe Routes to School practitioners with a wide variety of stakeholders through social media, conference calls, journal and newspaper articles, presentations and meetings. The California network will focus on these priorities:

#### **A. Research**

Using research to educate our partners allows the National Partnership to build a solid empirical argument for the need and benefit of Safe Routes to School. Research

augments our communication efforts by providing key facts to support our goals. In California we will:

- i. Identify additional research/fact needs for policy advancement and work with partners to get the research completed
- ii. Share information on research and other related news in bimonthly emails and on state site .
- iii. Partner with Caltrans, Universities and MPOs to evaluate prior National Household Travel Survey responses and to formulate questions for future surveys.

#### B. Communications

The California state network uses a wide variety of media to connect with our partners. Media is key to sharing best practices, educating partners of strategic opportunities, and creating consensus. Our communications efforts also serve as a medium to bring to stories of inequity and opportunities for transportation investments to improve conditions for under served communities. In California, we will:

- i. Strengthen [the state site](#), to develop state and regional content with blogs, calendar listings, best practices, and more.
- ii. Connect the National Partnership's website and the California state site.
- iii. Continually update our statewide media and blog list.
- iv. Cultivate partnerships with statewide, regional, local and blog media contacts to advance news and research coverage.
- v. Capitalize on opportunities for media coverage and OpEds (state and regional) through these expanded relationships with media contacts and by continuing to build leadership capacity with partners with focused messages regarding our main policy goals (see #2 below) as well as why Safe Routes to School efforts and investments matter and the benefits they bring throughout California communities.
- vi. Foster peer exchange /learning (state and regional).
- vii. Incorporate rural/urban/suburban models into communications.
- viii. Work with TARC and TransForm on a new youth engagement project and share the results.

## 2. **Changing Policy and Infrastructure**

The California state network will focus its efforts on: (A) leveraging funds for Safe Routes to School; (B) promoting Complete Streets/street-scale improvements; (C) capitalizing and promoting shared (or joint) use agreements for community-based schools; and (D) data/evaluation for these three main policy areas. Addressing the needs of lower-income communities shall be infused in each of these policy areas. The specific aspects of the National Partnership's work are as follows:

#### A. Leveraging Funds

- i. Background: Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and safety programs have historically been underfunded across the United States and in California, and in

California, more than 20% of traffic fatalities are pedestrians or bicyclists. As a result, most communities lack safe bicycle networks and connected sidewalks and children do not receive the safety education they need. The National Partnership seeks to increase government funding for bicycling and walking and works to ensure that these funds are spent efficiently and in a timely manner. A key focus area for the National Partnership is the obligation of state and federal Safe Routes to School grants which provide funding for infrastructure improvements and educational programs.

ii. Goals: It is the California state network's number one priority to work with Caltrans towards vastly improving award, obligation and encumbrance rates of the state and federal Safe Routes to School grants. It is critical to see Safe Routes to School funds, once awarded, implemented in a timely manner (obligation rates). It is also imperative that lower-income communities and schools are served through Safe Routes to School grants, and that this progress is measured. It is also critical that we ensure award and obligation of Transportation Enhancements (TE) funds.

1. Regional: In addition to ensuring that SRTS, SR2S and TE projects are obligated, the National Partnership works to increase overall funding levels for bicycling and walking by working with Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) to ensure that cities and counties have the funding necessary to implement complete street/street-scale improvement projects.

a. Bay Area: The National Partnership staff is working in the Bay Area to also ensure that the regional Safe Routes to School grants provided through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) One Bay Area Grant program are awarded, obligated and implemented in a timely manner.

b. Southern California: The National Partnership staff is working to increase funding streams for Safe Routes to School at the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the County Transportation Commissions (CTCs). To achieve this goal, the team is currently advocating for the creation of an Active Transportation Committee, an Active Transportation Strategic Funding Plan at SCAG, and a Regional Safe Routes to School Plan.

iii. Tactics (Obligation): To ensure SRTS, SR2S and TE grants are awarded, obligated and implemented in a timely manner, the National Partnership will work closely with Caltrans and the SRTS Technical Assistance Resource Center (TARC) to:

a. Convene Action Team meetings every 4-6 weeks to discuss status and challenges with current status of obligation and implementation of state SR2S and federal SRTS funds.

b. Work with Caltrans district leads to determine obligation rates.

c. Work with the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy on TE obligation strategy.

d. Partner with local cities and counties that have grants to help them move through the process.

- e. Determine roadblocks to successful implementation and highlight success stories.
  - f. Engage nontraditional partners to encourage the success of non-infrastructure grants (School Districts, etc.).
  - g. Work with TARC and equity partners on outreach to lower-income communities to help them to apply for Safe Routes to School grants, to ensure that help is provided to implement grants, and to measure how the state is serving our most vulnerable populations. Ensure that SR2S and SRTS grants are equitably serving lower-income schools and communities.
  - h. Actively participate in the SR2S Grants, as reviewers or commenters in Southern California districts: District 7 (Los Angeles), District 8 (Inland Empire), District 12 (Orange County) and District 4 (Bay Area). Additionally, the team will encourage Caltrans to recruit reviewers with insights into lower-income communities and equity issues.
- iv. Tactics (Leveraging Funding): To ensure that equitable funding levels are provided for bicycling and walking, the National Partnership will work with state and regional partners to influence policy change and implement existing policies as follows:
- a. Work with partners to identify existing and future funding sources that can be used for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Where necessary and appropriate, advocate to shift funding priorities from other modes.
  - b. Develop messaging to current and new partners on the need for more active transportation dollars.
  - c. Through the use of data-driven analysis, provide elected leaders, transportation planners, and other partners compelling arguments and examples that illustrate the benefits of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
  - d. Work with Caltrans on Challenge Area 8 (walking) and 13 (bicycling) for the Strategic Highway Safety Plan, and work with Caltrans and local agencies on application guidelines and criteria for project selection which encourages multi-modal projects and active transportation projects to be funded through Highway Safety Improvement Program funds.
  - e. Educate the Governor's office and members of the state legislature on the benefits of active transportation and Safe Routes to School.
- v. Leads: National Partnership, Caltrans, TARC, and implementing agencies and partners across the state.
- a. State Focus: Working with Caltrans, TARC, and implementing partners
  - b. Regional Focus (Bay Area and Southern California): Working with MPOs and CTCs.
- B. Complete Streets/Street-Scale Improvements
- i. Background: Complete Streets policies seek to ensure that all transportation projects are safe for all users. Throughout California, many regions' MPOs,

counties and local jurisdictions have, or are in the process of implementing, Complete Streets policies. At the state level AB 1358 (2008) directs all cities and counties to include Complete Streets policies into the transportation elements of each jurisdiction's general plan upon revision. In addition, Caltrans Deputy Directive 64-R1 requires the inclusion of Complete Streets into the revision of Caltrans manuals and at multiple points during the state highway planning and construction process. Caltrans also regularly updates design standards including the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices, and this affects what standards communities have available for infrastructure improvements.

- ii. Goals: To support an increase in Complete Streets policies statewide, and improvements to design guidelines. Given the broad nature of AB 1358 and DD 64-R1 there is widespread need for technical assistance, expertise and collaboration with regards to the drafting and implementation of Complete Streets policies. The National Partnership will support implementation of Complete Streets efforts across California and draw the link between Complete Streets and Safe Routes to School. This is achieved by expanding conversations and practices of transportation planning to include the needs of all users in the planning, design, construction and maintenance of transportation projects.
- iii. Tactics: The State network uses multiple strategies for the implementation of Complete Streets policies.
  - a. Track the implementation of AB 1358 across the state and develop a baseline list of what jurisdictions have Complete Streets policies, including copies of those policies, and who was the staff lead in the development of the policy. From this baseline list, we aim to double the number of Complete Streets policies in the state by December 2014.
  - b. Educate partners and transportation agencies about the benefits of complete streets. This will include the development of case studies and best practices at the city, county and MPO levels.
  - c. Analyze how Complete Streets are being implemented in lower-income communities and what types of technical assistance are needed to achieve improved infrastructure. Work with partners to prioritize implementation on Complete Streets in lower-income communities.
  - d. Identify the challenges faced by jurisdictions currently implementing policies to determine successful strategies and systemic policy obstacles at the city, regional, and state level.
  - e. Convene regular statewide Action Team meetings every 4-6 weeks to discuss the status and challenges of current of Complete Streets policies, and to develop and implement a plan to expand Complete Streets policies throughout the state.
  - f. In Southern California, continue working with SCAG staff and elected officials to implement a regional Complete Streets plan through the post-implementation motion passed by unanimous vote. (The post-implementation motion includes objectives to create a Complete Streets regional plan but must be analyzed by a pending SCAG

committee and recommended to Regional Council members by this committee.)

- g. In the Bay Area region, work with MTC on improving and strengthening Complete Streets requirements, timeline and check lists as a condition for cities and counties to receive funding and track the adoption of Complete Streets policies in all 101 cities and nine counties in the Bay Area.
- iv. Leads: National Partnership, California Bicycle Coalition, California Walks, regional partners and other partners across the state.

#### C. Shared Use and Community Based Schools

- i. Background: Shared use--or joint use--is a way to increase opportunities for children and adults to be more physically active. It refers to two or more entities — usually a school and a city or private organization — sharing indoor and outdoor spaces like gymnasiums, athletic fields and playgrounds. The concept behind joint use is that share resources keep costs down and increases access for the health and well-being of communities. Schools in lower-income urban areas may not have space for school fields and may lack urban parks, thus making it important to find ways to create safe places for children to engage in healthy physical activity after and during school hours. School-site selection also becomes critical to ensure school grounds are within walking distance to students, families and public transportation options.
- ii. Goals: To increase the number of joint use policies in the state and the total space available to communities to have safe places to play and engage in physical activity by creating a statewide policy environment that facilitates joint use and community based schools, and encouraging the adoption of local joint use agreements and school policies at the school district level.
- iii. Tactics: The State network uses multiple strategies for shared use.
  - a. Develop a baseline list of what jurisdictions have joint use agreement policies, including copies of those policies, and who was the staff lead in the development of the policy. From this baseline list, we aim to increase by 30 percent the number of joint use policies in the state by December 2014.
  - b. Convene regular statewide Action Team meetings every 6 weeks, working closely with the [Joint Use Statewide Task Force](#), coordinated by Prevention Institute.
  - c. Encourage the implementation of new joint use agreements and policies by sharing best practices, and model tools and agreements, such as those published by the National Policy and Legal Analysis network (NPLAN), specifically targeting lower-income schools and communities as the highest priority.
  - d. Work with the California Department of Education to publish joint use and school siting guidance, either as stand-alone documents, or by including guidance into any updated policy manuals, such as the Bluebook and Yellowbook.
  - e. Determine if joint use can be folded into regional planning and sustainable communities strategies at the regional level.

- f. Work with the [California School Boards Association](#) and the state [Health in All Policies Task Force](#) to determine opportunities to expand joint use and community based schools.
- iv. Leads: National Partnership, Prevention Institute, NPLAN, California Department of Education, Center for Cities and Schools.

#### D. Data Collection and Evaluation

- i. Background: There exists an important need to ensure that our transportation strategies and investments are data driven, especially in regards to safety and health for all community members. In addition, many decisions on government funding are predicated upon evaluation and modeling, which requires good data and the ability to project outcomes based on improvements in infrastructure. A multi-disciplinary perspective needs to inform this framework – with input from safety, transportation, health, air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, technology, academic and research and more. As funding becomes increasingly based on performance outcomes, now more than ever it is critical that California develop standards to ensure competitiveness and its ability to measure and forecast programmatic success and challenges in the field of walking and bicycling. Addressing the needs of lower-income communities shall be infused in each goals and tasks.
- ii. Goals: Foster discussions on how to best engage the state and other key partners in setting frameworks for active transportation and Safe Routes to School data collection, modeling and evaluation, and make changes to create new systems for data collection, modeling and evaluation of active transportation infrastructure. Ensure widespread distribution and the standardization of data and tools currently available for use by local jurisdictions and MPOs (i.e. SafeTrec crash mapping data tool).
- iii. Tactics: The State network uses multiple strategies for data collection and evaluation.
  - a. Develop a “State How We Travel Report Card” to include state mode splits, state school trip mode splits, and the four big regional MPO mode splits (SACOG, MTC, SCAG, and SANDAG).
  - b. Create a “Regional Score Card” for each SCAG county to measure active transportation policies, bikeability and walkability orientation of regions and cities, and potential for development. Metrics in scorecard will include: cities that are in progress or implemented Complete Streets, Safe Routes to School programs and plans, surveys on bicycle and pedestrian, first and last mile connection to public transportation, active transportation friendly policies within general plan updates, healthy city elements (optional), and bicycle parking.
  - c. Prepare a summary of current state and regional data collection efforts on bicyclists and pedestrians, such as bicycle and pedestrian counts, Health Impact Assessments, intersection surveys, and active transportation planning.
  - d. Track changes in the results of the California Household Travel Survey to be completed in 2013.



- e. Work with SANDAG on the development of their activity based model to ensure optimal projections for bicycle and pedestrian activity.
  - f. Collaborate with the four big regional MPOs to maximize on opportunities for data collection, evaluation and modeling, and seek ways to partner with health agencies and universities to analyze data and project cost /benefits.
- iv. Leads: National Partnership, Caltrans, Departments of Public Health, MPOs and CTCs and partners across the state.

### **3. Building the Capacity for Leadership**

#### **A. Background**

The National Partnership's California staff collaborates with and relies on partners to achieve policy change. By fostering leadership with our partners, we are able to mobilize diverse coalitions that articulate the benefits of Safe Routes to School, an improved built environment, active transportation and equity from a variety of viewpoints. In addition, the development of leadership capacity in our partners expands the reach of our efforts by creating more local champions and ensures the sustainability of our efforts and Safe Routes to School goals.

#### **B. Goals**

The National Partnership creates networks of local elected officials, non-profit organizations, health professionals, community members and a wide variety of stakeholders through education and encouragement, and builds the capacity for leaders within these groups to champion the policy efforts listed above.

#### **C. Tactics**

By educating our partners on the importance of walking and bicycling as tools for community change, we encourage them to bring their own personal experiences and expertise to the table regarding the types of policy goals and infrastructure investments are necessary for creating equitable, walkable and bikeable communities. The following tactics are being used in California to grow our network and increase the capacity for leadership amongst our partners, both at the state and regional levels:

- i. Track our partners by maintaining an online database of contacts and affiliates statewide and for each region that we work in.
- ii. Educate our partners through workshops, network calls and individual communications to build expertise and allow stakeholders to better understand the transportation planning process. Key topic areas include:
  - a. Transportation finance
  - b. Complete Streets/Street-scale Improvements
  - c. Safe Routes to School awards and obligation process
  - d. Safe Routes to School regional, countywide and school-district wide programs
  - e. Health impact assessments
  - f. Joint Use/School Siting policies
  - g. Data collection
  - h. Serving lower-income communities and schools

- iii. Develop county leaders, particularly in the four big MPO regions, in each of the following areas:
  - a. Elected officials
  - b. Agency staff leadership
  - c. School districts
  - d. Health
  - e. Transportation
  - f. Equity groups
  - g. Youth engagement
  - h. Environmental groups
- iv. Develop statewide leaders within state agencies and among state policy makers

D. Leads

National Partnership, local jurisdictions tasks forces and action teams, Departments of Public Health, Public Works, Planning and Recreation Departments, city staff/ MPO/ County Transportation Commission/ Transportation Authority staff and positions dedicated to healthy communities or active transportation programming

#### 4. Advancing Social Equity

A. Background

Quality transportation options are a lifeline to opportunity. Transportation gets people to work, to school, to the grocery store, and to the doctor's office. And while billions of public dollars are invested in our nation's transportation system each year, studies are showing that a disproportionate amount of burden and injury from these investment choices are falling on people living in lower-income communities. In addition, lower-income communities and communities of color are disproportionately impacted by chronic diseases, such as obesity, diabetes, and other health conditions that could be improved by increasing options for physical activity and active transportation.

B. Goals

Recognizing serious hurdles in addressing not only transportation-related concerns, but also personal safety and public health concerns, the Safe Routes to School California network supports efforts that address the disparity between population groups.

C. Tactics

- i. Establish strong working relationships with community-based organizations, groups working to advance social and economic equity, and public health departments working to address health disparities. We can serve to highlight the benefits of active transportation to lower-income communities and communities of color, and explore the unique challenges these communities face in accessing active transportation. Work closely with parallel efforts such as the work of Safe Passages and the Prevention Institute Unity programs.
- ii. Inventory the barriers and obstacles for lower-income and rural communities and schools implementing Safe Routes to School programs, Complete Streets and joint-use agreements, and develop strategies and partners to overcome these hurdles.

- iii. Encourage communities to implement crime prevention strategies through design landscaping techniques. These techniques contend that law enforcement officers, architects, city planners, landscape and interior designers, and resident volunteers can create a climate of safety in a community right from the start by striving to design a physical environment that positively influences human behavior.
- iv. Work to ensure that information and data on the impacts of transportation projects and policy changes is tracked and assessed by factors of concern, such as income, race, and ethnicity. Advocate for an assessment of existing pedestrian and bicycle networks through this lens.
- v. Advocate for effective tracking of Safe Routes to School awards to ensure equitable distribution, and that Safe Routes to School dollars are benefiting all communities in California, including low-income and communities impacted by health disparities.
- vi. Work to find a way to provide engineering assistance for lower-income communities by strengthening partnerships with Caltrans, TARC and equity groups at the state and regional levels. Focus outreach and technical assistance activities at low-income communities in the regions.
- vii. Work with partners and agencies to include health and environmental justice metrics into transportation planning and investment allocations. Request regional, county, cities, and local jurisdictions develop specific and measurable equity measures and policies at a neighborhood level, including assessments of injury and collision data, and the adoption of affordable housing and anti-displacement policies.

D. Leads

National Partnership, non-profit health organizations such as American Lung Association, American Heart Association, California Pan-Ethnic Health Network (CPHEN), Prevention Institute, Latino Healthy Access, Asian and Pacific Islander Obesity Prevention Alliance, Departments of Public Health, Hospitals and Community Clinics, Community Health Organizers, such as Community Health Coalition and California Rural Legal Assistance.

## 5. Assuring Sustainability

A. Background

The long-term viability of Safe Routes to School is dependent on the movement's ability to leverage additional funds, build capacity, ensure collaboration among leaders in the field and integrate Safe Routes to School within the plans and goals of a wide range of partners and government agencies.

B. Goals

Continue to grow support for Safe Routes to School so that infrastructure and non-infrastructure funding diversifies beyond federal and state resources and strengthens and supports public agencies and community based organizations throughout the state who are implementing Safe Routes to School efforts. Another goal is to sustain our California Safe Routes to School advocacy efforts after current grants expire, and continue to build the California team to further advance our goals.

### C. Tactics

- i. Update funders and elected officials on the successes, challenges, progress, the benefits, and the needs to continue to support Safe Routes to School.
- ii. Publicize successes to continue to expand the network of support and partners for Safe Routes to School beyond the traditional partners.
- iii. Publicize the successes and best practices of Safe Routes to School efforts throughout the state in order to continue to foster peer to peer learning and also to continue to demonstrate and champion the added value of all Safe Routes to School efforts and leaders in order to support future funds for efforts.
- iv. Continue to work to foster and strengthen relationships between transportation agencies and health partners.
- v. Market National Partnership technical assistance services as a strategy to help communities develop a successful Safe Routes to School program and situate themselves for leveraging additional funds.
- vi. Identify new sources of grant funds and individual donors.
- vii. Work with the media to publicize successes and how Safe Routes to School touches many policy goals.

### D. Leads

National Partnership, partners across the state, relevant city staff, such as Departments of Health, City and County Public Works, City and County Traffic Engineers, and City Manager's Offices.

## Appendices

- Appendix A. List of partners (attached)
- Bay Area (9 Counties) Regional Platform. -- forthcoming
- Southern California (7 Counties) Regional Platform. -- forthcoming

## Appendix A—List of Partners

Representatives from the following list of organizations have participated in at least two California State Network or State Action Team meetings within the past year and a half (2011 - May 2012).

[Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools Partnership](#)

[Alta Planning and Design](#)

[Bike Bakersfield](#)

[Butte County, Department of Public Health](#)

[California Department of Public Health, TARC](#)

[California Department of Transportation, Caltrans](#)

[California Bicycle Coalition](#)

[California Department of Education](#)

[California Medical Association Foundation](#)

[California Office of Traffic Safety](#)

[California Parent and Teachers Association](#)

[California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation](#)

[California School Board Association](#)

[California Strategic Growth Council](#)

[California Walks](#)

[California, Office of Planning and Research](#)

[Cities, Counties, and Schools Partnership](#)

[City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation](#)

[City of San Jose, Department of Transportation](#)

[City of Santa Clarita, Department of Transportation](#)

[City Project](#)

[Climate Plan](#)

[Coalition for Sustainable Transportation \(COAST\)](#)

[County of San Diego, Department of Public Health](#)

[Ecology Action](#)

[Humboldt County Department of Public Health](#)

[Kaiser Permanente](#)

[KENDALL PLANNING + DESIGN](#)

[KWS Consulting](#)

[Local Government Commission](#)

[Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition](#)

[Los Angeles County, Department of Public Health](#)  
[Marin County Bicycle Coalition](#)  
[Mercy San Juan Medical Center](#)  
[NPLAN](#)  
[Policy Link](#)  
[Prevention Institute](#)  
[R.D. White Elementary - Safety Committee](#)  
[Rady Children's Hospital, Safe Kids San Diego](#)  
[Riverside County Department of Public Health, Injury Prevention Services](#)  
[Office of Assemblymember V. Manuel Pérez](#)  
[Office of Traffic and Safety](#)  
[Ryan Snyder and Associates](#)  
[Rideshare San Luis Obispo](#)  
[Sacramento Area Council of Governments](#)  
[Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD](#)  
[Safe Kids Greater Sacramento](#)  
[Safe Transportation Research & Education Center \(SafeTrec\)](#)  
[San Francisco Department of Public Health](#)  
[Shasta County Health and Human Services Agency - Public Health Department](#)  
[Solana Transportation Authority](#)  
[Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition](#)  
[Southern California Association of Governments](#)  
[Sustainable Streets](#)  
[Transform](#)  
[Transportation for America](#)  
[Walk Sacramento](#)  
[Walk San Diego](#)  
[Walk San Francisco](#)  
[Youth Educational Sports, Inc.](#)