

**AUXILIARY SERVICES  
SERIES 700**

**702.2**

**Title: Safety Bussing/Bus Routes-Non -Transportation Zones**

The Board of Trustees of the Wilder School District may establish, and alter, bus routes and establish, and alter, non-transportation zones. Such routes and zones shall be determined for each year not later than the regular August meeting of the board; but nothing herein shall be construed as limiting the board in altering such routes or zones when change in the condition of the roads, or in the number of pupil transported would justify such alterations.

Safety busing is routing of buses to transport students who live less than one and one half miles from school. The safety of the students is the primary objective for this operation. The State Board of Education requires the board to approve all safety busing applications and these applications must be submitted to State Board of Education for review and approval prior to receiving funds for transportation expenses.

The Board of Trustees will adopt a “Measuring Instrument for Walking Students”. These “safety busing” areas will be rated at least once every three years.

The safety busing is provided primarily for elementary students who would otherwise be subjected, while walking to school, to hazards. The cost of approved safety busing is reimbursed 85% by the state transportation-funding program.

***Definitions:***

**Safety Busing Zone:** The transportation of a student who lives less than one and one-half miles from school when, in the judgment of the Board of Trustees, the age or health or safety of the students warrants such action.

**Non-Transportation Zone:** An area of the District designated by the Board which is not served by District transportation because of sparsity of students, remoteness, or condition of roads makes such service impractical In order to operate the transportation system as safely and efficiently as possible, the following factors shall be considered in establishing bus routes:

The Board of Trustees will determine that 66 total points or more on the measuring instrument will determine that safety bussing will be provided in the following safety zones/non transportation zones of elementary students who live within 1 and ½ miles from their school:

Students from Mitchell Subdivision, Chula Vista Housing and Prince Trailer Park must walk and/or cross Hwy 95. This is a heavily traveled highway and presents extreme hazardous conditions for elementary students. Many large trucks and farm equipment vehicles as well as a high number of other vehicles drive at speeds from 20 to 50 miles per hour. Young children have a difficult time judging when it’s safe to cross. There are no lights or crossing guards.

There are no statutory guidelines to use for identifying hazardous areas. However, the following guidelines are suggested when reviewing and evaluating “Safety Busing” applications.

1. Width of the shoulder of the road. Children should not be expected to walk upon the traffic lanes of a highway. The speed, number and type of vehicles traveling any of the roadways would indicate that traffic lanes are unsafe for pedestrians. Shoulder width on each side of the roadway should be at least three (3) feet and should be maintained free of snow and other obstructions.
2. Traffic count. There are usually more vehicles using main highways than using secondary roads. However, a traffic count can be misleading because of variations at different times of day. Motorists hurrying to and from work during rush hours which coincide with school hours present a hazard to children. Traffic counts should be taken during times students would be required to travel the area in question.
3. Lack of crossing guards. Some districts provide school crossing guards at busy intersections; others provide no extra protection for youthful pedestrians.
4. Lack of law enforcement. Posted speed limits are often ignored unless adequate enforcement is provided. This can be hazardous to school children.
5. Ages of children. While certain conditions present a degree of hazard to people of all ages, older students can be expected to accept more responsibility and exercise better judgement than younger students.
6. Railroad crossings. Moving trains as well as trains stopped at crossings present hazards to young peoples on their way to school.
7. Nature of traffic. A concentration of heavy truck traffic increases the hazards of any road. areas near large manufacturing plants or office building experience heavy traffic when work shifts change.
8. Inadequate pedestrian safeguards near school areas. Shortly before the start and close of the school day large numbers of vehicles converge on the school presenting extra hazards to children who must walk.
9. Temporary hazards. Construction projects, street repairs, excavations, and similar projects present additional problems and temptations to children walking to and from school.
10. Child molesters. Where children must walk through parks and other secluded areas, child molesters may present a hazard. However, this category is difficult, if not impossible to assess.

11. Inadequate protection around waterways. Where children must walk along or across ditches, creeks, rivers, etc. without adequate protection, hazardous situations and temptations to children are present, causing unsafe conditions. Length of required exposure should be factored into assessment. Walking past versus walking along open waterways present very different hazards.
12. SDE recommends school district administrators develop an objective measuring instrument which contains a scoring element for assessing hazards encountered by students while walking from home to school routes. Districts may use the sample measuring instrument provided by SDE, a sample of which is included in this manual.
13. SDE recommends school district board of trustees annually approve the formation of an ad hoc supplemental transportation committee for the purpose of objectively evaluating all hazardous routes under 1.5 miles from the students' home to school, using a board approved measuring instrument. It is further recommended that the ad hoc supplemental committee be made up of transportation professionals and student advocate representatives, i.e. city, county, state traffic engineers, law enforcement professionals, district pupil transportation supervisory personnel, district or other safety professionals, district and/or region PTA representatives, etc. SDE further recommends that the chairman of the ad hoc supplemental transportation committee report its recommendations to the local board of trustees at a timely scheduled public school board meeting.
14. SDE recommends that school district administrators solicit route evaluation requests from all interested patrons via school administrators.
15. SDE recommends that the objective measuring instrument and the related scoring element be used in determining an appropriate "cut off" for safety busing purposes when the scoring element used indicates hazards that are "reasonable" for students to encounter during their walk to and from school. The philosophy for this recommendation is based on the assumption that all students must encounter "some hazards" during the course of their travel from home to school. The intent of the objective measuring instrument is to prioritize and/or weight hazards.
16. SDE recommends that each local school district evaluate and implement a pedestrian safety program. This program should teach students of all ages how to deal with hazards to use existing pedestrian facilities, and follow safe walking practices. This should be a continuing program with positive reinforcement throughout the school year.
17. SDE encourages each school district and local governmental agency to upgrade their school zones as changing hazards suggest and to employ crossing guards, install signing, and upgrade pavement markings where appropriate.
18. SDE recommends that each school create or update a school route plan to provide for an orderly review of the school area traffic control needs. The plan should consist of a simple map showing streets accessing the school, existing traffic controls, established school routes,

and crossings. The number of school crossings should be limited to the fewest possible required to safely accommodate the demand.

Legal Reference: 33-1501 and 33-1502

Adopted: September 8, 2003  
Revised: November 11, 2010