Introduction

This Case Study Evaluation measures the impacts of Oregon Safe Routes to School (SRTS) 2019-2020 Competitive Construction Grants in communities across the state. The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of individual SRTS projects, techniques, and programs designed to reduce barriers to biking and walking to and from school. Evaluation research questions include:

- What are the impacts for standalone construction grants, and combined outreach and education and construction grants?
- How do different combinations of interventions effectively address the barriers identified by communities and affect mode shift, safety and perceptions of safety, program lifespan, and equity?

The Baseline Data Evaluation Report represents the “pre-construction” data and provides an overview of existing travel conditions and school site attributes. The Baseline Data Evaluation Report is intended to contain the majority of the information needed to plan for the post-construction data collection. The baseline report summarizes the funded improvement project, demographics of affected schools, and data from Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and local roadway authority crash records, parent surveys, and student travel hand tallies.

Plan for the Final Case Study Evaluation Report

The Final Case Study Evaluation Report will represent the “post-construction” data. A draft outline for this report is included in Appendix A. For data consistency, the post-construction data will be collected as soon as possible after construction is complete, likely starting in spring 2021. This will reduce weather-related impacts and also allow time during the school year for families to establish or change their travel habits. In addition to the standard parent surveys and student travel hand tallies, post-construction data collection methods for the evaluation report may also include: parent focus groups and surveys or interviews with school staff.

The Final Case Study Evaluation Report will measure shifts using the evaluation metrics laid out in this document to identify the successes of SRTS projects and provide insight on opportunities for further improvement. SRTS performance metrics measured during this evaluation process will include:

- **Mode split**: Are more students walking and biking to school after a project’s completion than at the time of baseline data collection?
- **Access to safe infrastructure**: Do students have better access to sidewalks, bike lanes, or safe crossing locations on their route to school after the completion of the project?
- **Safety/perception of safety**: Do parents and students feel safer or more comfortable walking and biking to school after the project’s completion?
- **Program lifespan/partnerships**: Is the SRTS program functioning efficiently and providing adequate support for partner jurisdictions, schools, and districts?
• **Equity:** Are students from a diversity of ethnic/racial and socioeconomic backgrounds benefiting from the investments being made?

In addition to reporting on grant effectiveness, data presented in the Baseline Data Evaluation Report and the Final Case Study Evaluation could be used for a variety of transportation and program planning purposes at the local level. Having a comprehensive set of quantitative data and qualitative feedback on transportation conditions and trends around these sites could help inform decisions on school/district policy, SRTS event and program planning by schools/districts/local jurisdictions, planning future infrastructure projects, as well as providing supporting documentation for future grant applications.

### Baseline SRTS Snapshot: South Shore Elementary

#### Summary

South Shore Elementary School is a public elementary school serving students in the City of Albany and rural Linn County. South Shore Elementary is a Title 1 school, with more than 95% of students eligible for the Federal Free and Reduced-Price Lunch Program. English and Spanish are the primary languages spoken by students, and 50% of students are registered as Ever English Learners.¹

City staff identified South Shore Elementary School as a high priority site for SRTS improvements due to the high traffic speeds and volumes on Waverly Drive in combination with prevalent pick-up and drop-off congestion around the beginning and end of school days.

The Oregon SRTS 2019-2020 Competitive IN Grant funded sidewalk gaps infill, construction of ADA compliant ramps, and pedestrian crossing improvements at the Waverly Dr./Southshore Dr. intersection. This project will address a large known barrier for students who would like to bike and walk to school.

In addition to these planned infrastructure improvements, the City and Albany Public School District have partnered to complete additional bicycle and pedestrian safety projects, including: designated school crossings and curb ramps in key locations, signage to support walking school bus participation, and weeklong bicycle education classes for all 5th grade district students.

Key information from South Shore Elementary parent surveys:

- 32% of students live within a mile of the school.
- Approximately 65% of students ride in a family vehicle to school and 64% use this mode to travel home. 33% of students take the school bus to school, and 32% take the bus home. Very few students reported walking to/from school.
- Parents report that travel time is the most common barrier to walking/biking to school. Other barriers include:
  - concerns about personal safety,
  - convenience of driving, and
  - poor driver behavior.
- Most parents recognize the value of walking/biking to school—69% described it as healthy and 41% described it as fun for their student.

¹ Number of students who have been served or were eligible for an English language development program during 2018-19 or at any time in the past. Oregon Department of Education 18-19 SY collected May 1, 2019.
Contact Information

JURISDICTION: City of Albany

CONTACT: Ron Irish, ron.irish@cityofalbany.net

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Greater Albany Public School District

CONTACT: District Office: (541)663-3202

OTHER CONTACTS: Marcia Beltran, Principal, marcia.beltran@albany.k12.or.us

Enrollment and Demographics

South Shore Elementary School is a Title 1 public school enrolling 407 students in Kindergarten through 5th grade. The school serves low income populations in the City of Albany and rural Linn County, with more than 95% of students eligible for the Free and Reduced-Price Lunch Program. English and Spanish are the primary languages spoken by students, and 50% are registered to be Ever English Learners.2

ENROLLMENT: 407
GRADE LEVELS SERVED AND SCHOOL TYPE: K-5, Public

STUDENT ETHNIC/RACIAL DEMOGRAPHICS:
- American Indian/Alaska Native: 2.5%
- Asian: 0.0%
- Hispanic or Latino: 61.9%
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Island: 0.0%
- Multiracial: 5.4%
- Black/African American: 0.5%
- White: 29.7%

PREDOMINANT LANGUAGES SPOKEN IN GREATER ALBANY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT:
- English: 8,551
- Spanish: 1,205
- Ukrainian: 16
- Punjabi: 10
- Vietnamese: 9
- Chinese: 8
- Russian: 7
- Tagalog: 6
- Arabic: 4

STUDENTS LIVING WITHIN 1-MILE OF SCHOOL: 32%3
TITLE 1 STATUS: Yes4

EVER ENGLISH LEARNERS: 50%5
FREE AND REDUCED-PRICE LUNCH ELIGIBILITY: >95%

---

2 Unless otherwise noted below, demographic data are from the Oregon Department of Education 19-20 SY, collected October 1, 2019.
3 SRTS Program parent surveys 2019.
4 Title 1 schools are schools where 40% or more of students are enrolled in USDA’s Free and Reduced-Price Meals Program.
5 Number of students who have been served or were eligible for an English language development program during 2018-19 or at any time in the past. Oregon Department of Education 18-19 SY collected May 1, 2019.
Community Context and Place Type

Place type describes attributes of a built environment, including: access to destinations, density, walkability, mixing of uses, and presence of transit. The evaluation team compiled Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development’s (DLCD) measures of place type for each community studied. Each attribute is rated as “Very Low, Low, Medium, or High” by block group. Place type characteristics provide important context for transportation opportunities and challenges in a community and influence the transportation decisions people make.

South Shore Elementary School is located in the City of Albany, and the block group encompasses a portion of the city limits. According to the Place Type Tool, the area surrounding South Shore Elementary School is categorized as Close-in Community, meaning it contains medium density development, and Employment, meaning the surrounding census block group generally contains more commercial than residential development, with 1,381 people residing and 1,612 people working within the census block group. The area has a medium level of access to regional employment centers and destinations, and a high mix of uses; however, the overall level of street connectivity in the area is characterized as “very low.”

**Close-In Community**
- Medium densities of housing and employment
- Located adjacent and with good access to the region’s employment center
- Lower densities decrease multi-modal access to jobs

**Employment**
- Land use is dominated by commercial or industrial activities
- Low diversity of land uses
- Jobs/Housing balance: mostly jobs
- Missing either the density or street design required of mixed Use

---

6 More information about OLCD’s Place Type Tool is available at: [www.oregon.gov/lcd/CL/Pages/Place-Types.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/lcd/CL/Pages/Place-Types.aspx)
### Project Description

A map of the project improvements from the South Shore Elementary grant application is included in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEM STATEMENT:</th>
<th>Gaps in sidewalk and the need to cross a busy arterial road at a non-stop controlled location restrict the ability of students to walk to and from South Shore Elementary School.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF BARRIERS TO WALKING AND BIKING:</td>
<td>The volume of traffic and the width of the crossing on Waverly Drive limits use of the crosswalk. South Shore Elementary is a dual immersion language school, resulting in a high percentage of students living too far away to walk or receive bus service. They are instead dropped off by parents. Those parents stack up along Southshore Drive when school is out, moving forward incrementally to pick up students in front of the school. That slowly moving line of cars and the lack of sidewalk means there's no place other than the middle of the street for by students that might otherwise walk to and from neighborhoods west of the school. Because of the safety issues those students aren't walking. That in turn adds to the parent drop off problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>The project will improve student access to South Shore Elementary School through: infill of sidewalk gaps, construction of ADA compliant ramps, and pedestrian crossing improvements at the Waverly Dr./Southshore Dr. intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED PROJECT TIMELINE:</td>
<td>August 2019 Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITY SAFETY CORRIDOR?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTREACH AND EDUCATION:</td>
<td>The City and Albany Public School District have partnered to complete bicycle and pedestrian safety projects including: designated school crossings and curb ramps in key locations, signage to support walking school bus participation, and weeklong bicycle education classes for all 5th grade district students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 A road where the posted speed or 85th percentile speed of traffic is 40 mph or greater OR if and two of the following apply: posted speed limit of 30 mph or greater, more than two lanes or a crossing distance greater than 30 feet, 12,000 AADT or greater, has a demonstrated history of crashes related to school traffic.
Access Analysis for Students Walking and Biking to School

The project team conducted an analysis to estimate the number of people who would gain walking and biking access to South Shore Elementary School when the project improvements are constructed, shown in Table 1 and Figure 1. First, the project improvements were evaluated to understand the geographic areas that would gain safe access to the school once the funded project was constructed. Next, American Community Survey (ACS) data was combined with zoning data to estimate the number of people and school-age children that live within the new access areas.

This analysis estimates that approximately 88 students, or 8% of the South Shore Elementary School student body living within a mile of the school, would gain safer walking or biking access to the school.

Table 1. Access Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population of New Access Areas</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Age Population of New Access Areas</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students within the School Areas Gaining Access</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Assumes that the SE 9th Ave school grounds entrance is not accessible via wheelchair and thus the residential areas south and west of the Waverly Dr and S Shore Drive intersection are included in the new access area.
9 Calculated using the proportion of school-age children (5-17 years old) within the City of Albany.
10 The School Area is defined as the area within the school enrollment area that is within one mile of the school.
South Shore Elementary School
Students with New Access to Walking and Biking

Estimated Number of Students: 88
Proportion of Students within 1 Mile: 8%

To view the methods for this analysis, please see Appendix
Baseline Data

The following section presents pre-construction data, which will be compared against similar data collected after the project has been construction, in order to estimate the impact of the improvements.

Hand Tallies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE COLLECTED:</th>
<th>May, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATA COLLECTION PROCESS:</td>
<td>13 classrooms surveyed about their trip to and from school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF STUDENTS:</td>
<td>207 students participated in hand tallies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPS RECORDED</td>
<td>971 trips recorded by the hand tallies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY

The May 2019 baseline hand tally data from South Shore Elementary includes 971 recorded trips collected from 207 students in 13 classrooms. The hand tally process surveyed all students in each classroom on which transportation mode(s) they had used to get to and from school the day of the survey and the day prior to the survey. The Oregon SRTS's hand tally data collection forms and process were used. Alta Planning + Design staff collected the data. This data provides a snapshot of student travel behavior trends.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS:

South Shore Elementary hand tally data from 2019 indicates that a majority of students surveyed ride in a family vehicle in the morning and ride the school bus in the afternoon (see Figure 2 and Table 2). Riding the school bus was the second most common way students got to school in the morning (37%). In the afternoon, family vehicles were the second most common mode, with 42% of students. Carpools are also used by 4% of students to get to school and 2% to get home. Three percent of students walk in the morning and 5% walk home in the afternoon. Four students reported biking to school.

Figure 2. Student Mode Split by Time of Day, 2019 Hand Tally Data

Note: Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Table 2. Count of Student Mode Split to and From School, 2019 Hand tally Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME OF DAY</th>
<th>WALK</th>
<th>BIKE</th>
<th>SCHOOL BUS</th>
<th>FAMILY VEHICLE</th>
<th>CARPOOL</th>
<th>TRANSIT</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parent/Caregiver Surveys

DATE COLLECTED: May, 2019

DATA COLLECTION PROCESS: The Oregon Department of Transportation SRTS parent/caregiver survey was distributed electronically to parents at South Shore Elementary School to assess family perceptions about school travel options and behavior. The survey was available in English and Spanish.

NUMBER OF SURVEYS: 32; 8% response rate

SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY

The parent/caregiver survey data included in this report was collected in May of 2019 from 32 participants with students attending South Shore Elementary.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS:

Parent/caregiver survey analysis revealed that 32% of respondents live within 1 mile of South Shore Elementary, with an additional 19% living between 1 and 2 miles of the school site (see Figure 3). Half of surveyed parents and caregivers live more than 2 miles from the school.

Figure 3. How Far Does your Family Live from School?, 2019 Parent/Caregiver Survey

Family vehicles modes were the most commonly used transportation option for students living less than a quarter mile from the school, as well as those living between a half mile and one mile away and those who live two miles or farther from school (see Figure 4 and Table 3). For students who live between a quarter-mile and a half-mile from school, the school bus was the most popular transportation, with 70% using this mode.
Additionally, 58% of students who lived between one and two miles from school used shared modes. Only three students (all living between a half-mile and one mile from school) walked to/from school.

**Figure 4. Mode Split by Distance from School, 2019 Parent/Caregiver Survey**

![Mode Split by Distance from School](image)

**Table 3. Count of Trips by Distance the Family Lives from School, 2019 Parent/Caregiver Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
<th>WALK</th>
<th>BIKE</th>
<th>SCHOOL BUS</th>
<th>FAMILY VEHICLE</th>
<th>CARPOOL</th>
<th>TRANSIT</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 mile up to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 mile up to 1 mile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile up to 2 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Figure 5 illustrates, 84% of parents and caregivers surveyed reported that they would not allow their student to walk to/from school. However, 13% responded that they would allow their student to walk if they were accompanied by a trusted adult, and another 3% would allow them to walk with a friend or sibling. 97% said they would not allow their student to bike, and only 3% would allow biking with a trusted adult present.

**Figure 5. Do You Allow this Student to Travel to School in the Following Ways?, 2019 Parent/Caregiver Survey**

![Allow Student to Travel](image)
While parents and caregivers reported varying concerns that limit their student’s ability to walk or bike to school, some were more commonly expressed than others (see Figure 6). Many surveyed parents faced the following barriers:

- The length of time it takes to walk or bike to school
- Concerns about safety, documentation, or criminal activity
- Poor driver behavior
- Convenience of driving

**Figure 6. What Concerns Limit Your Student’s Ability to Walk or Bike to/from School?, 2019 Parent/Caregiver Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takes too long to walk/bike</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety, Criminal activity</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving is more convenient</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver behavior</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other concerns</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad weather</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities or bike parking</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No crossing guards</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have any concerns</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of parent and caregiver respondents (59%) felt South Shore Elementary neither encouraged or discouraged students from walking and biking to school at the time of the survey. An additional 9% felt the school encouraged or strongly encouraged active transportation, while 32% characterized the school as discouraging walking and biking (see Figure 7).
At the time of the survey, 41% of parents and caregivers agreed that walking or biking to school would be a fun activity for their students, while only 22% believed the activity would be boring. An additional 38% were neutral or unsure on whether their student would enjoy walking and biking to school (Figure 8).

Figure 8. Agree/Disagree: Walking/Biking to/from School is Fun for my Student, 2019 Parent/Caregiver Survey
A majority of parents and caregivers recognized the health benefits of active transportation, with 69% agreeing that walking or biking to school would be healthy for their student. An additional 19% were neutral regarding the health benefits of walking and biking, and 13% did not feel that the activities would be healthy for their student (see Figure 9).

Figure 9. Agree/Disagree: Walking/Biking to/from School is Healthy for my Student, 2019 Parent/Caregiver Survey
# Crash Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DATE COLLECTED:</strong></th>
<th><strong>2012-2016</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA COLLECTION PROCESS:</strong></td>
<td>Crash Data included in this report originates from relevant roadway jurisdictions, as well as the ODOT SRTS Web Map Application. This analysis does not determine whether the grant intervention caused any change in the occurrence of crashes, due to small sample size. Additionally, due to insufficient mode split data to calculate crash rates, this report offers a count and description of reported incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER OF REPORTED CRASHES INVOLVING BIKES AND PEDESTRIANS WITHIN 1 MILE OF SCHOOL:</strong></td>
<td>Between 2012 and 2016, 62 crashes involving a bicyclist or pedestrian were reported within one mile of the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **TIME OF REPORTED CRASHES INVOLVING BIKES AND PEDESTRIANS WITHIN 1 MILE OF SCHOOL*:** | 53 of these reported crashes occurred during school commuting hours; the majority occurred during PM commuting hours.  
* For these purposes school commuting hours were defined as 6 AM to 9 PM. |
| **NUMBER OF REPORTED INJURIES BY SEVERITY WITHIN 1 MILE OF THE SCHOOL:** | All 62 of these reported crashes involved an injury to a bicyclist or pedestrian. All 31 of the reported crashes involving a bicyclist were non-fatal. Of the 31 reported crashes involving a pedestrian, 29 were non-fatal and two were fatal. Figure 10 illustrates the location of the crashes by type and injury severity. |
| **ADDITIONAL CRASH DATA CONSIDERATIONS:** | Sidewalk and crossing improvements are planned at South Shore Dr and Waverly Dr, where a non-fatal crash involving a bicyclist occurred in 2015. In its application, the City of Albany also cited a vehicle-only rear-end collision at the Waverly/Southshore crosswalk in which the stopping movement was likely triggered by a pedestrian in the crosswalk. |

## Notes on Community Context or other Relevant Information:

None.
Figure 10: South Shore Elementary School Bicycle & Pedestrian Collisions (2012-2016)
Follow-Up Data Collection Plan

Timeline

Post-grant field visits to collect follow-up data will be scheduled to take place the spring following the completion of each grant intervention. The City of Albany estimates the project will be completed by August 2019.

Follow-up Data Collection Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>PLANNED AT THIS SITE?</th>
<th>TARGET SAMPLE SIZE</th>
<th>TARGET FIELD WORK DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT HAND TALLIES:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>At least 2 classrooms per grade per school</td>
<td>Late spring 2021 (assuming project completion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT SURVEYS:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>At least 30 parents per school</td>
<td>Late spring 2021 (assuming project completion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT FOCUS GROUPS:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4-10 parents</td>
<td>Late spring 2021 (assuming project completion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF SURVEYS:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1-3 school staff and administration</td>
<td>Late spring 2021 (assuming project completion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRASH DATA:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B. Competitive SRTS IN Grant Funded Project Map

Figure 11. South Shore Elementary Competitive SRTS IN Grant Funded Project Map
Appendix C. Access to SRTS Detailed Methodology

Purpose

The access map analysis was designed to estimate the number of students with new or significantly improved access to school upon the implementation of a proposed walking or biking facility. While determining the number of students who benefit from a proposed project is not an exact science, this analysis provides a common approach that utilizes school district boundaries, census population data and local zoning codes to generate rough estimates. These estimates lend greater insight into the impact of a particular Safe Routes to School project, allowing facility improvements to be compared and thus aid in prioritizing investments. This memo outlines the data sources, methods, and assumptions that inform the access map analysis described in this report.

Data Sources

Three primary data sources were used in this analysis in conjunction with the information provided in each project application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Community Survey (ACS) Population Estimates</td>
<td>US Census Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon School District Boundaries</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Oregon Statewide Zoning Map</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods

The analysis establishes two geographical areas in which census block population data are apportioned to: 1) the school area and 2) the access area. The school area is defined as the area that is within a 1-mile radius of the applicant school or within the enrollment boundary, whichever is closer. This area covers residents within reasonable walking or biking distance of the to school. The access area is the area that covers all residents who would experience new or significantly improved access to school upon the implementation of the proposed walking or biking facility.

Once both of these areas have been established, the consultant team identified the census blocks that intersect each. We then apportioned the population data from the census blocks to the school area and the access area, based on the relative coverage of each census block. To account for varying residential densities in each census block, we used residential zoning data to determine the proportion of the population that should be attributed to the school area and access area.
After the estimated populations of both the school area and the access area are calculated, the local jurisdiction’s youth rate is applied to each to get the number of people ages 5-17 in those areas, which we refer to as the ‘school age population’. Finally, the school age populations of the access area and the school area are compared. The percentage of school age students with new or improved access to school represents the proportion of students impacted by the project out of all the students in the school area who could reasonably walk or bike to school.

**Defining the Access Area**

The boundary of the school area is readily calculable using GIS and the rules described above. By contrast, the access area boundary was determined manually based on the project description and professional judgement of impact. While this method inherently includes subjective judgement, the high variability and nuance in the transportation context surrounding the proposed project makes this method more suitable for determining the residential areas would benefit from its implementation than a purely GIS-based workflow. The following assumptions and rules of thumb were adopted in order to make the assessment of the access areas as uniform as possible:

1. The analysis assumes people are willing to “walk around the block” half the distance of their street in the opposite direction of school in order to utilize a safe path to school.
2. The analysis assumes that Google Earth street view imagery is up to date, as this was used to determine sidewalk connectivity and condition, which informed the access areas.
3. Places without sidewalks, particularly in small towns, are considered walkable if the street is narrow, residential, and designed for a low volume of traffic (i.e., lacks a centerline)
4. The access areas consider ADA accessibility and account for those in wheelchairs or other mobility devices.
5. The access areas may include residents who have to walk more than one mile to school, based on the available street network.
6. Even if some residents may have already had access to school, they might be included in the access area if the proposed project would significantly improve their access to school.

**Apportioning Census Population Data**

As described above, census population data was apportioned to both the school area and the access area based on how much a census block covered them. However, to account for varying population densities across census blocks, residential zones in the census blocks were identified.

The statewide zoning data provided by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development groups residential zones across all jurisdictions in the state into 13 categories of increasing density. Our team further consolidated these categories into just 4: Low Density, Medium-Low Density, Medium-High Density, and High Density. We then weighted these categories by their relative density compared to Low Density:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Zone Group</th>
<th>Population Density Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Low Density</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-High Density</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These factors serve to more accurately distribute the population data across the residential zones within the census block. In other words, if the census block contained only Low Density residential zones, then the population of any given area within that census block is equal to the proportion of the census block that that area covers. By contrast, if a census block contains Low Density residential zones and High Density zones, we attribute 15 times the population of the census block to the High Density zones than the Low Density zones. The density factors were determined using the typical number of dwellings per acre in in each zone.

The analysis uses these four zoning categories to identify the spatial distribution of the population of the census block and apportion it to the overlaying school area and access areas based on how much those areas cover the residential zones of the census block.

**General Assumptions**

- This analysis assumes that the Oregon Statewide Zoning code reflects the actual residential densities of the current built environment.
- Areas that were zoned for housing that had no development on them according to the latest satellite imagery (and significantly impacted the output) were removed from the analysis in order to improve the accuracy of the estimates. This was only utilized in a few low-population jurisdictions.
- This analysis assumes that families are evenly distributed between each of the four residential zone groups.
- The reported number of school-age students includes all students ages 5-17, not just elementary or middle school students. Thus, the number of students who actually attend the applicant school is likely much lower than the reported figure.