



Safe
Routes
PARTNERSHIP

Active Paths for Equity & Health

MAKING STRIDES 2022

**STATE REPORT CARDS
on Support for Walking, Bicycling,
and Active Kids and Communities**



AUTHORS:

Marisa Jones
Michelle Lieberman

CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS:

Kori Johnson
Natasha Riveron
Maria Sipin

©2022 Safe Routes Partnership

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the many people who contributed to the development of these report cards and this publication. We could not have developed the report cards without significant assistance from state government staff from a variety of agencies. We also thank the range of experts and stakeholders who have helped us refine our understanding of the topical areas and measures over the past four editions of the report cards.

We would also like to extend our thanks to our partner in this work, the YMCA of the USA. The partnership between our organizations has been instrumental in enabling these report cards to make a concrete difference on the ground.

This report was developed with support from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Its contents are solely the position of the authors and do not represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; nor does the mention of trade names, commercial practices, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.



Active People, Healthy NationSM is a national initiative to help 27 million Americans become more physically active by 2027. This initiative promotes effective strategies, including Safe Routes to School, recommended by the Community Preventive Services Task Force to improve physical activity. CDC, in collaboration with state, community, and national partners, promotes these proven strategies through Active People, Healthy Nation to ensure that all Americans have access to safe and accessible places for physical activity. Use of Active People, Healthy NationSM does not imply review, approval, or endorsement by HHS.

Table of Contents

About This Report	<u>ii</u>
I. Introduction	<u>1</u>
II. The Importance of Physical Activity	<u>2</u>
III. Why a State Report Card?	<u>5</u>
IV. Overview of the Report Cards: Key Topics and Grading	<u>6</u>
A. Complete Streets and Active Transportation Policy and Planning	<u>7</u>
1. Complete Streets Policies	<u>8</u>
2. Active Transportation Goals and Planning	<u>9</u>
B. Federal and State Active Transportation Funding	<u>10</u>
1. Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	<u>11</u>
2. State Funding for Active Transportation	<u>12</u>
C. Safe Routes to School Funding and Supportive Practices	<u>14</u>
1. Safe Routes to School Funding	<u>15</u>
2. Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	<u>16</u>
D. Active Schools and Neighborhoods	<u>18</u>
1. Shared Use of School Facilities	<u>18</u>
2. School Siting and Design	<u>19</u>
3. Physical Education	<u>20</u>
V. The Report Cards	<u>21</u>
VI. Reflections and Comparisons	<u>73</u>
VII. Conclusions	<u>82</u>
Appendices	<u>83</u>
A. Complete Streets and Active Transportation Scores by State	<u>83</u>
B. Federal and State Active Transportation Funding Scores by State	<u>84</u>
C. Safe Routes to School Funding and Supportive Practices by State	<u>85</u>
D. Active Neighborhoods and Schools Scores by State	<u>86</u>
E. 2022 Overall Scores by State	<u>87</u>
F. School Siting and Design: School Minimum Acreage Guidelines Scoring Details by State	<u>88</u>
G. School Siting and Design: School Walking/Biking/Physical Activity Support Scoring Details by State	<u>89</u>
H. PE Requirements Scoring Details by State	<u>90</u>
Endnotes	<u>91</u>

About This Report


Physical activity is essential for improving and maintaining the physical, social, and emotional health of children and adults in all communities. Our state governments play a crucial role in supporting opportunities for physical activity by enacting laws and policies and making funding decisions that lead to physical, social, and institutional environments that promote and enable health.



This report includes the fourth edition of state report cards produced by the Safe Routes Partnership, providing an at-a-glance snapshot of how states are doing in their support of walking, bicycling, rolling, and active kids and communities. Used in conjunction with the state report cards developed in 2016, 2018, and 2020, they allow us to see where progress has been made, where each state is doing well, and where there continue to be opportunities for improvement.

This report begins in **Section I** with an introduction to the goals of the 2022 state report cards. **Section II** provides an overview of the current research that supports walking, bicycling, and physical activity as ways to improve health. In **Section III**, we set out the rationale for state-level report cards. In **Section IV**, we provide a detailed explanation of how the states were graded. **Section V** contains the report cards themselves, ordered alphabetically by state. In **Section VI**, we share reflections on overall trends illustrated by the report cards, provide maps with visual representations of data, delve into specific indicators, and compare these report cards with previous report cards. **Section VII** summarizes concluding thoughts. **Appendices** supply more detailed summaries of the report card data and underlying conditions.

This report was developed by the Safe Routes Partnership as part of a partnership with the YMCA of the USA. With support from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, this partnership has allowed our organizations to advance our joint work to support communities in becoming places where children and adults can be physically active and healthy. The Safe Routes Partnership is a national nonprofit that works to advance safe walking and rolling to and from schools and in everyday life, improving the health and well-being of people of all races, income levels, and abilities, and building healthy, thriving communities for everyone. YMCA of the USA is the national office for the Y, one of the nation's leading nonprofits strengthening communities through youth development, healthy living, and social responsibility. These state report cards allow state and local Ys, nonprofit organizations, agency personnel, communities, and individuals to identify where a state has done well and where there is more work needed. As we have already seen to date, the report cards inspire action that makes our states and our country more supportive of healthy, physically active children and communities.



Introduction


Safe, accessible, and welcoming environments where people can play, exercise, travel, and interact with others are essential for improving health and maintaining the good health of children and adults in all communities.

The previous edition of the Making Strides State Report Cards was released in 2020 just a few months after the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. Low levels of physical activity were already harming people of every demographic group pre-pandemic, with many of the worst effects experienced by people of color.¹ Unfortunately, over the last two years, physical activity has fallen further down on the priority list for many people.² But also during this time, awareness around the importance of safe places and opportunities to walk, roll, and recreate seemingly grew. The pandemic highlighted walking and rolling as often the only transportation options for necessary activities such as grocery shopping, and for essential workers like health care workers and supermarket clerks to connect to transit or reach their places of employment. The pandemic emphasized the need for expanding opportunities for recreation, especially outdoors, following the temporary closure of exercise facilities and gyms, school campuses, and afterschool programs. And the pandemic continues to exacerbate existing health disparities, which increases the urgency for addressing barriers to physical activity.³ During this time, state governments and decision-makers have maintained a crucial role in creating health-promoting or health-defeating conditions on the ground – and many states rose to the challenge to further support people in their communities and their ability to safely walk, bicycle, roll, and be physically active.



The 2022 Making Strides State Report Cards capture each state's progress in supporting walking, bicycling, rolling, and physically active kids and communities. As will be discussed in Section VI, there was an upward shift in overall state scores from 2020 – a promising sign of change! Delving into each of the four core topic areas and 27 indicators, we can see where each state has taken action and where there is more work to do. These state report cards come at a time ripe with the potential for states to make positive changes.

Many current factors can be the impetus to increase state policies and local conditions that support active, resilient, and sustainable communities. These include new federal funding through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, increased awareness around the causes and effects of climate change, and a responsibility to help communities and individuals through a period of pandemic recovery. These report cards provide a tool for state elected officials, agency decision-makers, stakeholders, and community members who want to see healthier residents and more vibrant neighborhoods throughout our states and country.



The Importance of Physical Activity

Physical activity is vital for our physical and mental health. The National Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans, 2nd edition set out the amounts and kinds of physical activity that children and adults need to receive significant health benefits.⁴

To achieve substantial health benefits, preschool-aged children (ages three through five years) need active play through a variety of enjoyable physical activities throughout the day every day. For children and youth ages six through 17 years, the recommended physical activity level is 60 minutes or more of moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical activity daily, including vigorous aerobic activities, muscle-strengthening, and bone-strengthening activities on at least 3 days a week.

Adults need at least 150 minutes of moderate-intensity activity per week along with muscle-strengthening activities on at least two days per week, and older adults (65 years and older) need both of those, along with activities to improve balance. In addition, the guidelines suggest higher levels of physical activity to achieve even greater benefits and emphasize avoiding physical inactivity.

But most Americans are not meeting these guidelines. Based on self-reporting (which often over-estimates healthy behavior), only 54 percent of American adults are meeting the aerobic component of the physical activity guidelines and a scant 24 percent are meeting the recommended levels of overall physical activity.⁵ Moreover, rates were lower for adults living in rural communities than in urban areas.⁶

Data released in 2022 showed that 25.3 percent of American adults surveyed from 2017 to 2020 reported they were physically inactive, meaning they did not do any physical activity outside of their regular job.⁷ There were differences by race and by location. Overall, non-Hispanic Asian adults (20.1 percent) had the lowest prevalence of physical inactivity outside of work followed by non-Hispanic white (23.0 percent), non-Hispanic American Indian/Alaska Native (29.1 percent), non-Hispanic Black (30.0 percent), and Hispanic adults (32.1 percent). Regionally, states in the South (27.5 percent) had the highest prevalence of physical inactivity, followed by the Midwest (25.2 percent), Northeast (24.7 percent), and West (21.0 percent). These disparities emerge in significant part from differences in neighborhood availability of health-promoting features such as sidewalks, parks, bicycle lanes, and so on.

Less than one-quarter (24 percent) of children six to 17 years of age participate in 60 minutes of physical activity every day.⁸ In 2019, only 23.2 percent of high school students were physically active for at least 60 minutes per day, every day, and only 16.5 percent had met both aerobic and muscle-strengthening physical activity guidelines.⁹ This was a decline from rates of physical activity in high school students that were already low as of 2017.¹⁰ Physical activity rates were higher for boys than girls, and higher for white students than for African American and Hispanic students.¹¹

Physical Activity Recommendations¹²

Physical Activity Recommendations for Adults (ages 18-64 years)

- At least 150 minutes a week of moderate intensity activity such as brisk walking
- At least 2 days a week of activities that strengthen muscles

*Aim for the recommended activity level but be as active as one is able

Physical Activity Recommendations for Older Adults (65+ years)

- At least 150 minutes a week of moderate intensity activity such as brisk walking
- At least 2 days a week of activities that strengthen muscles
- Activities to improve balance such as standing on one foot

*Aim for the recommended activity level but be as active as one is able

Physical Activity Recommendations for Children and Adolescents (ages 6-17 years)

- 60 minutes (1 hour) or more of moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical activity daily
- A variety of enjoyable physical activities
- As part of the 60 minutes, on at least 3 days a week, children and adolescents need:
 - o Vigorous activity such as running or soccer
 - o Activity that strengthens muscles such as climbing or push-ups
 - o Activity that strengthens bones such as gymnastics or jumping rope

Physical Activity Recommendations for Preschool-aged Children (ages 3-5 years)

- Physical activity every day throughout the day
- Active play through a variety of enjoyable physical activities

Why Walking, Bicycling, and Physical Activity Matter

Physical activity is one of the key ways to improve health. Studies have shown that physical activity is important for everyone—children, teens, adults, and older adults, men and women, people with disabilities, and people of all racial and ethnic groups.¹³

The benefits of physical activity for children include improved attention and memory, reduced risk of depression, improved aerobic fitness, and reduced risk of chronic diseases like type 2 diabetes and obesity, among others.¹⁴ The benefits of physical activity for adults include immediate benefits such as improved sleep quality and reduced blood pressure and long-term benefits such as lower risk of heart disease, stroke, and type 2 diabetes, lower risk of some cancers, improved bone health, and others.¹⁵

Designing communities that make it easy to walk bicycle and take public transit can help people improve their health by making physical activity part of their daily lives. For example, almost one-third of transit users get their entire recommended amount of physical activity just by walking to and from transit stops.²⁴ Conversely, people who travel by car are more sedentary, which is associated with chronic disease and premature death.²⁵ People who live in places that support walking, bicycling, and public transportation get more physical activity and are less likely to be overweight than those who live in automobile-oriented communities.²⁶ Access to places for physical activity, such as parks, playgrounds, community centers, and other recreational facilities, also increases the likelihood of children and adults being physically active. For example, studies show that people who live closer to parks are more likely to visit parks and be physically active more often than those who live further from parks.²⁷

Walking, bicycling, and physical activity are good for individual health, but there are other benefits as well. Healthy communities and a healthy workforce can benefit our country, our states, and our businesses.

The Importance of Physical Activity During and After the COVID-19 Pandemic

The decrease in physical activity during the pandemic has led to serious physical health outcomes. During the pandemic, 42 percent of adults reported undesired weight gain with an average increase of 29 pounds.¹⁶ Communities of color were most likely to report unintended physical changes during the pandemic, including changes to weight and sleep patterns.¹⁷ Children also experienced accelerated weight gain during the pandemic, with increasing levels of obesity and more pronounced increases for children ages five to nine years and those who were Latinx, Black, or from families with lower incomes.¹⁸ In addition, people who do little or no physical activity are more likely to get very sick from COVID-19 than those who are physically active.¹⁹

A survey of parents and caregivers by Action for Healthy Kids in 2021 found that parents and caregivers recognized their children were facing a health crisis as a result of the pandemic. Nearly two-thirds of parents noticed impediments to their kids getting enough sleep, proper nutrition, and physical activity.²⁰ During the pandemic, the concern that

increased the most for parents and caregivers was related to the physical activity of their children.²¹ Parents were increasingly concerned for their children's inactivity and most interested in receiving support from their children's schools in the form of virtual physical education classes and at-home physical activities.²²

Safe Routes Partnership's report **One Step Forward, Two Steps Back: COVID-19's Impact on Youth Physical Activity and Safe Routes to School** describes how the opportunities for physical activity and how people move through their communities have shifted in different ways. Living in a pandemic emphasized the importance of movement and play for emotional and physical health. The pandemic also exposed how opportunities were limited for many because of their home or work environments, and if safe streets and public spaces were available in their communities.²³

For example, one study calculated that 8.7 percent of aggregate health care expenditures in the United States were associated with inadequate physical activity by people with the capacity to be active.²⁸

Other benefits of more walking, bicycling, and physical activity may include an increased sense of community and less social isolation, higher cognitive functioning, lower rates of depression, less air pollution and fewer climate-changing emissions, and many more.²⁹



Changes to the built environment as well as the systems that neighborhoods were created in can ensure all people have access to places and resources that support health and wellness, and also address outcomes of physical inactivity such as the higher risk of obesity that do not affect all communities equally. For example, obesity is disproportionately prevalent in low-income communities and communities of color.³⁰ Black and Latinx children have higher rates of obesity than white and Asian American children.³¹ Racial disparities in obesity are not solely due to biological and genetic differences or health behaviors. Stress exposure, stress appraisals, and the overall social context in which individuals live also contribute.³² Health inequities can be caused or exacerbated by stressors such as racism, sexism, homophobia, and other harms perpetuated by institutions and individuals. One example of a stressor is the hypervigilance caused by racial profiling of Black Americans in white neighborhoods which has emerged as a national dialogue called Running While Black following the murder of Ahmaud Arbery during an afternoon jog.³³ More research is demonstrating how racial discrimination is an emerging risk factor for disease and a contributor to racial disparities in health.³⁴

Health Benefits of Physical Activity for Children³⁵

- Academic Performance – Improves attention and memory
- Brain Health – Reduces risk of depression
- Muscular Fitness – Builds strong muscles and endurance
- Heart and Lung Health – Improves blood pressure and aerobic fitness
- Cardiometabolic Health – Helps maintain normal blood sugar levels
- Long-term Health – Reduces risk of several chronic diseases, including type 2 diabetes and obesity
- Bone Strength – Strengthens bones
- Healthy Weight – Helps regulate body weight and reduce body fat

Health Benefits of Physical Activity for Adults³⁶

Immediate Benefits

A single bout of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity provides immediate benefits for your health.

- Sleep - Improves sleep quality
- Less Anxiety - Reduces feelings of anxiety
- Blood Pressure - Reduces blood pressure

Long-term Benefits

Regular physical activity provides important health benefits for chronic disease prevention.

- Brain Health - Reduces risks of developing dementia (including Alzheimer's disease) and reduces the risk of depression
- Heart Health - Lowers risk of heart disease, stroke, and type 2 diabetes
- Cancer Prevention - Lowers risk of eight cancers: bladder, breast, colon, endometrium, esophagus, kidney, lung, and stomach
- Healthy Weight - Reduces risk of weight gain
- Bone Strength - Improves bone health
- Balance and Coordination - Reduces risks of falls
- Emerging research suggests physical activity may also help boost immune function.



A Challenge of National Significance

In 1996, the problem of physical inactivity came to national attention with the release of the first Surgeon General's report on Americans' escalating physical inactivity, *Physical Activity and Health: A Report of the Surgeon General*.³⁷ The report's publication marked the official recognition that physical inactivity ranks among the top risk factors affecting the health of our entire nation, along with tobacco use, deadly transmissible diseases, and other grave threats to health. The report summarized positive practices and promising interventions occurring around the country.³⁸


In 2015, the Surgeon General's Office again took action to emphasize the significance of sufficient physical activity to the health of Americans. With the Call to Action to Promote Walking and Walkable Communities, the Surgeon General homed in on the vital role that active transportation—walking and bicycling as a way to get around—has in providing Americans with the recommended daily amount of physical activity.

As the Surgeon General noted, walking helps prevent disease before it starts, is available to people of all ages and stages of life without need for special equipment, helps build social connectedness, and is fun.

The Call to Action laid out five goals for supporting walking:

- Make walking a national priority
- Design communities that make it safe and easy to walk for people of all ages and abilities
- Promote programs and policies to support walking where people live, learn, work, and play
- Provide information to encourage walking and improve walkability
- Fill research gaps related to walking and walkability

The measures in the state report cards are aligned with the goals set out by the Surgeon General's Call to Action, as well as many of their accompanying suggested approaches. The Status Report for Step It Up! The Surgeon General's Call to Action to Promote Walking and Walkable Communities, released in 2017, found that the Call to Action received web and media attention, activities by federal agencies to promote the Call to Action have continued since its release, the goals of the Call to Action are being advanced, and states, communities, and organizations are successfully implementing activities that build on the Call to Action. It re-emphasized that physical activity needs to be improved in the United States.³⁹



Why a State Report Card?

States have a crucial role in supporting the health of their communities by promoting physical activity through policies and other decisions. Although there are key opportunities for action at every level of government and by businesses, developers, religious institutions, families, and individuals, states are in a unique position. Our nation as a whole is large and its regions differ widely from one another. While the diversity and differences within our states are also considerable, state governments are closer to the ground than the federal government, are familiar with the specific challenges and opportunities faced by individual communities, and have responsibility for the wellbeing of all their residents.



In many states, local communities require state authorization in order to take action on health and other challenges. Consequently, states have a responsibility to enact policies and practices and implement programs that support residents to lead healthy, active lives.

Through executive action, states can establish state goals to inspire change. States can pass laws that ensure that state money is spent on infrastructure or other programs that support health. State departments of transportation and other agencies are stewards of federal funds that are available for health-promoting initiatives such as Safe Routes to School. State policies can authorize cities and towns to enact health-promoting laws, or can require localities or private parties to avoid actions that are detrimental to community health. States can prioritize funding for low-income communities, communities of color, and rural communities in order to reduce health disparities. Data indicates that commitment to supporting physical activity can pay off in health dividends: states with the highest levels of bicycling and walking have the lowest rates of obesity, high blood pressure, and diabetes.⁴⁰

The state report cards in this report provide a snapshot of how supportive each state is of walking, bicycling, and physical activity for children and adults as of 2022. Pulling from the strongest data we could gather, we assessed states on a large number of indicators that reflect key state-level public policies and policy implementation. Each state is scored in four core topic areas, which add up to an overall grade: Lacing Up, Warming Up, Making Strides, or the highest grade, Building Speed.

How to Use Your State Report Card

The good news is that your score in 2022 is not your score forever! Whether your state has a low or high level of support for physical activity, there is much work to be done. Look at the areas where your state has room for improvement and consider partnering with others to change related policies. Look at areas where your state has done well, and make sure that future state decisions do not undermine those key areas. Whatever your score, use this assessment to inspire action, and make your state a place that is even more supportive of healthy, physically active people and communities. See this factsheet on [how to use your state report card](#) for tips on how to use your state's report card, key points you can use in communicating the importance of state support for walking, biking, and physical activity, steps to consider in using the report card, and ideas to inspire change in your state.



Overview of the Report Cards: Key Topics & Grading

This section provides an overview of the structure and contents of the report cards, setting out the importance of the issues assessed in each report card and explaining how we graded the actions and achievements of each state. We discuss why these topics are so important to the country’s health and explain the criteria and process used in evaluating each state’s support for walking, bicycling, and other forms of physical activity.

Our 2022 report cards deepen and broaden the topical coverage included in our 2020 report cards, but retain the same basic structure and grading scale. Overall, we have added a few topics for assessment, removed a few indicators where data was less available or where research showed diminished significance, and made minor adjustments to improve scoring, indicators, and data sources. As a result, individual state grades are not directly comparable to 2020.

OVERVIEW OF SCORING

The report cards for each state summarize a total of 27 indicators spanning four core topic areas: *Complete Streets and Active Transportation Policy and Planning*, *Federal and State Active Transportation Funding*, *Safe Routes to School Funding and Supportive Practices*, and *Active Neighborhoods and Schools*. In each of these topic areas, states can play a significant role—through policies, funding, and other support—in increasing the number of children and adults walking, bicycling, and being physically active.



The report cards show the number of points earned for each indicator, the numerical sum and the grading category for each of the four core topic areas and an overall score. Each state also has an overall grade based on their total number of points earned. The total possible number of points is 200.

Each indicator is worth up to 20 points. Each indicator's potential points are based on the importance of the indicator in gauging a state's overall support of and contributions to walking, bicycling, and physical activity. Most of the indicators recognize positive steps, programs, and policies of a state. For two of the indicators, where particular actions are extremely detrimental to the goals of supporting physically active kids and communities, up to ten points may be deducted per indicator. However, if the total score for an entire core topic area is a negative number, the total score for that area is rounded up to zero, to ensure that states still receive recognition for their good work in other strategy areas, rather than seeing those achievements cancelled out in the overall score. When this arises, we denote this situation on the report cards with an asterisk and explanation.

THE OVERALL GRADING CATEGORIES ARE:

LACING UP

0 - 50 POINTS



The state may be taking some initial steps to supporting walking, bicycling, and physical activity, but the efforts are still getting off the ground.

WARMING UP

51 - 100 POINTS



The state has established some policies or initiatives, and may have taken some strong steps that support walking, bicycling and physical activity, but the state has not used many of the tools and techniques available.



MAKING STRIDES

101 - 150 POINTS



The state has established multiple policies and initiatives that are moving the state in the right direction, but may still be missing some key strategies.

BUILDING SPEED

151 - 200 POINTS



The state has made a significant commitment to support walking, bicycling, and physical activity and is providing support in multiple ways. This ranking shows that a state is a strong leader in the realm of physical activity – but that doesn't mean that there is not still much more work to be done in every state to ensure that everyone has a chance to be healthy.

UNDERSTANDING THE CORE TOPIC AREAS

Our four core topic areas—*Complete Streets and Active Transportation Policy and Planning, Federal and State Active Transportation Funding, Safe Routes to School Funding and Supportive Practices, and Active Neighborhoods and Schools*—reflect key areas for state action to promote and support physical activity. In this section, we explain the significance of these topic areas, describe the specific indicators we used under each topic area, and set out our scoring criteria.

A. COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING

40 TOTAL POINTS

Our first core topic area for evaluating states' commitment to communities where people can easily be physically active involves state policy and planning related to support of Complete Streets and active transportation. State policies, goals, and plans that promote walking, bicycling, and building streets that are safe and feel safe for everyone play a crucial role in encouraging and enabling safe walking and bicycling. Active transportation is a key strategy for enabling children and adults to

get the recommended amounts of daily physical activity. Among people who walk on a regular basis, about 60 percent meet the physical activity guidelines, either by walking alone or in combination with other forms of physical activity. In contrast, only 30 percent of those who do not walk regularly met the physical activity guidelines.⁴¹

A number of individual factors influence whether children and adults choose to

walk or bicycle instead of driving. Street design is one significant factor. The way our streets are designed can support or hinder active transportation and physical activity. People with access to more and better-quality sidewalks are more likely to walk and meet physical activity recommendations.⁴² Similarly, people with access to bicycle lanes and paths are more likely to bicycle and meet physical activity recommendations.⁴³

One way to encourage people to walk and bicycle—and increase their safety while doing so—is by providing Complete Streets. Complete Streets are streets that are “designed and operated to enable safe access for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders of all ages and abilities.”⁴⁴ Complete Streets include places for people to walk and bicycle, along with space for transit and cars, with their design and appearance varying widely to fit the local context.

Each state has a great deal of control over its roads, including how they are designed, which improvements are made, and where new facilities are constructed. State departments of transportation design, construct, and maintain many roads. They also control much of the funding for other roads and provide guidance to cities and counties on the design of local streets. They set the tone throughout the state, so their policies, goals, plans, and general guidance play key roles in supporting or undermining the state environment for walking and bicycling. To evaluate how well states

support Complete Streets and advance active transportation, this report looked at state policies for Complete Streets, state goals related to walking and bicycling, and state active transportation plans.

Resource

[Model State Complete Streets Policy \(ChangeLab Solutions\)](#)

1 Complete Streets Policies

25 POINTS

WHAT IS IT?

A Complete Streets policy sets out a state's commitment to routinely design, build, and operate all streets to enable safe use by everyone, regardless of age, ability, or mode of transportation.⁴⁵ A Complete Streets policy can take many forms; it may be state legislation, an executive order, a resolution, or a policy of the state's department of transportation. Although Complete Streets policies can be adopted at any level of government, for this report card we evaluated the presence and strength of state Complete Streets policies. Policies vary widely in the types of projects they apply to, the detail regarding implementation of the policy, and the level of enforceability.

HOW DOES IT HELP?

At a minimum, Complete Streets policies commit the state department of transportation to consider all roadway users including people walking and bicycling in decisions about how their roadways are used. But strong Complete Streets policies can go much farther, changing the way roads are designed and built to ensure that people walking and bicycling receive much more protection and convenience than they currently do. Complete Streets policies improve safety, help promote lifestyles that are more active, promote economic growth and sustainability, and reduce environmental burdens.⁴⁶ State Complete Streets policies serve as good examples for cities and counties to change their practices and can incentivize these jurisdictions to commit to Complete Streets locally.

HOW WERE POINTS AWARDED?

INDICATOR:

Adopted legislative or administrative Complete Streets policy or policies

Whether a state adopts a Complete Streets policy through legislation or through administrative means has varying effects on implementation success. Passing Complete Streets legislation such as a statute is more permanent and binding. In contrast, administrative Complete Streets policies within the state department of transportation (DOT) are more likely to get into specific details on course of action, but may be more easily rescinded or altered with a change in department leadership. Implementation success is most likely in states that take a comprehensive approach to Complete Streets by adopting both legislation and a DOT policy, in addition to other non-binding strategies like design guidelines, executive orders, and checklists.

- 5 POINTS:** State has adopted both Complete Streets legislation and a DOT policy.
- 4 POINTS:** State has adopted Complete Streets legislation.
- 3 POINTS:** State has adopted a Complete Streets DOT policy.
- 0 POINTS:** State has not adopted a Complete Streets policy.

INDICATOR:

Has strong state Complete Streets policy

State Complete Streets policies vary widely in terms of how effectively or ineffectively they function to improve transportation decision-making. In 2017, the National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC) updated its system for measuring the strength of Complete Streets policies, known as the ten elements of a strong Complete Streets policy.

The updated elements include factors such as how binding the policy is, what mechanisms for accountability are built in, how the policy is designed to advance equitable communities, and whether the policy is designed to encourage meaningful implementation.⁴⁷ Each year NCSC uses its ten elements system to measure all the new Complete Streets policies in the country using a scoring rubric with a maximum of 100 points. Because no state has achieved a score of more than 57 points on NCSC's 100-point scoring system, we buffer against the otherwise substantial negative impact on state scores by setting a theoretical maximum number of points at 60. Our indicator uses the score awarded to each state's Complete Streets policy by the NCSC, translated proportionally to our indicator's 20 point maximum. For example, a state that scored 57 points on the NCSC's scoring system, would receive a score of 19 (calculated as $20 \times 57 \div 60$) for this indicator.

1-20 POINTS: State has adopted a Complete Streets policy, with more points awarded for stronger policy, as measured by the National Complete Streets Coalition scoring criteria ($20 \times \text{NCSC score} / 60$).

0 POINTS: State has not adopted a Complete Streets policy.

WHERE DID THE DATA COME FROM?

Each state policy was located on state websites and through tracking by the Safe Routes Partnership and National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC). Policies were reviewed, and scores for the first indicator were determined. Working with the National Complete Streets Coalition in 2020, each state policy adopted at that time was evaluated under the NCSC scoring rubric. New or updated policies adopted since 2020 were scored by Safe Routes Partnership using the same NCSC scoring rubric.

2 Active Transportation Goals and Planning

15 POINTS

WHAT IS IT?

States can support planning and design that advance active transportation in a variety of ways. By adopting goals to increase the number of people walking or bicycling or the proportion of trips made by bicycle or on foot, states can make effective plans to reach these goals, perhaps by programs, developing other policies, or providing funding to meet its established goals.

Statewide plans are another way to advance active transportation. These can address biking and walking together or separately, and are sometimes referred to as active transportation plans. The overarching purpose of these plans is to establish a vision for bicycling and walking as viable modes of transportation for all users and needs. Planning activities can include gathering and analyzing crucial data, prioritizing projects and performance measures, and producing design guidance that can support an interconnected and robust transportation system. The most effective plans support comprehensive community engagement in both development and implementation, and prioritize outcomes that support safety, public health, economic, environmental, and quality of life benefits.

HOW DOES IT HELP?

State and local governments need thoughtfully developed and informed goals and plans to successfully create the networks and street environments required for safe, convenient, and abundant walking and bicycling. These actions work together to create effective change on the ground.

When states publish goals to increase bicycling and walking, they are making public commitments to progress and to measuring movement toward those goals.⁴⁸ Such goals articulate the importance of active modes of transportation. They provide accountability and increase the likelihood that subsequent actions by the state will be tied back to those overarching goals.

Creating a statewide planning foundation allows state agencies and regional and local partners to coordinate on supporting prioritized projects, policies, and programs. Implementation strategies vary, yet overall bicycle and pedestrian plans help guide decision-making for investments to develop inclusive and safe bike and pedestrian facilities. Project prioritization within plans helps ensure that improvements target enhancements in access opportunities and overall network connectivity. The plans also provide guidance for local jurisdictions to develop their own strategies



for improving bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Long-range planning for bicycling and walking shows commitment to a vision where the most vulnerable road users are a priority. Planning for all types of active transportation together creates a more equal planning and policy landscape, and importantly, leverages exposure to important stakeholders at all levels of implementation.

HOW WERE POINTS AWARDED?

INDICATOR:

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share

Points in this indicator are awarded based on whether a state has adopted and published an explicit goal or goals to increase the number or percentage of people walking and bicycling statewide.

- 5 POINTS:** State has adopted a goal or goals to increase both walking and bicycling.
- 3 POINTS:** State has adopted a goal to increase walking or bicycling, but not both.
- 0 POINTS:** State has not adopted goals to increase walking or bicycling.

INDICATOR:

Adopted a bicycle, pedestrian, or active transportation plan

Points in this indicator are awarded based on whether a state has adopted a bicycle, pedestrian, or active transportation plan within the past 10 years. Plans adopted more than 10 years ago are not included because of the likelihood that they are less reflective of current community needs and best practices for planning. A plan for a singular mode of active transportation indicates progress; because transportation systems are complex and different active modes need tailored attention to ensure that primary safety and accessibility needs are met, more points are awarded for plans that address bicycle and walking needs.

10 POINTS: State has adopted a bicycle plan and a pedestrian plan, or a combined active transportation plan..

5 POINTS: State has adopted bicycle or pedestrian plan, but not both.

0 POINTS: State has not adopted a bicycle, pedestrian, or active transportation plan.

WHERE DID THE DATA COME FROM?

Data for the active transportation goals indicator comes from state responses to the League of American Bicyclists' 2021 Bicycle Friendly State Survey with verification by the Safe Routes Partnership. Data for the plan indicator comes from the League of American Bicyclists' Benchmarking Project, reflecting data published in June 2021.⁵⁰



B. FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

75 TOTAL POINTS

The second core topic for advancing physical activity is the essential arena of active transportation funding. For children and adults to feel and be safe walking and bicycling, active transportation infrastructure is critical. That means providing sidewalks, crosswalks, bike lanes, trails, and other facilities that create or delineate space for people to walk and bicycle. In addition to supportive infrastructure for walking and biking, non-infrastructure, programmatic activities are also important for encouraging people to walk and bike and educating them to do so safely. This all costs money. However, as of 2020, only 1.8 percent of the annual federal surface transportation budget supports walking and bicycling. Every state receives federal funding to invest in active transportation through the Transportation Alternatives Program. Nationally, only about half (52 percent) of project applications to the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) – the primary source of federal funds for walking, bicycling, and Safe Routes to School – are funded, leaving \$6.7 billion in unfunded projects for 2016-2019 alone.⁵⁰ States

recognize the need to fund walking, bicycling, and Safe Routes to School improvements and are using their own revenue to pay for them, but demand far outpaces available state resources as well.

With few resources for active transportation infrastructure and programming, many communities lack sidewalks, crosswalks, and bike lanes to make it safe for people to walk and bicycle. This is especially true in low-income communities and in predominantly Latinx or Black neighborhoods, where walking and bicycling infrastructure is less available and there are fewer locations supportive of play and exercise.^{51,52,53} The way we have invested in transportation over the years has, unsurprisingly, led to a limited number of transportation trips on foot or bicycle. Short trips of less than a mile are perfect for walking or bicycling, yet more than 60 percent of those trips are made by car.⁵⁴ Our health, safety, community vitality, and environment all benefit from converting motor vehicle trips to walking and bicycling.

This core topic area focuses on how states are directing money for active transportation. Because federal dollars available for bicycling and walking improvements are limited, it is crucial that they be used effectively. State departments of transportation (DOTs) have a big impact on how those federal dollars are—or aren't—translated into safer communities for walking and bicycling. DOTs make key choices, such as how to implement the federal programs for active transportation, which projects they fund, what equity-oriented processes they use, and how quickly they get the funding out the door.

Increasingly, state legislatures are allocating state funding for active transportation. State funding may have fewer administrative hurdles and requirements than federal funding, and may equal or exceed the amount of funding available federally for active transportation. State funding can also be more responsive to state and local needs. State actions to take full advantage of opportunities for federal and state active transportation funding are essential for advancing conditions for walking and bicycling throughout a state.



1 Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

50 POINTS

WHAT IS IT?

In 2012, Congress created the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) by merging together three previous programs that funded active transportation. In 2015, Congress authorized TAP through 2020, and then extended it through the end of 2021 as it worked on a longer-term re-authorization. In November 2021, President Biden signed the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of 2021 also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (referred to as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law throughout this report), which re-authorizes the program through 2026. For more information on how this new law will affect the 2024 state report cards, see Looking Ahead to the 2024 State Report Cards on page 21. For the years covered in this report card, there was over \$850 million available to the states each year for TAP, making it the primary federal source of funding for building active transportation infrastructure and conducting Safe Routes to School programming. State departments of transportation (DOTs) receive federal TAP funds and must select projects through a competitive process open to local governments and school systems.

HOW DOES IT HELP?

As states and localities work to transform streets from an almost exclusive focus on movement of motor vehicles to safe places for children and adults to walk and bicycle, federal dollars are essential. Federal support is particularly critical to low-income urban, suburban, and rural communities that lack the tax base to use local funds to make street improvements. The choices that DOTs make regarding when and how they hold TAP competitions determine which communities receive funding and how quickly improvements can be built that provide safe opportunities for physical activity.

HOW WERE POINTS AWARDED?

INDICATOR:

Retained Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding without transfers

While Congress provided more than \$850 million each year to TAP, for the years covered in this report, it allowed states to transfer up to half of their TAP dollars to other transportation programs and projects. States that transfer significant amounts of TAP funding are prioritizing roads and bridges above the safety of people walking and bicycling by slashing the already limited funding available for active transportation infrastructure. States can also let funds lapse, which means

they are no longer available to a state to spend, if they do not use the funding in a timely fashion, reducing available dollars for active transportation.

- 10 POINTS:** State has not transferred or let lapse any TAP funding.
- 5 POINTS:** State transferred or let lapse less than 10% of funds out of TAP.
- 0 POINTS:** State transferred or let lapse 10-20% of TAP funds.
- 2 POINTS:** State transferred or let lapse 20-30% of TAP funds.
- 5 POINTS:** State transferred or let lapse 30-40% of TAP funds.
- 8 POINTS:** State transferred or let lapse 40-50% of TAP funds.
- 10 POINTS:** State transferred or let lapse more than 50% of TAP funds.

INDICATOR:

Awarded TAP projects

Thus far, states have received nine years' worth of funding for TAP, from 2013 to 2021. States must hold a competition to select projects and make those funds available to communities; otherwise, funds sit unused for their intended purpose and may ultimately lapse. To make use of TAP funding, states must have developed their competition framework and awarded several years' worth of projects.

- 10 POINTS:** State held at least one TAP competition and awarded at least eight years' worth of funding.
- 8 POINTS:** State held at least one TAP competition and awarded at least seven years' worth of funding.
- 6 POINTS:** State held at least one TAP competition and has awarded at least six years' worth of funding.
- 4 POINTS:** State held at least one TAP competition and has awarded at least five years' worth of funding.
- 2 POINTS:** State held at least one TAP competition and has awarded less than four years' worth of funding.
- 0 POINTS:** State has not held any TAP competition.

INDICATOR:

Obligated state-controlled TAP funds

Once a competition has been held and a project has been selected for TAP funding, the local project sponsor and the state DOT must work together to complete a number of regulatory processes and agreements before construction or implementation can begin. Obligation means

that the legal commitment has been made by the state DOT toward a selected TAP project. Higher obligation rates indicate that a state is holding TAP competitions and is prioritizing moving selected projects towards implementation.

- 10 POINTS:** State obligated more than 80% of state-controlled TAP funds.
- 8 POINTS:** State obligated between 70-79.9% of state-controlled TAP funds.
- 6 POINTS:** State obligated between 60-69.9% of state-controlled TAP funds.
- 4 POINTS:** State obligated between 50-59.9% of state-controlled TAP funds.
- 2 POINTS:** State obligated between 40-49.9% of state-controlled TAP funds.
- 0 POINTS:** State obligated less than 40% of state-controlled TAP funds.

INDICATOR:

Provides special consideration for high-need communities

Low-income communities generally have a greater need for active transportation improvements due to a history of low investment and higher rates of walking and bicycling. However, low-income communities and communities that have experienced other systemic disadvantages can face barriers in submitting successful applications. Low-income communities often lack access to experienced grant writers or planning data that can be essential to a successful application. States that provide extra points in application scoring for high-need applicants or that set aside a portion of TAP funding for high-need communities can help offset those disadvantages, ensuring that funding goes to benefit communities most in need.

- 5 POINTS:** State provides special consideration or a funding set-aside in TAP for high-need communities.
- 0 POINTS:** State does not provide any special consideration or funding set-aside in TAP for high-need communities.

INDICATOR:

Provides matching funds for high-need communities

TAP generally only covers 80 percent of a project's cost, requiring state governments or local project sponsors to fund the remainder of the project. Most states require the match to be covered by the local project sponsor. While this requirement can be difficult for many communities, it is often particularly challenging for low-income, small, and rural communities to find the financial resources for the match, which can deter them from applying for TAP.

States that use their own resources to cover the required match for “high-need” communities (as defined by the state) provide an opportunity for communities that most need active transportation improvements to compete for TAP funding without worrying about the financial commitment.

- 5 POINTS:** State utilizes state resources to provide required matching funds for TAP projects for high-need communities.
- 0 POINTS:** State does not provide any matching assistance for high-need communities.

INDICATOR:

Provides support to TAP applicants

Some states provide workshops, grant writing assistance, or other application-oriented technical assistance specifically focused around how to apply for TAP funding. This can help communities understand what kinds of projects may be funded, the value of funding walking, biking, and Safe Routes to School infrastructure and programs, and how to plan and compete more effectively for the limited federal funding. Application assistance is particularly important for low-income communities.

- 5 POINTS:** State provides workshops, grant writing assistance, or other application technical assistance to help communities apply for TAP funding.
- 0 POINTS:** State does not provide workshops, grant writing assistance, or other application assistance to communities or schools.

INDICATOR:

Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation NEW

The Transportation Alternatives Program is the primary source of federal funding for walking, bicycling, and Safe Routes to School. However, nearly all federal transportation programs can fund active transportation, including Safe Routes to School, and states use their discretion on how to allocate funds. When a state uses a source of federal funding that is not the Transportation Alternatives Program to improve walking, biking, and Safe Routes to School, it signals that the state values active transportation enough to invest additional dollars in it. This indicator awards points to states that set aside non-TAP federal funds to improve active transportation. TAP is excluded from this section because its purpose is funding walking, bicycling, and Safe Routes to School, and states should be spending it accordingly. Some states direct federal funding outside of TAP toward Safe Routes to School, using sources such as federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds, Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ), Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), or other sources, like applying toll credits toward the non-federal share requirement (local match). States receive points under this indicator for

those efforts. Note: while many states report spending non-TAP federal funds on projects that benefit people walking and bicycling, this indicator awards points to states that proactively set funds aside for this purpose.

- 5 POINTS:** State sets aside funds from non-TAP federal funding sources for walking and bicycling
- 0 POINTS:** State does not set aside funds from non-TAP federal funding sources for walking and bicycling

WHERE DID THE DATA COME FROM?

The data for the indicators about the transfer of TAP funding and the obligation of TAP funding was provided as of December 31, 2021 by the Federal Highway Administration’s Financial Management Information System (FMIS), which tracks a range of financial information about state usage of federal transportation dollars.

The data for the indicators about whether a state has held a TAP competition, special consideration for high-need communities, matching funds for high-need communities, non-TAP federal funding,⁵⁵ and support for TAP applicants were gathered through research conducted by the Safe Routes Partnership into publicly available information from each state’s DOT, followed by outreach to and additional confirmation by state DOT staff.⁵⁶

2 State Funding for Active Transportation

25 POINTS

WHAT IS IT?

Funding for active transportation comes from federal, state, and local governments. As interest grows in promoting safe, equitable, convenient routes and social supports to everyday destinations, it is increasingly clear that existing sources of federal funding for active transportation are essential, yet insufficient. As a result, states are increasingly taking on the financial responsibility of building and maintaining active transportation infrastructure and programming. Many states are passing transportation bond measures or bills – often with significant active transportation components, which may equal or exceed the amount of money available from the federal Transportation Alternatives Program.

State active transportation funding has great variability from state to state. Some funding consists of a yearly appropriation from the state’s general fund, some is provided by specialty license plate revenue that comes in irregularly to a particular fund, some is from bonds that may cover ten or twenty years, and other sources

also exist. When states do have state funding, there is enormous unevenness in the strength of their active transportation funding, ranging from states that have provided a few hundred thousand dollars for a limited program or discrete project, to states that have approved tens of millions of dollars on an ongoing basis. In addition, some states may award money to active transportation projects from funding sources for which active transportation is eligible but not dedicated.

HOW DOES IT HELP?

Decades of underinvestment in infrastructure and programming to support walking and biking means that there is tremendous unmet need for funding. Investing state money in active transportation is one of the most important steps that a state can take to improve active transportation. With billions of dollars in needed infrastructure for walking and bicycling, state funding of active transportation provides an essential complement to federal money, enabling state residents to access the many benefits of active transportation. With fewer bureaucratic

Resources:

[Funding Beyond the Feds: How State Governments Generate Active Transportation Funding](#)

[Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding](#)

[State Implementation of the Transportation Alternatives Program](#)



impediments, state money can often get into communities more rapidly than federal dollars. States can use such funding to address inequities in street safety and underinvestment in low-income communities and communities of color. Additionally, when used as the local match, state funding can be used as leverage to access federal funding, helping communities access larger amounts of money for walking and bicycling projects.

HOW WERE POINTS AWARDED?

INDICATOR:

Allocates state funding for active transportation

This indicator recognizes states that have dedicated or allocated state funding for active transportation. Active transportation funding includes funding for infrastructure or non-infrastructure for walking and bicycling, including Safe Routes to School. Points are awarded for any state active transportation funding passed or in place within the past two calendar years (beginning with January of 2020), with additional points available where funding is ongoing for at least four years, rather than one-time funding.⁵⁷ Where a state can clearly summarize its state funding awarded to active transportation projects per year, we include this funding.

- 10 POINTS:** State dedicates minimum amount of state funding to active transportation on an ongoing basis (for at least four years or four award cycles).
- 5 POINTS:** State has dedicated or awarded any amount of state funding for active transportation within the past two years.
- 0 POINTS:** State has no state funding dedicated or awarded to active transportation, or no funding was dedicated prior to the past two years.

INDICATOR:

Amount of state funding for active transportation

Dedicating state funding for active transportation is an important step a state can take to make it easier and safer for more people to walk and bicycle in their state. With a larger investment of state funds, a state can build significantly more supportive street features and networks for walking and bicycling and run more education and encouragement programs to promote safe and active travel. For states to implement safe, connected networks that support people to conveniently walk and bicycle to essential services or everyday destinations, they need reliable funding. Knowing money is available in the future helps improve planning processes and creates more visionary and connected projects. If money has to be re-identified every year, it is very difficult – impossible even – to plan for



safe, connected bike and pedestrian networks, which research shows are key to getting more people to walk and bike.⁵⁸ Determining the best method of comparing funding amounts between states is challenging due to differences in population, density, economic strength, underlying infrastructure, development patterns, topography, and maintenance. In order to provide a meaningful and manageable comparison, we assess the amount of annual active transportation funding provided per capita. We allocate points based upon a few broad categories, with more points awarded for higher amounts of funding per capita.⁵⁹ Where a state can clearly summarize its state funding awarded to active transportation projects per year, we include this funding.

- 10 POINTS:** State funding for active transportation is more than \$3 per capita per year.
- 7 POINTS:** State funding for active transportation is between \$2.01 and \$3.00 per capita per year.
- 5 POINTS:** State funding for active transportation is between \$1.01 and \$2.00 per capita per year.
- 3 POINTS:** State funding for active transportation is between \$0.10 and \$1.00 per capita per year.
- 1 POINTS:** State funding for active transportation is less than \$0.10 per capita per year.
- 0 POINTS:** State does not dedicate state funding for active transportation.

INDICATOR:

Provides special consideration in awards of dedicated state funding for active transportation or Safe Routes to School for high-need communities

Large inequities exist in transportation infrastructure and safety in every state across the United States, particularly when it comes to active transportation and safety for people walking and bicycling. While other aspects of communities may also factor into whether a community experiences transportation inequities, such inequities tend to particularly affect communities of color and communities that are low-income. Added to high need is the fact that many low-income communities may have limited capacity to research and apply for grants or to conduct engineering studies and design which are often unfunded prerequisites. States can take steps to address these inequities by ensuring that state active transportation funding provides special consideration for high-need communities through extra points in application scoring and/or funding set-asides.

- 5 POINTS:** State provides special consideration or a funding set-aside in state active transportation funding for high-need communities.
- 0 POINTS:** State does not provide special consideration or a funding set-aside in state active transportation funding for high-need communities.

WHERE DID THE DATA COME FROM?

The data for each of these indicators were gathered through research conducted by the Safe Routes Partnership into publicly available information from each state's DOT, reviewing state Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Plans, state bicycle and/or pedestrian advocacy organization websites, and Google searches of active transportation funding and Safe Routes to School funding followed by outreach to and additional confirmation by state DOT staff.⁶⁰

C. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES

40 TOTAL POINTS

Our third core topic area looks at Safe Routes to School, exploring how states can advance Safe Routes to School through funding allocations and awards, the types of framework that states can put in place to support local Safe Routes to School programming and infrastructure improvements, and how states can ensure equitable practices and programs.

Safe Routes to School is one of the most effective evidence-based children's health strategies in the chronic disease realm. As one of only a handful of approaches that the CDC has selected as cost-effective measures that have a health impact in five years (known as HI-5 interventions)^{61,62} Safe Routes to School has the potential to benefit population health at a variety of levels. More than seventeen years after the federal Safe Routes to School program was created, the Safe Routes to School movement has helped build greater collaboration between state governments, local governments, and school systems to address safety issues around schools affecting rates of walking and bicycling to school.

The trip to school is a crucial opportunity for children to get regular physical activity by walking or bicycling. Walking and bicycling not only create healthier students, but also support focused learning and academic performance. In order to achieve these benefits, walking and biking to school need to be convenient, comfortable, and safe. Roughly 40 percent of parents who live within one mile of their children's school expressed concerns about traffic safety when asked about barriers to walking to school.⁶³ Safe Routes to School is a movement that comprehensively addresses those parental concerns and enables students to get regular physical activity by making it safer and easier to walk and bike to school. Safe Routes to School street improvements address problems like broken or missing sidewalks, faded crosswalks, and lack of safe bike lanes. Safe Routes to School programs get more students walking



and biking by bringing together partners to create culture change regarding student transportation in schools and communities. These programs also provide skills and safety education for children, create encouragement activities that get kids moving together, and build enthusiasm and support among families, teachers, school administrators, and municipal officials.

Meanwhile, motor vehicle crashes are a leading cause of death for children, whether as passengers or outside the vehicle.⁶⁴ Sixteen percent of children ages 14 and younger who died due to motor vehicle crashes in 2020 were walking and four percent were biking.⁶⁵

Safe Routes to School initiatives address safety, enable children to get vital physical activity, and help children build healthy life habits. Studies show that children who walk and bicycle to school have better cardiovascular fitness,⁶⁶ higher overall levels of physical activity,⁶⁷ and lower BMIs⁶⁸ than children who do not actively commute to school. Two separate studies of hundreds of schools involved in Safe Routes to School initiatives found increases in walking and bicycling to school of anywhere from 31 to 43 percent.^{69,70} A study in New

York City found Safe Routes to School infrastructure reduced pedestrian injuries from school travel by 44 percent.⁷¹ A systematic review of 52 research articles on Safe Routes to School found that it is effective at reducing traffic-related injuries around school neighborhoods.⁷² Safe Routes to School programs are one of the most effective and practical methods available for improving children's health, the safety of our communities, and the sustainability of our transportation system.

The Importance of Safe Routes to School During and After the COVID-19 Pandemic

In 2021, the Safe Routes Partnership released the factsheet **Why Safe Routes to School is an Essential Part of Reopening**. While Safe Routes to School cannot solve every problem, it can address some significant health and safety challenges while enabling easier access to community destinations and resources that fill other gaps. This factsheet summarizes key information about Safe Routes to School as a response to challenges faced by communities during the pandemic.

1 Safe Routes to School Funding

18 POINTS

WHAT IS IT?

Safe Routes to School initiatives aim to make it safer and easier for more children to walk and bicycle to and from school. Comprehensive Safe Routes to School programs improve infrastructure near schools (i.e., sidewalks, bike paths, crosswalks, school zone signage, and traffic calming) and provide programming (called non-infrastructure projects) to teach children traffic safety skills, ensure that motorists are driving safely near schools, and encourage more children to walk and bicycle. However, our 2019 national census of Safe Routes to School programs found that insufficient funding was one of the biggest hurdles experienced by Safe Routes to School programs.⁷³ Thus, state action that eases access to funding or increases funding levels for Safe Routes to School is essential to achieve the benefits of Safe Routes to School.

From 2005 to 2012, a federal transportation program called Safe Routes to School allocated \$1.1 billion to state departments of transportation (DOTs) for Safe Routes to School projects. Since 2013, Safe Routes to School has been eligible for funding through the federal Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), discussed as part of the previous core topic area on active transportation funding. Safe Routes to School may also be funded through state or local sources.

State governments, particularly state DOTs, have a great deal of influence over the funding of local Safe Routes to School initiatives. State DOTs can affect whether Safe Routes to School projects are funded by TAP by prioritizing these projects in TAP competitions, and they can direct funds from other state or federal pots toward Safe Routes to School projects. State DOTs can also influence other key factors, such as whether state and federal funds only go to Safe Routes to School infrastructure projects (a default for many DOTs since they are more accustomed to that type of project), or whether these funds also go to non-infrastructure programs and efforts. Supporting planning grants or other small low effort grants for Safe Routes to School initiatives is another way that DOTs can jumpstart Safe Routes to School efforts and keep different communities engaged.

HOW DOES IT HELP?

Decisions by state DOTs around how to prioritize and structure funding for Safe Routes to School have an enormous effect on local Safe Routes to School work and student walking and bicycling numbers and safety. When state DOTs prioritize

Safe Routes to School for funding – TAP funding, other federal funding, and state funding – they enable more street safety improvements to be constructed near schools and on school routes. When they ensure that funding flows to Safe Routes to School programs, not just infrastructure, they support the encouragement and education activities that change habits and improve safety. Other efforts that DOTs may lead, such as providing Safe Routes to School planning grants or mini-grants, can also remove or ease barriers to involvement in Safe Routes to School for local communities.

HOW WERE POINTS AWARDED?

INDICATOR:

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds

Although there is no longer a stand-alone, federally-funded Safe Routes to School program, Safe Routes to School projects are eligible for most surface transportation funding programs, and are most often funded by TAP. In setting up their competition parameters for TAP, states may choose to prioritize the funding of Safe Routes to School projects to ensure that these child safety projects are adequately funded. This can be done in a variety of ways, including providing extra points to Safe Routes to School projects when scoring applications, running a separate competition for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP resources, or dedicating a portion of TAP funding for Safe Routes to School projects.

- 5 POINTS:** State holds a separate competition or sets aside TAP funding specifically for Safe Routes to School projects.
- 3 POINTS:** State allocates extra points or otherwise incentivizes or prioritizes Safe Routes to School when scoring or selecting projects in a TAP competition.
- 0 POINTS:** State does not provide any special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects.

INDICATOR:

Dedicates state or non-TAP federal funding for Safe Routes to School

Federal TAP funding meets only a fraction of the need for Safe Routes to School infrastructure and programming, as evidenced by high numbers of funding applications in many states. As a result, some states have created standalone Safe Routes to School funding from state revenue sources—such as annual appropriations, state gas tax revenues, increases to school zone traffic fines, or other mechanisms. Such state Safe Routes to School funding may occur as

part of a larger active transportation or general transportation funding package. We award points for state active transportation and Safe Routes to School funding as part of the subtopic on state active transportation funding, but also award additional points here where meaningful funding is dedicated to Safe Routes to School. Additionally, some states direct federal funding outside of TAP toward Safe Routes to School, using sources such as federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds or other sources. States also receive points under this indicator for those efforts in recognition of their commitment to Safe Routes to School programs.

- 5 POINTS:** State provides at least \$500,000 per year in state or non-TAP federal funding to Safe Routes to School projects.
- 3 POINTS:** State provides between \$1 and \$500,000 per year in state or non-TAP federal funding to Safe Routes to School projects.
- 0 POINTS:** State does not provide state or non-TAP federal funding to Safe Routes to School projects.

INDICATOR:

Funds Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure projects

The original federal Safe Routes to School program required state DOTs to support both infrastructure and non-infrastructure programming. Now that Safe Routes to School funding is provided through TAP, it is up to state DOTs to decide whether or not to make non-infrastructure programming eligible for TAP competitions. Research has found that the most effective Safe Routes to School programs include both infrastructure improvements and education and encouragement activities (such as teaching children traffic safety skills and having regular walking and biking to school events) that continue over several years.⁷⁴ States that do not use TAP to fund Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure projects are surrendering the potential for increases in children walking and biking, which limits the potential health and safety benefits.

- 5 POINTS:** Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure projects are eligible for TAP funding, and state prioritizes their selection through extra points or a funding set-aside.
- 3 POINTS:** Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure projects are eligible for TAP funding, but state does not prioritize their selection.
- 0 POINTS:** Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure projects are not eligible for funding.

INDICATOR:

Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or mini grants

Financial and administrative hurdles often discourage communities, especially small, rural, and low-income communities, from accessing funding from state DOTs. Many communities encounter a barrier to applying for state Safe Routes to School funds when they must engage in unfunded planning or engineering work before the application. Planning grants help communities methodically identify needs and develop projects for future funding pursuits. In addition, many Safe Routes to School programs begin as volunteer efforts or as small pilot initiatives. By providing mini grants that do not require a large application effort or complex administrative efforts, states can help launch Safe Routes to School programs in more communities.

- 3 POINTS:** State offers communities both Safe Routes to School planning grants and mini grants.
- 2 POINTS:** State offers communities Safe Routes to School planning grants or mini grants but not both.
- 0 POINTS:** State does not offer Safe Routes to School planning grants or mini grants.

WHERE DID THE DATA COME FROM?

The data for each of these indicators were gathered through research conducted by the Safe Routes Partnership into publicly available information from each state's DOT, followed by outreach to and additional confirmation by state DOT staff.⁷⁵



2 Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

22 POINTS

WHAT IS IT?

While funding for active transportation and Safe Routes to School is critical, state departments of transportation can engage in additional supportive practices that further advance Safe Routes to School initiatives. Key practices include having DOT and/or consultant staff who are experienced and knowledgeable about Safe Routes to School. Knowledgeable personnel enable state DOTs to create Safe Routes to School technical assistance or resource centers, which can ensure better applications, more strategic funding, and stronger and more effective Safe Routes to School programs on the ground. States can develop statewide Safe Routes to School plans which, similar to state active transportation plans, outline a vision, goals, and strategies to coordinate activities and resources to support active travel to school. States can support local programs and



communities by providing technical assistance, curricula or resources to help education efforts, application assistance, webinars, workshops and trainings, sample materials, and networking opportunities. States can also adopt practices to support local Safe Routes to School programs in more equitably reaching and engaging students of different demographic groups.

HOW DOES IT HELP?

With appropriate staffing resources to provide support, DOTs can ensure that schools and local governments implement comprehensive Safe Routes to School initiatives based upon best practices and tailored to local needs and challenges.⁷⁶ Local communities access key information and resources through webinars, factsheets, sample materials, and trainings. Knowledgeable personnel can help schools and communities implement Safe Routes to School initiatives with or without funding, and can provide assistance in planning for future applications. State practices can also help local Safe Routes to School programs become more equitable. Our 2019 national census of Safe Routes to School programs found that fewer than one-third of responding programs had any outreach or tailored programming aimed at increasing participation by girls, students with disabilities, students who are immigrants, or others, but that more than a quarter of programs wanted to move into this area.⁷⁷ States can also encourage Safe Routes to School educational programming inside and outside of classrooms by developing curricula and other materials to assist with uptake. Strong state supportive practices mean more effective Safe Routes to School programming and more children safely walking and bicycling to school.

HOW WERE POINTS AWARDED?

INDICATOR:

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program through employees or consultants

Under the original federal Safe Routes to School program, each state DOT was required to have a full-time staff person focused on administering Safe Routes to School funding. When the federal Safe Routes to School program was folded into the new Transportation Alternatives Program in 2012, states were allowed, but no longer required, to dedicate a full-time staff person to Safe Routes to School issues. State DOT Safe Routes to School coordinators and other staff play an important role in making sure that Safe Routes to School funding is accessible, liaising between school systems and transportation professionals, and providing technical assistance to schools and communities.

- 5 POINTS:** State devotes two or more full-time equivalent (FTE) employees or consultants to Safe Routes to School.
- 2 POINTS:** State devotes at least one, but less than two FTE employees or consultants to Safe Routes to School.
- 1 POINTS:** State devotes a portion of one employee or consultant's time to Safe Routes to School.
- 0 POINTS:** State does not devote staff or consultants to Safe Routes to School.



INDICATOR:

Provides SRTS resource center or technical assistance that supports strong local SRTS programs **REVISED**

Some states provide more extensive assistance to schools or school systems to help them initiate Safe Routes to School programs and improve their practices and approaches. States have done this in various ways including workshops and trainings, directly helping local programs, developing toolkits, guides, and materials, or running a statewide resource center. This type of assistance is particularly important for low-income communities and others with limited capacity and local resources.

As part of or in addition to a Safe Routes to School resource center, states can facilitate education regarding Safe Routes to School through curricula, trainings, or related resources. Education is one of the core components of Safe Routes to School initiatives. States can support educational programming inside and outside of classrooms by developing curricula, lesson plans, and other materials. Curricula can be tailored to state educational standards. States receive points for developing curricula, trainings, or similar resources to facilitate Safe Routes to School education in schools.

Resource Center or Technical Assistance

- 5 POINTS:** State provides technical assistance or a statewide resource center to help communities start and run effective Safe Routes to School initiatives.
- 0 POINTS:** State does not provide technical assistance or a statewide resource center to communities or schools.

Curricula or Education Resources

- 2 POINTS:** State has developed curricula, training or similar resources to facilitate Safe Routes to School education in schools.
- 0 POINTS:** State has not developed curricula, training or similar resources to facilitate Safe Routes to School education in schools.

INDICATOR:

Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan **NEW**

Points in this indicator are awarded based on whether a state has created a statewide plan for Safe Routes to School, either through a standalone plan or as a component of a statewide active transportation planning effort. States that have a standalone Safe Routes to School plan or a specific section, chapter, or component that details Safe Routes to School-specific goals and implementation strategies within a broader active transportation plan receive the most points. States that include mention of Safe Routes to School within another state plan, but do not provide the same level of detail, receive some points.

- 5 POINTS:** State has adopted a standalone Safe Routes to School plan or a Safe Routes to School-specific chapter or section of another state plan.
- 2 POINTS:** State has included mention of SRTS in a statewide plan.
- 0 POINTS:** State has not adopted a Safe Routes to School plan or incorporated Safe Routes to School into another state plan.

INDICATOR:

Supports equitable Safe Routes to School programming

The benefits of walking and bicycling to school, and of Safe Routes to School programs, are not equitably distributed among students of different genders, races, nationalities, or abilities. Girls are less likely to walk and bicycle than boys; students of color walk at higher rates, but also experience traffic injuries and fatalities at higher rates; students with disabilities are often inadvertently excluded from Safe Routes to School programming, despite strong opportunities for physical activity and social benefits.^{78,79,80} As noted above, a limited number of Safe Routes to School programs are tailoring their programs or outreach to bring in under-represented demographic groups; others

show interest, but have not begun this work.⁸¹ States can play a strong role in encouraging and incentivizing local programs to tailor programs and practices to appeal to each demographic group. This indicator awards points to states providing funding, publications, or other support dedicated to enabling local programs to engage one or more specific demographic groups, such as low-income students, students of color, English learner students, students in rural communities, students with disabilities, or girls and non-binary students. Note that where a state is already receiving points under the Federal and State Active Transportation Funding core topic area for providing special consideration to high-needs communities in TAP or state funding awards, it will not receive additional points for the same prioritization under this indicator, although it will still be eligible to earn points here for other types of support for equitable Safe Routes to School programming.

- 5 POINTS:** State provides funding, publications, or other support dedicated to enabling local programs to engage one or more specific demographic groups such as low-income students, students of color, English-language learners, students in rural communities, students with disabilities, or girls and non-binary students.

- 0 POINTS:** State does not provide funding, publications, or other support dedicated to enabling local programs to engage one or more specific demographic groups such as low-income students, students of color, English-language learners, students in rural communities, students with disabilities, or girls and non-binary students.

WHERE DID THE DATA COME FROM?


The data for the indicators were gathered through research conducted by the Safe Routes Partnership into publicly available information from each state's DOT, followed by outreach to and additional confirmation by state DOT staff.⁸²



D. ACTIVE SCHOOLS AND NEIGHBORHOODS

45 TOTAL POINTS

Our fourth core topic area assesses the policy steps that a state takes to support the creation of neighborhoods and schools that encourage physical activity. Children and adults need neighborhoods that have safe places to be physically active. When students attend schools that enable outdoor play and walking and bicycling to school, and that provide regular opportunities for physical activity, they are better able to meet daily physical activity guidelines. In contrast, without such access and support, children and adults are less likely to be physically active, even if they have the desire and motivation.⁸³



To evaluate states' provision for active neighborhoods and schools, this report looked at state policy support for shared use of school facilities, state encouragement of school facilities that support walking, biking, and physical activity, and state requirements for physical education in schools.

1 Shared Use of School Facilities

15 POINTS

WHAT IS IT?

Opening school playgrounds and fields for recreational use outside of school hours is one of the most common forms of shared use in the United States. "Shared use" or "joint use" occurs when schools or other government entities (or sometimes private, nonprofit organizations) agree to open or broaden access to their property and/or facilities for community use, such as recreational activities. The partnerships can be formal (e.g., based on a written, legal document) or informal (e.g., based on historical practice). Formal arrangements are often documented through an agreement, which sets forth the terms and conditions for the shared use of the property or facility.⁸⁴

HOW DOES IT HELP?

Shared use is seen as a promising strategy to address issues of physical inactivity and obesity by leading public health authorities, including the Center for Disease Control and Prevention,⁸⁵ the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services,⁸⁶ and the American Academy of Pediatrics.⁸⁷ One study found that the number of children who are physically active outside is 84 percent higher when school playgrounds and fields are kept open for public play outside of school hours.⁸⁸ Schools are often centrally located in a community, providing an ideal location for opening fields and facilities to children and adults in areas that are lacking parks and other recreational facilities.⁸⁹

Shared use can increase access to recreational spaces for children and adults, increase physical activity, and may decrease obesity. Shared use can be a quick and affordable way to increase the number of recreational facilities open to residents in a community.

HOW WERE POINTS AWARDED?

INDICATOR:

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities

State laws can make it more or less likely that a local school will agree to open its facilities for recreational use outside of school hours. While decisions about whether and how to open school facilities outside of school hours generally happen at the local level, many states recognize the benefits of shared use and have enacted laws that encourage or even require schools to open their facilities to the community.

- 10 POINTS:** State has adopted legislation that requires schools to allow communities or organizations access to schools' recreational facilities outside of school hours.
- 6 POINTS:** State has adopted legislation that recommends cooperation between schools and communities or organizations to allow access to school's recreational facilities outside of school hours.
- 0 POINTS:** State has not adopted legislation requiring or recommending shared use of school facilities.

INDICATOR:

Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities

In addition to adopting policies recommending or requiring schools to allow access to school facilities, states can further support the implementation of shared use by providing funding or other incentives such as technical assistance for local implementation.

- 5 POINTS:** State provides funding or incentives in support of shared use of school facilities..
- 0 POINTS:** State does not provide funding or incentives in support of shared use of school facilities.

WHERE DID THE DATA COME FROM?

Scores are based on the National Cancer Institute's Classification of Laws Associated with School Students (CLASS). The relevant material appeared in the physical education/joint use agreement requirement scoring system, with reporting as of December 31, 2019.⁹⁰ In addition to the CLASS website, the Safe Routes Partnership conducted outreach to state health department staff for additional confirmation.⁹¹

2 School Siting and Design

15 POINTS

WHAT IS IT?

For students to be able to walk or bike to school, or to use student recreational facilities outside of school hours, it is essential that schools be located relatively near to where students live. School siting involves decisions made by the state and by local districts that affect where schools are located. School siting decisions include decisions about opening new schools, closing existing schools, or even investing in the rehabilitation of older or dilapidated schools. Local school districts are in charge of school siting and design decisions, but state requirements and policies affect their decisions.

HOW DOES IT HELP?

In 1969, 45 percent of elementary school children lived a mile or less from school, but by 2001, only 24 percent did.^{92,93} Distance from school is the biggest barrier to walking to school.⁹⁴ States can require districts to consider the distances that students must travel to school when they make decisions about school site locations. But all too often, states instead have policies that discourage or prevent school districts from making decisions that support smart school siting. Smart school siting policies not only support physically active kids by allowing walking and biking to school and shared use of school grounds, but also yield other benefits, reducing cost, air pollution, and time spent on trips to school by school buses and private vehicles. The design of school sites can also affect students' physical activity, by including outdoor space for play and physical activity and by providing ease of entry for students walking and bicycling.

HOW WERE POINTS AWARDED?

INDICATOR:

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guidelines)

When states have large school site minimum acreage recommendations or requirements, it means that school districts must find large parcels of land for new school sites. Large minimum acreage guidelines often result in the exclusion of sites within existing towns or near residential areas, and the selection of sites that are outside of town, on undeveloped land. Such sites are often far from where students live, making walking or bicycling to school difficult or impossible. This indicator provides only negative points, up to a total of negative ten points. Because states generally have different requirements for different school age levels, state requirements were separately assessed for elementary, middle, and high schools.

Acreage guidelines were categorized as large for elementary schools, if they called for minimum acreages of more than five acres plus one additional acre for every hundred students; for middle schools, if they called for minimum acreages of more than ten acres plus one additional acre for every hundred students; and for high schools if they called for minimum acreages of more than fifteen acres plus one additional acre for every hundred students. States received separate negative points for large minimum acreage requirements for each of these categories, which were added to yield their final points.

Requires or Recommends Large Elementary School Sites

- 0 POINTS: State has no minimum acreage guidelines or its guidelines call for relatively small minimum site size for elementary schools.
- 4 POINTS: State has large minimum acreage guidelines for elementary schools.

Requires or Recommends Large Middle School Sites

- 0 POINTS: State has no minimum acreage guidelines or its guidelines call for relatively small minimum site size for middle schools.
- 3 POINTS: State has large minimum acreage guidelines for middle schools.

Requires or Recommends Large High School Sites

- 0 POINTS: State has no minimum acreage guidelines or its guidelines call for relatively small minimum site size for high schools.
- 3 POINTS: State has large minimum acreage guidelines for high schools.

INDICATOR:

Supports walking, bicycling & physical activity in school siting & design guidelines

State policies around school siting and design (including handbooks and guidelines as well as more formal regulations or statutes) may contain language that requires or recommends that school districts take factors that relate to healthy school siting into account in making siting decisions. In allocating the 15 points available for this indicator, states were rated on whether state school siting or design policies contained recommendations or requirements around these four separate factors: considerations around walking, biking, and Safe Routes to School; incentives for co-locating school sites with parks or other community facilities; maximum

school site acreage requirements to discourage unnecessarily large school campuses; and minimum outdoor play space requirements, to ensure that districts do not sacrifice student play and outdoor physical activity spaces for parking lots and buildings. Scores on each of these factors were added together to yield the final result for this indicator.

Walking/Bicycling/SRTS Criteria

- 6 POINTS: State school siting guidelines contain criteria encouraging or requiring consideration of walking, biking, or Safe Routes to School in school siting and/or design.
- 0 POINTS: State school siting guidelines do not contain criteria encouraging or requiring consideration of walking, biking, or Safe Routes to School in school siting and/or design.

Incentives for Co-location with Parks or Other Community Facilities

- 3 POINTS: State guidelines contain incentives for schools to be located next to or near to parks or other community facilities.
- 0 POINTS: State guidelines do not contain incentives for schools to be located next to or near to parks or other community facilities.

Maximum Acreage Requirements

- 3 POINTS: State guidelines provide maximum school site acreage requirements or recommendations.
- 0 POINTS: State guidelines do not provide maximum school site acreage requirements or recommendations.

Minimum Outdoor Play Space Requirements

- 3 POINTS: State guidelines require minimum outdoor play space and physical activity space for school sites.
- 0 POINTS: State guidelines do not require minimum outdoor play space and physical activity space for school sites.

WHERE DID THE DATA COME FROM?

Data were initially gathered through research conducted by the Safe Routes Partnership into publicly available information from each state's department of education or other agencies, followed by 2018 interviews with state education/construction facilities staff. Assessments were sent to each state for confirmation in 2022, and additional review of guidelines was conducted.⁹⁵

3 Physical Education

15 POINTS

WHAT IS IT?

Physical education is structured instruction during the school day that focuses on developing physical fitness and creating lifelong healthy habits. Like other school courses such as math, social studies, and science, physical education classes provide students with key topical concepts and structured skill-building, here related to physical fitness and health. The goal of physical education is to have teachers assess student knowledge and motor and social skill development, and provide instruction in a safe, supportive, inclusive environment.⁹⁶ Physical education is different from physical activity. While both are important, physical activity encompasses any kind of daily physical activity or sports or fitness opportunities, while physical education provides an organized and methodical opportunity for students to learn skills, habits, and material with lifelong value.⁹⁷

HOW DOES IT HELP?

Students spend an average of 6.5 hours per day in school.⁹⁸ Schools are a key location for physical activity for children, in light of the amount of time that students spend in school and the fact that school is the one activity that most children have in common. Schools can help children be active and learn active lifetime habits by requiring quality physical education and by providing recess and other structured opportunities for physical activity. While students benefit from physical activity opportunities at recess and other times of the school day, physical education provides additional benefits. Research shows a link between quality physical education and present and future physical activity participation.⁹⁹ National health organizations such as SHAPE America¹⁰⁰ and the American Heart Association¹⁰¹ recommend that schools provide 150 minutes per week of physical education for elementary school students and 225 minutes per week of physical education for middle and high school students throughout the school year. Requiring physical education credit for graduation from high school demonstrates that physical education is a core subject and a fundamental component of a student's education.

HOW WERE POINTS AWARDED?

INDICATOR:

Adopted PE minutes & graduation requirements

State laws or regulations can mandate that schools require that students meet the recommended weekly number of minutes of physical education for their grade range: 150 weekly minutes for elementary school, and 225 weekly minutes for middle and high schools. In addition, states can require that students obtain physical education credits in high school in order to graduate. In allocating the 15 points available for this indicator, states were rated on these four separate categories. Scores for each category were added together to yield the final result for this indicator.

Required Weekly PE Minutes: Elementary

- 4 POINTS:** Elementary students required to participate in 150 minutes or more of PE/week.
- 3 POINTS:** Elementary students required to participate in 90 to 149 minutes of PE/week.
- 2 POINT:** Elementary students required to participate in 40-89 minutes of PE/week.
- 0 POINTS:** Elementary students not required to participate in PE on a weekly basis or less than 40 minutes/week required.

Required Weekly PE Minutes: Middle School

- 4 POINTS:** Middle school students required to participate in 225 minutes or more of PE/week.
- 3 POINTS:** Middle school students required to participate in 150 to 224 minutes of PE/week.
- 2 POINT:** Middle school students required to participate in 40-149 minutes of PE/week.
- 0 POINTS:** Middle school students not required to participate in PE on a weekly basis or less than 40 minutes/week required.

Required Weekly PE Minutes: High School

- 4 POINTS:** High school students required to participate in 225 minutes or more of PE/week.
- 3 POINTS:** High school students required to participate in 150 to 224 minutes of PE/week.
- 2 POINT:** High school students required to participate in 40-149 minutes of PE/week.
- 0 POINTS:** High school students not required to participate in PE on a weekly basis or less than 40 minutes/week required..

PE Credit Required for Graduation from High School

- 3 POINTS:** State requires high school students to earn physical education credit for graduation.
- 0 POINTS:** State does not require high school students to earn physical education credit for graduation.

WHERE DID THE DATA COME FROM?

Data for this indicator were initially drawn from SHAPE America's 2016 Shape of the Nation report on the status of physical education in the USA.¹⁰² Data was updated or confirmed in 2022 using the National Association of State Boards of Education's State Policy Database¹⁰³ and the Education Commission of the State's 50-State Comparison¹⁰⁴.





Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		10 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		21 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	0 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		0 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	10 / 15
		16 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		10 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	-2 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	2 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		15 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	3 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	1 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		9 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	0 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	9 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	0 / 15
		9 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		10 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	-8 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	0 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		-8* / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	0 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		2 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	15 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	0 / 15
		21 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)

*The individual indicator scores for this topic area totaled up to a negative score; however, so as not to penalize states for good work in other topic areas, negative scores for core topic areas are rounded to zero.



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		10 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	-5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		16 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	0 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	2 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		7 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	5 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-10 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	7 / 15
		8 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	5 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	17 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
	32 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	10 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	8 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
	73 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	3 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
	25 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	10 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	12 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	12 / 15
	34 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	5 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	18 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		33 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	0 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	5 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	7 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
		47 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	3 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	5 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	5 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	3 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	5 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
		33 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	5 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	6 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	0 / 15
		17 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Connecticut 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

73 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	5 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	16 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		31 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	-8 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
		37 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	0 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		0 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-10 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	6 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		5 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	11 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		24 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	10 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		60 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	5 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	3 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	3 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		23 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-10 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	6 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		5 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



District of Columbia 2022

MAKING STRIDES



OVERALL SCORE

125 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	11 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	3 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
Total	27 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	10 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	8 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
Total	58 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	2 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
Total	19 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	10 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	11 / 15
Total	21 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Florida 2022

MAKING STRIDES



OVERALL SCORE

146 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	5 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	8 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
	28 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	10 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	7 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
	62 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	5 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	5 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	2 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	5 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
	37 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	6 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	7 / 15
	19 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Georgia 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

50 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	13 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	5 / 10
Total	26 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	-10 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	2 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
Total	2 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	5 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
Total	15 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-6 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	7 / 15
Total	7 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Hawaii 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

88 / 200



COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	4 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	11 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
		15 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	-2 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	4 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	4 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	7 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		28 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	5 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	3 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
		25 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	10 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-10 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	9 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	11 / 15
		20 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		10 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	5 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	5 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		40 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	1 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	5 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		9 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	0 / 15
		6 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Illinois 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

98 / 200



COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	4 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	3 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	3 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	5 / 10
		15 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
	State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
		65 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	5 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		12 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	0 / 15
		6 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	11 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
		14 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	10 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5
	State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		50 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	2 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	1 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	5 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		8 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		9 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Iowa 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

72 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	18 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
Total	36 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	-8 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	8 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
Total	10 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
Total	17 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
Total	9 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
		0 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	8 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	5 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	1 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		34 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	5 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	2 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	3 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	2 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		14 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	5 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		14 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	7 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
		10 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	-5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	8 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	5 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	1 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		24 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	0 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		3 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-7 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	3 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		5 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Louisiana 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

60 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	15 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
		18 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	-2 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		24 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	0 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		2 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	10 / 15
		16 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Maine 2022

MAKING STRIDES



OVERALL SCORE

114

/200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	12 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>	
15 / 40	

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	10 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	3 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>	
59 / 75	

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	3 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	3 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	3 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	3 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>	
19 / 40	

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	12 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>	
21 / 45	

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Maryland 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

96 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	5 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	11 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		26 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	0 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	2 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		37 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	3 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
		11 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	10 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	9 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		22 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	5 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	19 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		39 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
		70 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	5 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	5 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	2 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	5 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
		37 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	12 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	0 / 15
		18 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Michigan 2022

MAKING STRIDES



OVERALL SCORE

145 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	5 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	14 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
	34 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	10 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	5 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
	65 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	5 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	5 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	3 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
	32 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	5 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
	14 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Minnesota 2022

MAKING STRIDES



OVERALL SCORE

149 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	5 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	16 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
Total	36 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
Total	60 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	5 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	5 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	3 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	5 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
Total	35 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	10 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	5 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	3 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	0 / 15
Total	18 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Mississippi 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

59 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	5 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
8 / 40	

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	0 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
31 / 75	

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	3 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	1 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
14 / 40	

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-7 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	7 / 15
6 / 45	

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: ■ LACING UP ■ WARMING UP ■ MAKING STRIDES ■ BUILDING SPEED ■ 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	4 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	2 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
		6 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	-8 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		8 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	1 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		1 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	7 / 15
		13 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Montana 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

64 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
10 / 40	

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	0 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	8 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	3 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
36 / 75	

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	0 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
5 / 40	

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	7 / 15
13 / 45	

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
		0 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	8 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		23 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	0 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	2 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		2 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	0 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	5 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		8 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	16 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	5 / 10
		24 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	-2 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		18 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	5 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	5 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
		23 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		9 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
		0 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	-10 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	8 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		13 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	1 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		1 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		9 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



New Jersey 2022

BUILDING SPEED



OVERALL SCORE

153 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	13 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
Total	31 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	8 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	3 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
Total	61 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	5 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	5 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	2 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	5 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
Total	34 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	5 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	3 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	13 / 15
Total	27 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	4 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	1 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
	15 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	-2 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
	23 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	1 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
	4 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
	9 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



New York 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

97 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	4 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	13 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
	22 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	-5 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	5 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
	50 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	2 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	1 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
	6 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	3 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	10 / 15
	19 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



North Carolina 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

65 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	11 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
Total	24 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	-2 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	1 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
Total	24 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	5 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	3 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
Total	17 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-10 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
Total	-1* / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)

*The individual indicator scores for this topic area totaled up to a negative score; however, so as not to penalize states for good work in other topic areas, negative scores for core topic areas are rounded to zero.

North Dakota 2022

LACING
UP



OVERALL SCORE

45 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
	15 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	-10 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
	11 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	1 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
	3 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	3 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	7 / 15
	16 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Ohio 2022

MAKING STRIDES



OVERALL SCORE

110 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
15 / 40	

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
45 / 75	

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	5 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	5 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	3 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
35 / 40	

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	10 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-10 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	12 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
15 / 45	

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
		0 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	-10 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	8 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		8 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	3 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	1 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	5 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		12 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	5 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-10 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	3 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	2 / 15
		6 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	4 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	6 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		25 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
		65 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	5 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	5 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	2 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	5 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
		34 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	11 / 15
		17 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	9 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		22 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	10 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	8 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	5 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		63 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	2 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		12 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-10 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	9 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		8 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	4 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	11 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	5 / 10
	25 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
	35 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	3 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	3 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
	8 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5


School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	9 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	7 / 15
	22 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



South Carolina 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

65 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	15 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
Total	18 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	-10 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
Total	16 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	3 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	2 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
Total	5 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	5 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	9 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	6 / 15
Total	26 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
		0 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	-5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	8 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		23 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	2 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	3 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		8 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		9 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	13 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
		21 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	0 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5
	State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	7 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
		48 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES




Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	0 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		2 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	5 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	5 / 15
		16 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Texas 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

66 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	5 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
	8 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	-10 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	3 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
	39 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	3 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	0 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	0 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	2 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
	10 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
	9 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	6 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	5 / 10
		14 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	10 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
	State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
		70 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	5 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	3 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		23 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	10 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-10 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	6 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		9 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Vermont 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

94 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	4 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	8 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
22 / 40	

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	7 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
48 / 75	

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	3 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	3 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
18 / 40	

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	0 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	3 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
6 / 45	

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	3 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	12 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
		15 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	8 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		38 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES




Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	3 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	3 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	5 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	5 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
		29 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	0 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	3 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
		6 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Washington 2022

BUILDING
SPEED



OVERALL SCORE

157 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	4 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	11 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>	
	30 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	10 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	5 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	5 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	10 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	5 / 5
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>	
	71 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	5 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	5 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	2 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	5 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	7 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	5 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	5 / 5
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>	
	37 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	5 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	8 / 15
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>	
	19 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



West Virginia 2022

WARMING UP



OVERALL SCORE

55 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	4 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	14 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	5 / 10
		23 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	6 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		17 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	0 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	0 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		3 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-3 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	3 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	6 / 15
		12 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Wisconsin 2022

LACING UP



OVERALL SCORE

35 / 200

Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies

Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20

Active Transportation Goals and Planning

Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	5 / 5
Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	0 / 10
	5 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation

Retained TAP funding without transfers	-5 / 10
Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	2 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	5 / 5
Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
Provides support to TAP applicants	0 / 5
Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5

State Funding for Active Transportation

Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
	12 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding

Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	3 / 5
Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3

Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices

Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	1 / 5
Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
	9 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities

Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5

School Siting and Design

Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	0 / 0
Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	0 / 15

Physical Education

Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	3 / 15
	9 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)



Scoring Key: LACING UP WARMING UP MAKING STRIDES BUILDING SPEED 100%

COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING



Complete Streets Policies	Adopted state Complete Streets policy(ies)	0 / 5
	Has strong state Complete Streets policy	0 / 20
Active Transportation Goals and Planning	Adopted goals to increase walking and bicycling mode share	0 / 5
	Adopted a state pedestrian, bicycle, or active transportation plan	10 / 10
		10 / 40

FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING



Use of Federal Funding for Active Transportation	Retained TAP funding without transfers	5 / 10
	Awarded TAP projects	10 / 10
	Obligated state-controlled TAP funds	6 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in TAP awards	0 / 5
	Provides matching funds for high-need communities	0 / 5
	Provides support to TAP applicants	5 / 5
	Sets aside other federal (non-TAP) funding for active transportation	0 / 5
State Funding for Active Transportation	Dedicates state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Amount of state funding for active transportation	0 / 10
	Provides special consideration for high-need communities in state awards	0 / 5
		26 / 75

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES



Safe Routes to School Funding	Provides special consideration for Safe Routes to School projects using TAP funds	0 / 5
	Dedicates state or other funding for Safe Routes to School	0 / 5
	Funds SRTS non-infrastructure projects	3 / 5
	Provides Safe Routes to School planning grants or minigrants	0 / 3
Safe Routes to School Supportive Practices	Staffs state Safe Routes to School program with state employees or consultants	1 / 5
	Provides a resource center or technical assistance to Safe Routes to School initiatives	0 / 7
	Adopted a state SRTS plan or incorporated SRTS into a state active transportation plan	2 / 5
	Supports equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming	0 / 5
		6 / 40

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS



Shared Use of School Facilities	Adopted state policy supporting shared use of school facilities	6 / 10
	Provides funding/incentives in support of shared use of school facilities	0 / 5
School Siting and Design	Requires large school sites (minimum acreage guideline)	-3 / 0
	Supports walking, bicycling and physical activity in school design guidelines	9 / 15
Physical Education	Adopted PE minutes and graduation requirements	0 / 15
		12 / 45

To review a quick summary of the report cards' scoring structure, click here: [Understanding the Scores and Grading](#)

VI

Reflections & Comparisons

What do the 2022 report cards tell us about the state support for walking, biking and the ability for kids and adults to be active in their communities? In comparison to 2020, there has been a promising upward shift in overall scores! Twelve states fall into the lowest grading category, Lacing Up. The majority of states (24) remain in the next category, Warming Up. Eleven states are in the Making Strides category. Four states are in the highest category, Building Speed, with New Jersey and Massachusetts achieving this level for the first time. The overall average score across the 50 states and DC also shifted upward from 80 points in 2020 to 82.7 points in 2022.



COMPLETE STREETS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PLANNING

When looking at the Complete Streets and Active Transportation Policy and Planning core topic area, state scores generally improved from 2020 to 2022. States in the West, Mid-Atlantic, and Northeast regions are significantly above the national average of 17.98 points, while the South and Midwest region states score significantly below average.

The Complete Streets and Active Transportation Policy and Planning core topic area first looks at Complete Streets policies. Since 2020, only two states (California and South Carolina) have adopted or revised their Complete Streets policies. The strength of these new policies increased substantially based on the National Complete Street Coalition’s scoring rubric. Overall, 36 states have some form of Complete Streets policy in place, with DOT policies being the primary tool that states rely on to put in place Complete Streets at the state level.

Complete Streets policies continue to be less prevalent in the Midwest and Mountain West regions.


This core topic area also looks at Active Transportation Planning. We found that even fewer states (17, down from 20) reported having goals explicitly calling for an increase in walking and bicycling than in 2020. That presents an opportunity to encourage states to adopt explicit mode shift goals to increase accountability and the likelihood of implementing actions.

Thirty-three states reported having an adopted bicycle or pedestrian plan, more than in 2020 when 31 states had a plan. Because we only included plans adopted/updated within the last 10 years, five of the plans that were in place in 2020 have “expired,” but we heard through our data collection that many states are in the

process of updating or creating new bicycle and pedestrian plans. Of the 33 states that have an adopted plan, the majority (27 states) address both bicycles and pedestrians.

The upward shift in state scores in the Complete Streets and Active Transportation Policy and Planning topic area resulted in 17 states falling in the lowest category (Lacing Up), 11 in the next (Warming Up), 15 in the next (Making Strides), and 8 in the highest category (Building Speed). Compared to 2020, the number of states achieving the Making Strides category increased by one and the states achieving the highest category, Building Speed, increased by two. This suggests more states are recognizing the importance of Complete Streets and active transportation policies and plans. As these scores improve it also means more states will have examples to learn from and inform their own policies and plans.

FIGURE 1:
Complete Streets: Policy Type & Strength



FEDERAL AND STATE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

When looking at the federal and state funding core topic area state scores generally improved from 2020 to 2022. States in the West and Mid-Atlantic regions are significantly above the national average of 36.68 points, while the South and Mountain West region states score significantly below average. The most improved state is New York, moving from a score of 16 in 2020 to a score of 50 points in 2022, due to state funding for active transportation.

When reviewing scores on individual questions, we are pleased to see TAP competitions and obligation rates continuing to improve—meaning more funds are getting out to local communities and projects. Looking at the rate at which states are holding TAP competitions, 45 states receive the top score, meaning they have awarded at least eight years' worth of TAP funding for projects—compared to 44 states in 2020 and 39 states in 2018. States also continue to make excellent progress on obligation rates. The

number of states that have obligated at least 60 percent of TAP funds has been on an upward trajectory. In 2018, only ten states had obligated 60 percent of TAP funds. In 2020, that number rose to 31 states, and by 2022, 45 states had obligated at least 60 percent of TAP funds. One troubling note, however, is that states are transferring more funds away from TAP, shifting resources away from biking and walking and towards road and bridge projects. Prior to 2022, no state had transferred more than 50 percent of their TAP funds out of the program, and this year, six states fell into this category. The number of states transferring less than 10 percent of TAP funding remained steady at 25 states.

On a positive note, we are very pleased to see states making progress on prioritizing TAP resources for communities most in need. The number of states who utilize an equity consideration when awarding TAP projects has been growing.

We first included this indicator in 2018, and 16 states prioritized high-need communities that year. In 2020, 21 states did so, and now in 2022, we observe a further increase to 24 states. The number of states that provide matching funds for projects benefiting low-income communities remained steady at 17 states from 2020 to 2022. A provision in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law requires states to define and prioritize high-need communities in TAP project selection, so these states provide a strong foundation of examples others can learn from as they implement this new provision.

In 2020, we included state funding for active transportation and Safe Routes to School as a new indicator, which provided a baseline of how many states are paying for walking and bicycling out of their own revenue sources. This year, we are able to observe how state funding changed relative to 2020. Overall, we were very pleased with the findings.

FIGURE 2:
Transportation Alternatives Funding Transfers




FIGURE 3:
Special Consideration and Matching Funds for High Need Communities





FIGURE 4:
State Active Transportation Funding



The percentage of states funding active transportation with state revenue remained steady - sixty percent of states are dedicating their own money for walking, biking, and/or Safe Routes to School.¹⁰⁵ The two-year average for annual state spending on active transportation jumped from \$430 million to \$612 million, demonstrating that states continue to invest significant state money to support and promote safe walking and bicycling. Of the 31 states dedicating funding, 20 states increased their per capita spending since 2020. In 2020, the average per capita spending among states that dedicate funding for active transportation (does not include states with zero state spending) was \$1.03; in 2022, it increased to \$1.93. The number of states dedicating more than \$3 per capita, the highest category for this indicator, increased from seven in 2020 to 12 in 2022.

There are a number of potential explanations for the increase. The simplest explanation is that several states increased existing budgets for active transportation. For example, in 2020, Illinois had \$25 million per year in state funding, and in 2022 it had \$50 million per year. Another explanation is that the attention the COVID-19 pandemic shed on peoples' desire for walking and bicycling led states to increase their active transportation investments.

Five states saw boosts in funding related to shared streets and public spaces as well as connections to trails and recreation spaces. For example, Massachusetts started a Shared Streets and Places program with federal CARES funding that was so successful it started using state funds to grow the program. A third explanation has to do more with data collection than dollar amounts. In 2022, state DOT staff provided more detailed summaries of state funding for active transportation from work plans and state budgets than they did in 2020, which likely provides a more robust portrait of state spending on active transportation.

Continuing what we saw in 2020, as of 2022, states use a variety of revenue sources to invest in walking, bicycling, and Safe Routes to School. State bonds are among the most popular financing mechanism. Other strategies include requirements that a state spend a certain percentage of state funds on active transportation, revenue from traffic fines and fees, state gas taxes, and general fund appropriations. Two lesser-used revenue sources include lottery proceeds and revenue generated from specialty license plates.

When it comes to prioritizing communities that have been historically underinvested in or actively harmed by transportation policy and funding decisions, 14 states prioritize high-need communities when awarding funds made with state funding. This is an increase of three states from when we first collected these data in 2020. The two primary mechanisms states use to prioritize high-need communities are awarding points to projects that benefit certain demographic groups or locations or by designating a percentage of funding that must benefit high-need communities. While we did not award points for states that had informal ways of prioritizing high-need communities, it is worth noting that several shared that in their internal assessments of projects, they consider whether a project benefits high-needs factors into project selection.

Overall, within the Federal and State Active Transportation Funding core topic area, 13 states fall in the lowest category (Lacing Up), 15 in the next (Warming Up), 9 in the next (Making Strides), and 14 in the highest category (Building Speed). This upward movement in grades are reflective of improvement in TAP competition and obligation rates, prioritization of high-need communities, and state funding for active transportation.

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING AND SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES

In general, we saw scores for Safe Routes to School funding and supportive practices increase slightly from 2020 to 2022, though several states saw significant increases. Looking at overall scores by region, the West has a significantly score above the national average of 14.8 points, though at least one state in every region scores close to perfect in this arena.


Looking across the various Safe Routes to School funding indicators, we are pleased to see that more states are finding ways to prioritize or fund Safe Routes to School. The number of states that either utilize state dollars or pull in non-TAP federal funding (such as the Highway Safety Improvement Program) specifically for Safe Routes to school saw growth from 2016 to 2020 and remained steady in 2022 at 13 states. Collectively, these 13 states dedicated an average of \$36.5 million to Safe Routes to School annually from state and non-TAP federal sources. Specific to the Transportation Alternatives Program, the number of states that either provide a scoring preference or set aside TAP funding specifically for Safe Routes to School grew steadily from 17 in 2016 to 22 in 2020, and dropped to 19 states in 2022. However, these absolute numbers do not tell the whole story. Of the five states that stopped setting aside funds from TAP for Safe Routes to School two of them began running their Safe Routes

to School programs entirely with state funds, which can make them easier projects for local communities to manage. Additionally, while some states removed prioritization for Safe Routes to School within TAP, new states added it in between 2020 and 2022. This shows the fluidity of project scoring criteria and the importance of stakeholder involvement to convey the value and importance of prioritizing Safe Routes to School within TAP funding competitions. One area of growth was in the number of states allowing the funding of

Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure, the educational and encouragement components of Safe Routes to School. Research has demonstrated that Safe Routes to School infrastructure improvements have a stronger impact on walking and biking rates when paired with non-infrastructure elements like education and encouragement, so we are pleased that 34 states allow funding Safe Routes to School programming, a marked increase from 23 states in 2020.



FIGURE 5:
Special Consideration for SRTS and Non-Infrastructure Funding



This core topic area also looks at state practices that support Safe Routes to School programs at the local level. While many states have eliminated a Safe Routes to School coordinator position within the state DOT, a number of states continue to dedicate resources to staffing the state program. From 2020 to 2022, we saw minimal changes in state staffing for Safe Routes to School. Seventeen states have at least two full-time equivalent staff (FTE) that focus on Safe Routes to School, and 11 have at least one FTE focused on Safe Routes to School. About half of states provide technical assistance or a statewide resource center that supports local Safe Routes to School programs, remaining unchanged since 2020.

The number of states providing support for equitable access to Safe Routes to School programming has increased since 2020 by 3 states with 16 states now reporting having publications, resources, or other support dedicated to enabling local programs to support underserved demographic groups. This is still an area where states have a long way to go in terms of supportive Safe Routes to School practices. When it comes to providing curricula, training, or other resources to facilitate Safe Routes to School education, 25 states (two more than in 2020) have developed these materials.

Finally, the 2022 report cards included a new indicator looking at state planning for Safe Routes to School through a standalone plan or inclusion in another state's active transportation plan. Only nine states have adopted a standalone Safe Routes to School strategic plan, while 22 have mentioned Safe Routes to School in another state plan. This will be an area to watch moving forward as adopted state plans are an indicator of a state's commitment and coordinated efforts around the initiative.

Within the Safe Routes to School Funding and Supportive Practices core topic area, 24 states fall in the lowest category (Lacing Up), 12 in the next (Warming Up), 6 in the next (Making Strides), and 9 in the highest category (Building Speed). We note that changes in the overall scoring in this topic area since 2020 may also reflect changes to the indicators used.

ACTIVE NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS

From 2020 to 2022, we generally saw scores in the Active Neighborhoods and Schools decrease. Looking at overall scores by region, the West has a significantly higher score above the national average of 13.11 points with California scoring the highest by far out of all of the states, earning 34 points.

The Active Neighborhoods and Schools core topic area first looks at shared use. Since the 2020 report cards, the District of Columbia has moved from recommending to requiring shared use of school facilities. Outside of that, the number of state policies on shared use has not changed since 2020. The number of states providing

funding or incentives to increase shared use has decreased to only eleven. This change may be indicative of the temporary nature of the funding for these shared use incentives – states may have been offering the incentive based on availability due to a specific grant or funding source that was not a long-term commitment.



This core topic area also looks at school siting. Unfortunately, there has not been progress since 2020 on the states that continue to include large minimum acreage requirements in their school siting guidelines. Currently 14 states have large minimum acreage requirements for one or more school levels. This lack of change may be indicative of the need for more guidance on how states can update acreage requirements. Support for walking, bicycling, and physical activity within states' school design guidelines increased minimally with one state, Ohio, implementing new supportive guidelines. We continue to regard this as a policy arena where there is significant potential for additional state action.

FIGURE 6:
School Siting: Supportive Guidelines & Minimum Acreage Requirements





FIGURE 7:
Physical Education Requirements



There also remains significant room for improvement in physical education requirements in many states. Since 2020, two states have updated their requirements and now align with the number of weekly minutes of physical education recommended by experts. However, no state is receiving the full 15 points for this indicator and the vast majority are receiving 3 points or fewer.

Overall, there was a downward shift in state scores in the Active Neighborhoods and Schools topic area with 24 states falling in the lowest category (Lacing Up), 24 in the next (Warming Up), 3 in the next (Making Strides), and none in the highest category (Building Speed). While this downward shift is in part due to state policy

and practice changes (mainly around providing incentives for shared use), we again note that the changes in the overall scoring in this topic area may also reflect changes to the indicators used since 2020.





Conclusion

Following each edition of the Making Strides state report cards, we have seen states take steps to create and improve opportunities for people to safely walk, bicycle, wheel, and be physically active.

From 2020 to 2022, some states implemented new policies and plans committing to Complete Streets and coordinated efforts to support walking and biking. Other states ensured critical federal dollars flowed to local jurisdictions, and others increased their own state funding for active transportation. Support for equitable access to Safe Routes to School

programming increased, as did resources for Safe Routes to School education. Overall, there has been a promising upward shift in state scores. However, most states are not earning even half of the available points. There is more work to be done!

The benefits of having more physically active communities are well established.

As we emerge from the pandemic, more than ever, we need safe walking and biking infrastructure to help us get around safely in our communities and to everyday destinations. We need safe places for community members to move outdoors and opportunities for kids to be active during and outside of the school day. We need the support of states – through policies, plans, and prioritized funding – to make these changes on the ground.

The indicators in the state report cards offer a roadmap for states to answer these questions: What can we do to ensure all people in all communities are able to safely walk, bicycle, roll, and be physically active? How do we more proactively address inequities to ensure that communities of color and low-income communities have walking and biking connections to essential destinations and access to physical activity? How do we ensure we do not slip backwards on any progress that has been made? Positive change across our nation will be incremental, but now is our opportunity to make strides toward vibrant, healthy, resilient, equitable, and thriving communities.

Are you a community member or organization looking to champion change in your state? See this factsheet on how to use your state report card for tips on [how to use your state's report card](#), key points you can use in communicating the importance of state support for walking, biking, and physical activity, steps to consider in using the report card, and ideas to inspire change in your state.

Looking Ahead to the 2024 Report Cards

As we wrap up the 2022 state report cards, we set our sights on the 2024 iteration of the report cards. The state report cards have served as a way to convey best practices for states to use public policy and practices to support and promote safe, convenient, and equitable walking and bicycling to school and throughout communities.

As we look ahead to the 2024 state report cards, we recognize that the passage of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law will require making changes to the core topic area of federal funding for active transportation. From the original issue of the state report cards in 2016, this indicator has measured how well states administer the Transportation Alternatives Program to maximize benefits for people walking and bicycling. The state report cards highlight state innovation that can be replicated in other states, either through shared knowledge or through legislation. Drawing in part on information learned through these biannual state report cards, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law made the following changes that will affect the indicators included in the 2024 version of this core topic area.

- A key indicator in this section has been whether a state retains TAP funding without transfers. As shown in the state report cards, there are states that transfer these valuable funds away from walking and bicycling to other uses. The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law

places stricter guardrails on a state's ability to transfer funds out of TAP, which is expected to cut down on states transferring money out of TAP.

- Due in part to the data collected on how states were currently defining and prioritizing “high-need” communities in TAP awards, the IJA now requires states to define and prioritize “high-need communities” in TAP project selection.
- The IJA creates several new flexibilities for states to support the local match/non-federal share of TAP awards, including: allowing Highway Safety Improvement Program funds to be used as the match so projects can be done entirely with federal funds and allowing the local match to be met at the program level, rather than at the individual project level.
- The indicator on providing support to TAP applicants is another area where the IJA has made improvements to TAP. Starting in FY22, states have the opportunity to use up to five percent of their TAP funds to provide improved access to TAP funds and improve efficiency of project delivery.

The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law also makes changes that will affect the Complete Streets core topic area. States (and metropolitan planning agencies) are required to use 2.5 percent of their State Planning and Research funds to develop Complete Streets policies and project prioritization plans. We will adjust this indicator to account for the work states are now being required by federal law to comply with.

CDC's [Active People, Healthy Nation webpage](#) provides information, examples, and resources on evidence-based strategies to increase physical activity for different sectors, including Government, Transportation, and Education.

Appendices

A Complete Streets and Active Transportation Scores by State

The tables in Appendices A through D summarize scoring for each indicator in each of the core topic areas by state. Appendix A summarizes scoring by state for the indicators in the Complete Streets and Active Transportation core topic area. Refer to Section IV. Overview of the Report Cards: Key Topics & Grading for information about the indicators.

STATE	Complete streets legislation or DOT policy	Complete Streets Policy Strength	Mode Share Goal	State Bike/ Pedestrian Plan	CS & AT Total	CS & AT Topic Grade
Alabama	0	0	0	10	10	LACING UP
Alaska	0	0	0	10	10	LACING UP
Arizona	0	0	0	10	10	LACING UP
Arkansas	0	0	0	10	10	LACING UP
California	5	17	0	10	32	BUILDING SPEED
Colorado	5	18	0	10	33	BUILDING SPEED
Connecticut	5	16	0	10	31	BUILDING SPEED
Delaware	3	11	0	10	24	MAKING STRIDES
District of Columbia	3	11	3	10	27	MAKING STRIDES
Florida	5	8	5	10	28	MAKING STRIDES
Georgia	3	13	5	5	26	MAKING STRIDES
Hawaii	4	11	0	0	15	WARMING UP
Idaho	0	0	0	10	10	LACING UP
Illinois	4	3	3	5	15	WARMING UP
Indiana	3	11	0	0	14	WARMING UP
Iowa	3	18	5	10	36	BUILDING SPEED
Kansas	0	0	0	0	0	LACING UP
Kentucky	3	7	0	0	10	LACING UP
Louisiana	3	15	0	0	18	WARMING UP
Maine	3	12	0	0	15	WARMING UP
Maryland	5	11	0	10	26	MAKING STRIDES
Massachusetts	5	19	5	10	39	BUILDING SPEED
Michigan	5	14	5	10	34	BUILDING SPEED
Minnesota	5	16	5	10	36	BUILDING SPEED
Mississippi	3	5	0	0	8	LACING UP
Missouri	4	2	0	0	6	LACING UP
Montana	0	0	0	10	10	LACING UP
Nebraska	0	0	0	0	0	LACING UP
Nevada	3	16	0	5	24	MAKING STRIDES
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	LACING UP
New Jersey	3	13	5	10	31	BUILDING SPEED
New Mexico	4	1	0	10	15	WARMING UP
New York	4	13	0	5	22	MAKING STRIDES
North Carolina	3	11	0	10	24	MAKING STRIDES
North Dakota	0	0	5	10	15	WARMING UP
Ohio	0	0	5	10	15	WARMING UP
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0	0	LACING UP
Oregon	4	6	5	10	25	MAKING STRIDES
Pennsylvania	3	9	0	10	22	MAKING STRIDES
Rhode Island	4	11	5	5	25	MAKING STRIDES
South Carolina	3	15	0	0	18	WARMING UP
South Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	LACING UP
Tennessee	3	13	5	0	21	MAKING STRIDES
Texas	3	5	0	0	8	LACING UP
Utah	3	6	0	5	14	WARMING UP
Vermont	4	8	0	10	22	MAKING STRIDES
Virginia	3	12	0	0	15	WARMING UP
Washington	4	11	5	10	30	MAKING STRIDES
West Virginia	4	14	0	5	23	MAKING STRIDES
Wisconsin	0	0	5	0	5	LACING UP
Wyoming	0	0	0	10	10	LACING UP

B Federal and State Active Transportation Funding Scores by State

The tables in Appendices A through D summarize scoring for each indicator in each of the core topic areas by state. Appendix B summarizes scoring by state for the indicators in the Federal and State Active Transportation Funding core topic area. Refer to Section IV. Overview of the Report Cards: Key Topics & Grading for information about the indicators.

STATE	TAP Transfers	TAP Awards	TAP Obligation	TAP Consideration for High-Need	Matching Funds for High-Need	TAP Applicant Support	Other Federal Funds for AT	Dedicates State AT Funds	Amount of State AT Funds	State AT Consideration for High-Need	AT Funding Total	AT Funding Topic Grade
Alabama	5	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	WARMING UP
Alaska	-2	10	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	LACING UP
Arizona	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-8	LACING UP
Arkansas	-5	10	6	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	16	LACING UP
California	10	10	8	5	5	5	5	10	10	5	73	BUILDING SPEED
Colorado	0	10	10	5	0	0	5	5	7	5	47	MAKING STRIDES
Connecticut	-8	10	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	5	37	WARMING UP
Delaware	10	10	10	0	5	5	0	10	10	0	60	BUILDING SPEED
District of Columbia	10	8	10	5	5	0	0	10	10	0	58	BUILDING SPEED
Florida	10	10	10	0	5	5	5	10	7	0	62	BUILDING SPEED
Georgia	-10	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	LACING UP
Hawaii	-2	4	4	0	0	5	0	10	7	0	28	WARMING UP
Idaho	5	10	10	0	0	5	0	5	5	0	40	MAKING STRIDES
Illinois	5	10	10	5	5	5	0	10	10	5	65	BUILDING SPEED
Indiana	10	10	10	0	0	0	5	5	10	0	50	MAKING STRIDES
Iowa	-8	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	LACING UP
Kansas	5	10	8	0	0	5	0	5	1	0	34	WARMING UP
Kentucky	-5	10	8	5	0	0	0	5	1	0	24	WARMING UP
Louisiana	-2	10	6	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	24	WARMING UP
Maine	10	10	6	5	5	5	5	10	3	0	59	BUILDING SPEED
Maryland	0	10	2	0	0	5	0	10	10	0	37	WARMING UP
Massachusetts	5	10	10	5	5	5	5	10	10	5	70	BUILDING SPEED
Michigan	10	10	10	5	5	5	5	10	5	0	65	BUILDING SPEED
Minnesota	5	10	10	0	5	5	0	10	10	5	60	BUILDING SPEED
Mississippi	0	10	6	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	31	WARMING UP
Missouri	-8	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	LACING UP
Montana	0	10	8	0	0	5	0	10	3	0	36	WARMING UP
Nebraska	5	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	WARMING UP
Nevada	-2	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	LACING UP
New Hampshire	-10	10	8	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	13	LACING UP
New Jersey	5	10	8	5	5	5	5	10	3	5	61	BUILDING SPEED
New Mexico	-2	10	10	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	23	WARMING UP
New York	-5	10	10	5	0	5	5	10	5	5	50	MAKING STRIDES
North Carolina	-2	10	10	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	24	WARMING UP
North Dakota	-10	10	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	LACING UP
Ohio	5	10	10	5	5	5	5	0	0	0	45	MAKING STRIDES
Oklahoma	-10	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	LACING UP
Oregon	5	10	10	5	0	5	5	10	10	5	65	BUILDING SPEED
Pennsylvania	10	10	8	5	5	5	5	10	5	0	63	BUILDING SPEED
Rhode Island	5	10	10	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	35	WARMING UP
South Carolina	-10	10	6	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	16	LACING UP
South Dakota	-5	10	8	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	23	WARMING UP
Tennessee	0	10	6	5	0	0	5	10	7	5	48	MAKING STRIDES
Texas	-10	10	6	5	5	5	5	10	3	0	39	MAKING STRIDES
Utah	10	10	10	5	5	5	0	10	10	5	70	BUILDING SPEED
Vermont	5	10	6	0	0	5	0	10	7	5	48	MAKING STRIDES
Virginia	5	10	8	5	0	5	5	0	0	0	38	MAKING STRIDES
Washington	10	10	6	5	5	5	5	10	10	5	71	BUILDING SPEED
West Virginia	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	LACING UP
Wisconsin	-5	10	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	LACING UP
Wyoming	5	10	6	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	26	WARMING UP

C

Safe Routes to School Funding and Supportive Practices by State

The tables in Appendices A through D summarize scoring for each indicator in each of the core topic areas by state. Appendix C summarizes scoring by state for the indicators in the Safe Routes to School Funding and Supportive Practices core topic area. Refer to Section IV. Overview of the Report Cards: Key Topics & Grading for information about the indicators.

STATE	Consideration for SRTS	State or Other Funds for SRTS	SRTS Non-Infrastructure	Planning/Mini-Grants	SRTS State Staffing	SRTS State TA Program	SRTS Strategic Plan	Equitable SRTS Programming	SRTS Total	SRTS Topic Grade
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	LACING UP
Alaska	3	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	9	LACING UP
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	LACING UP
Arkansas	0	0	3	0	0	2	2	0	7	LACING UP
California	3	0	3	0	5	7	2	5	25	MAKING STRIDES
Colorado	3	5	5	0	3	7	5	5	33	BUILDING SPEED
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	LACING UP
Delaware	5	3	3	0	3	7	2	0	23	MAKING STRIDES
District of Columbia	0	0	3	2	5	7	2	0	19	WARMING UP
Florida	5	5	3	2	5	7	5	5	37	BUILDING SPEED
Georgia	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	5	15	WARMING UP
Hawaii	0	5	3	0	3	7	2	5	25	MAKING STRIDES
Idaho	0	0	3	0	1	5	0	0	9	LACING UP
Illinois	5	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	12	WARMING UP
Indiana	0	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	8	LACING UP
Iowa	0	0	3	0	5	7	2	0	17	WARMING UP
Kansas	0	0	5	2	3	2	2	0	14	WARMING UP
Kentucky	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	LACING UP
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	LACING UP
Maine	3	3	0	3	3	7	0	0	19	WARMING UP
Maryland	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	5	11	WARMING UP
Massachusetts	5	5	3	2	5	7	5	5	37	BUILDING SPEED
Michigan	0	5	5	3	5	7	2	5	32	BUILDING SPEED
Minnesota	0	5	5	3	5	7	5	5	35	BUILDING SPEED
Mississippi	3	0	3	0	1	7	0	0	14	WARMING UP
Missouri	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	LACING UP
Montana	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	5	LACING UP
Nebraska	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	LACING UP
Nevada	0	0	3	0	5	5	5	5	23	MAKING STRIDES
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	LACING UP
New Jersey	5	5	0	2	5	7	5	5	34	BUILDING SPEED
New Mexico	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	LACING UP
New York	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	6	LACING UP
North Carolina	0	0	5	0	3	7	2	0	17	WARMING UP
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	LACING UP
Ohio	5	5	3	3	5	7	2	5	35	BUILDING SPEED
Oklahoma	3	0	3	0	1	5	0	0	12	WARMING UP
Oregon	0	5	5	2	5	7	5	5	34	BUILDING SPEED
Pennsylvania	0	0	3	0	5	2	2	0	12	WARMING UP
Rhode Island	3	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	8	LACING UP
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	5	LACING UP
South Dakota	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	8	LACING UP
Tennessee	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	LACING UP
Texas	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	10	LACING UP
Utah	5	3	3	0	5	7	0	0	23	MAKING STRIDES
Vermont	3	0	3	0	3	7	2	0	18	WARMING UP
Virginia	3	0	3	3	5	5	5	5	29	MAKING STRIDES
Washington	5	5	3	2	5	7	5	5	37	BUILDING SPEED
West Virginia	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	LACING UP
Wisconsin	3	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	9	LACING UP
Wyoming	0	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	6	LACING UP

D Active Neighborhoods and Schools Scores by State

The tables in Appendices A through D summarize scoring for each indicator in each of the core topic areas by state. Appendix D summarizes scoring by state for the indicators in the Active Neighborhoods and Schools core topic area. Refer to Section IV. Overview of the Report Cards: Key Topics & Grading for information about the indicators.

STATE	Shared Use Policy	Shared Use Incentives	Minimum Acreage Guidelines	Walk / Bike / Physical Activity Support	PE Requirements	Active Neighborhoods & Schools Total	Active Neighborhoods & Schools Topic Grade
Alabama	6	0	0	0	10	16	WARMING UP
Alaska	0	0	0	9	0	9	LACING UP
Arizona	6	0	0	15	0	21	WARMING UP
Arkansas	6	5	-10	0	7	8	LACING UP
California	10	0	0	12	1	34	MAKING STRIDES
Colorado	6	5	0	6	0	17	WARMING UP
Connecticut	6	0	-10	6	3	5	LACING UP
Delaware	6	0	-10	6	3	5	LACING UP
District of Columbia	10	0	0	0	11	21	WARMING UP
Florida	6	0	0	6	7	19	WARMING UP
Georgia	6	0	-6	0	7	7	LACING UP
Hawaii	10	0	-10	9	11	20	WARMING UP
Idaho	6	0	0	0	0	6	LACING UP
Illinois	6	0	0	0	0	6	LACING UP
Indiana	6	0	0	0	3	9	LACING UP
Iowa	6	0	0	0	3	9	LACING UP
Kansas	6	5	0	0	3	14	WARMING UP
Kentucky	6	0	-7	3	3	5	LACING UP
Louisiana	6	0	0	0	10	16	WARMING UP
Maine	6	0	0	12	3	21	WARMING UP
Maryland	10	0	0	9	3	22	WARMING UP
Massachusetts	6	0	0	12	0	18	WARMING UP
Michigan	6	5	0	0	3	14	WARMING UP
Minnesota	10	5	0	3	0	18	WARMING UP
Mississippi	6	0	-7	0	7	6	LACING UP
Missouri	6	0	0	0	7	13	WARMING UP
Montana	6	0	0	0	7	13	WARMING UP
Nebraska	0	5	0	0	3	8	LACING UP
Nevada	6	0	0	0	3	9	LACING UP
New Hampshire	6	0	0	0	3	9	LACING UP
New Jersey	6	5	0	3	13	27	MAKING STRIDES
New Mexico	6	0	0	0	3	9	LACING UP
New York	6	0	0	3	10	19	WARMING UP
North Carolina	6	0	-10	0	3	-1	LACING UP
North Dakota	6	0	0	3	7	16	WARMING UP
Ohio	10	0	-10	12	3	15	WARMING UP
Oklahoma	6	5	-10	3	2	6	LACING UP
Oregon	6	0	0	0	11	17	WARMING UP
Pennsylvania	6	0	-10	9	3	8	LACING UP
Rhode Island	6	0	0	9	7	22	WARMING UP
South Carolina	6	5	0	9	6	26	MAKING STRIDES
South Dakota	6	0	0	0	3	9	LACING UP
Tennessee	6	5	0	0	5	16	WARMING UP
Texas	6	0	0	0	3	9	LACING UP
Utah	10	0	-10	6	3	9	LACING UP
Vermont	0	0	0	3	3	6	LACING UP
Virginia	0	0	0	3	3	6	LACING UP
Washington	6	5	0	0	8	19	WARMING UP
West Virginia	6	0	-3	3	6	12	WARMING UP
Wisconsin	6	0	0	0	3	9	LACING UP
Wyoming	6	0	-3	9	0	12	WARMING UP

E 2022 Overall Scores by State

The following table summarizes the overall scores and grades by state in 2022. Refer to Section IV. Overview of the Report Cards: Key Topics & Grading for information about the scoring and grading categories.

STATE	Complete Streets & Active Transportation Score	Federal and State Active Transportation Funding Score	Safe Routes to School Funding and Supportive Practices Score	Active Neighborhoods & Schools Score	2022 Overall Score	2022 Overall Grade
Alabama	10	21	0	16	47	LACING UP
Alaska	10	15	9	9	43	LACING UP
Arizona	10	-8	2	21	33	LACING UP
Arkansas	10	16	7	8	41	LACING UP
California	32	73	25	34	164	BUILDING SPEED
Colorado	33	47	33	17	130	MAKING STRIDES
Connecticut	31	37	0	5	73	WARMING UP
Delaware	24	60	23	5	112	MAKING STRIDES
District of Columbia	27	58	19	21	125	MAKING STRIDES
Florida	28	62	37	19	146	MAKING STRIDES
Georgia	26	2	15	7	50	WARMING UP
Hawaii	15	28	25	20	88	WARMING UP
Idaho	10	40	9	6	65	WARMING UP
Illinois	15	65	12	6	98	WARMING UP
Indiana	14	50	8	9	81	WARMING UP
Iowa	36	10	17	9	72	WARMING UP
Kansas	0	34	14	14	62	WARMING UP
Kentucky	10	24	3	5	42	LACING UP
Louisiana	18	24	2	16	60	WARMING UP
Maine	15	59	19	21	114	MAKING STRIDES
Maryland	26	37	11	22	96	WARMING UP
Massachusetts	39	70	37	18	164	BUILDING SPEED
Michigan	34	65	32	14	145	MAKING STRIDES
Minnesota	36	60	35	18	149	MAKING STRIDES
Mississippi	8	31	14	6	59	WARMING UP
Missouri	6	8	1	13	28	LACING UP
Montana	10	36	5	13	65	WARMING UP
Nebraska	0	23	2	8	33	LACING UP
Nevada	24	18	23	9	74	WARMING UP
New Hampshire	0	13	1	9	23	LACING UP
New Jersey	31	61	34	27	153	BUILDING SPEED
New Mexico	15	23	4	9	51	WARMING UP
New York	22	50	6	19	97	WARMING UP
North Carolina	24	24	17	-1	65	WARMING UP
North Dakota	15	11	3	16	45	LACING UP
Ohio	15	45	35	15	110	MAKING STRIDES
Oklahoma	0	8	12	6	26	LACING UP
Oregon	25	65	34	17	141	MAKING STRIDES
Pennsylvania	22	63	12	8	105	MAKING STRIDES
Rhode Island	25	35	8	22	90	WARMING UP
South Carolina	18	16	5	26	65	WARMING UP
South Dakota	0	23	8	9	40	LACING UP
Tennessee	21	48	2	16	87	WARMING UP
Texas	8	39	10	9	66	WARMING UP
Utah	14	70	25	9	116	MAKING STRIDES
Vermont	22	48	18	6	94	WARMING UP
Virginia	15	38	29	6	88	WARMING UP
Washington	30	71	37	19	157	BUILDING SPEED
West Virginia	23	17	3	12	55	WARMING UP
Wisconsin	5	12	9	9	35	LACING UP
Wyoming	10	26	6	12	54	WARMING UP

F

School Siting and Design: School Minimum Acreage Guidelines Scoring Details by State

This table summarizes the state minimum acreage requirements for schools at each grade level (elementary, middle, and high school) by state. The first column under each grade level sets out the acreage range of the requirement and the second column indicates the scoring correlated with that range. Refer to Section IV. Overview of the Report Cards: Key Topics & Grading for a full description of the indicator and scoring.

STATE	Elementary Minimum Acreage Requirement	Elementary Minimum Acreage Score	Middle School Minimum Acreage Requirement	Middle School Minimum Acreage Score	High School Minimum Acreage Requirement	High School Minimum Acreage Score	Total Minimum Acreage Requirement Score
Alabama	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Alaska	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Arizona	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Arkansas	>5 ac req	-4	> 10 ac req	-3	>15 ac req	-3	-10
California	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Colorado	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Connecticut	>5 ac req	-4	> 10 ac req	-3	>15 ac req	-3	-10
Delaware	>5 ac req	-4	> 10 ac req	-3	>15 ac req	-3	-10
District of Columbia	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Florida	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Georgia	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	> 10 ac req	-3	>15 ac req	-3	-6
Hawaii	>5 ac req	-4	> 10 ac req	-3	>15 ac req	-3	-10
Idaho	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Illinois	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Indiana	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Iowa	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Kansas	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Kentucky	>5 ac req	-4	> 10 ac req	-3	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	-7
Louisiana	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Maine	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Maryland	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Massachusetts	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Michigan	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Minnesota	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Mississippi	>5 ac req	-4	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	>15 ac req	-3	-7
Missouri	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Montana	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Nebraska	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Nevada	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
New Hampshire	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
New Jersey	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
New Mexico	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
New York	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
North Carolina	>5 ac req	-4	> 10 ac req	-3	>15 ac req	-3	-10
North Dakota	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Ohio	>5 ac req	-4	> 10 ac req	-3	>15 ac req	-3	-10
Oklahoma	>5 ac req	-4	> 10 ac req	-3	>15 ac req	-3	-10
Oregon	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Pennsylvania	>5 ac req	-4	> 10 ac req	-3	>15 ac req	-3	-10
Rhode Island	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
South Carolina	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
South Dakota	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Tennessee	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Texas	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Utah	>5 ac req	-4	> 10 ac req	-3	>15 ac req	-3	-10
Vermont	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Virginia	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Washington	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
West Virginia	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	> 10 ac req	-3	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	-3
Wisconsin	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 15 ac	0	0
Wyoming	No min ac req or ≤ 5 ac	0	No min ac req or ≤ 10 ac	0	>15 ac req	-3	-3

G School Siting and Design: School Walking/Biking/Physical Activity Support Scoring Details by State

This table summarizes state support for walking, biking, and physical activity in four key areas within school siting and design guidelines. The first column under each support area indicates whether or not the state has supportive language in this area and the second column indicates the correlated scoring. Refer to Section IV. Overview of the Report Cards: Key Topics & Grading for a full description of the indicator and scoring.

STATE	Walk/Bike/ SRTS Criteria	Walk/Bike/ SRTS Criteria Score	Park Co-location	Park Co-location Score	Max. Acreage	Max. Acreage Score	Min. Playspace	Min. Playspace Score	Total Supportive Guidelines Score
Alabama	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Alaska	Yes	6	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	9
Arizona	Yes	6	Yes	3	Yes	3	Yes	3	15
Arkansas	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
California	Yes	6	Yes	3	No	0	Yes	3	12
Colorado	Yes	6	No	0	No	0	No	0	6
Connecticut	Yes	6	No	0	No	0	No	0	6
Delaware	Yes	6	No	0	No	0	No	0	6
District of Columbia	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Florida	Yes	6	No	0	No	0	No	0	6
Georgia	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Hawaii	Yes	6	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	9
Idaho	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Illinois	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Indiana	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Iowa	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Kansas	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Kentucky	No	0	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	3
Louisiana	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Maine	Yes	6	No	0	Yes	3	Yes	3	12
Maryland	Yes	6	Yes	3	No	0	No	0	9
Massachusetts	Yes	6	Yes	3	No	0	Yes	3	12
Michigan	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Minnesota	No	0	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	3
Mississippi	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Missouri	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Montana	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Nebraska	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Nevada	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
New Hampshire	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
New Jersey	No	0	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	3
New Mexico	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
New York	No	0	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	3
North Carolina	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
North Dakota	No	0	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	3
Ohio	Yes	6	Yes	3	No	0	Yes	3	12
Oklahoma	No	0	Yes	3	No	0	No	0	3
Oregon	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Pennsylvania	Yes	6	No	0	Yes	3	No	0	9
Rhode Island	Yes	6	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	9
South Carolina	Yes	6	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	9
South Dakota	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Tennessee	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Texas	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Utah	Yes	6	No	0	No	0	No	0	6
Vermont	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	No	0	3
Virginia	No	0	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	3
Washington	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
West Virginia	No	0	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	3
Wisconsin	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	0
Wyoming	Yes	6	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	9

H PE Requirements Scoring Details by State

This table summarizes the state physical education requirements at each grade level (elementary, middle, and high school) and requirements for graduation by state. The first column under each grade level sets out the minutes range of the requirement and the second column indicates the scoring correlated with that range. The final columns indicate whether or not a state requires physical education for high school graduation. Refer to Section IV. Overview of the Report Cards: Key Topics & Grading for a full description of the indicator and scoring.

STATE	Elementary PE Minutes Required	Elementary PE Score	Middle School PE Minutes Required	Middle School PE Score	High School PE Minutes Required	High School PE Score	PE Credits for Graduation	Graduation Credits Score	Total PE Score
Alabama	150 min/week +	4	150-224 min/week	3	None	0	Yes	3	10
Alaska	None	0	None	0	None	0	No	0	0
Arizona	None	0	None	0	None	0	No	0	0
Arkansas	40-89 min/week	2	40-149 min/week	2	None	0	Yes	3	7
California	90-149 min/week	3	150-224 min/week	3	150-224 min/week	3	Yes	3	12
Colorado	None	0	None	0	None	0	No	0	0
Connecticut	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Delaware	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
District of Columbia	150 min/week +	4	225 min/week +	4	None	0	Yes	3	11
Florida	150 min/week +	4	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	7
Georgia	150 min/week +	4	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	7
Hawaii	40-89 min/week	2	150-224 min/week	3	150-224 min/week	3	Yes	3	11
Idaho	None	0	None	0	None	0	No	0	0
Illinois	None	0	None	0	None	0	No	0	0
Indiana	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Iowa	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Kansas	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Kentucky	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Louisiana	150 min/week +	4	150-224 min/week	3	None	0	Yes	3	10
Maine	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Maryland	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Massachusetts	None	0	None	0	None	0	No	0	0
Michigan	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Minnesota	None	0	None	0	None	0	No	0	0
Mississippi	40-89 min/week	2	40-149 min/week	2	None	0	Yes	3	7
Missouri	40-89 min/week	2	40-149 min/week	2	None	0	Yes	3	7
Montana	None	0	225 min/week +	4	None	0	Yes	3	7
Nebraska	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Nevada	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
New Hampshire	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
New Jersey	150 min/week +	4	150-224 min/week	3	150-224 min/week	3	Yes	3	13
New Mexico	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
New York	90-149 min/week	3	40-149 min/week	2	40-149 min/week	2	Yes	3	10
North Carolina	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
North Dakota	40-89 min/week	2	40-149 min/week	2	None	0	Yes	3	7
Ohio	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Oklahoma	40-89 min/week	2	None	0	None	0	No	0	2
Oregon	150 min/week +	4	225 min/week +	4	None	0	Yes	3	11
Pennsylvania	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Rhode Island	90-149 min/week	3	40-149 min/week	2	40-149 min/week	2	No	0	7
South Carolina	90-149 min/week	3	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	6
South Dakota	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Tennessee	40-89 min/week	2	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	5
Texas	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Utah	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Vermont	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Virginia	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Washington	90-149 min/week	3	40-149 min/week	2	None	0	Yes	3	8
West Virginia	90-149 min/week	3	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	6
Wisconsin	None	0	None	0	None	0	Yes	3	3
Wyoming	None	0	None	0	None	0	No	0	0

Endnotes

- 1 CDC, "Adult Physical Inactivity," Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, February 28, 2022, <https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/data/inactivity-prevalence-maps/index.html>.
- 2 Watson, Kathleen B., Geoffrey P. Whitfield, George Huntzicker, John D. Omura, Emily Ussery, Tiffany J. Chen, and Robyn Neblett Fanfair. "Cross-Sectional Study of Changes in Physical Activity Behavior during the COVID-19 Pandemic among US Adults." *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 18, no. 1 (July 7, 2021): 91. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-021-01161-4>.
- 3 Hasson, Rebecca, James F. Sallis, Nailah Coleman, Navin Kaushal, Vincenzo G. Nocera, and NiCole Keith. "COVID-19: Implications for Physical Activity, Health Disparities, and Health Equity." *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine*, July 27, 2021, 155982762110292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15598276211029222>.
- 4 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, "Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans, 2nd edition," 2018, https://health.gov/paguidelines/second-edition/pdf/Physical_Activity_Guidelines_2nd_edition.pdf.
- 5 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Trends in Meeting the 2008 Physical Activity Guidelines, 2008—2018," <https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/downloads/trends-in-the-prevalence-of-physical-activity-508.pdf>.
- 6 Whitfield, Geoffrey P., Susan A. Carlson, Emily N. Ussery, Janet E. Fulton, Deborah A. Galuska, and Ruth Petersen. "Trends in Meeting Physical Activity Guidelines Among Urban and Rural Dwelling Adults — United States, 2008–2017." *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 68, no. 23 (June 14, 2019): 513–18. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6823a1>.
- 7 CDC. "Adult Physical Inactivity." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, February 28, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/data/inactivity-prevalence-maps/index.html>.
- 8 "CDC | Physical Activity | Facts | Healthy Schools," April 21, 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/physicalactivity/facts.htm>.
- 9 "Dietary and Physical Activity Behaviors among High School Students ..." Accessed May 3, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/su/pdfs/su6901a8-H.pdf>.
- 10 "CDC | Physical Activity | Facts | Healthy Schools," April 21, 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/physicalactivity/facts.htm>.
- 11 "Dietary and Physical Activity Behaviors among High School Students ..." Accessed May 3, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/su/pdfs/su6901a8-H.pdf>.
- 12 CDC. "How Much Physical Activity Do You Need?" Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, February 28, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/basics/age-chart.html>.
- 13 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, "Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans, 2nd edition," 2018, https://health.gov/sites/default/files/2019-09/Physical_Activity_Guidelines_2nd_edition.pdf.
- 14 CDC. "Benefits of Physical Activity for Children." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, January 12, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/basics/adults/health-benefits-of-physical-activity-for-children.html>.
- 15 CDC. "Benefits of Physical Activity." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, November 1, 2021. <https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/basics/adults/health-benefits-of-physical-activity-for-adults.html>.
- 16 "One Year on: Unhealthy Weight Gains, Increased Drinking Reported by Americans Coping with Pandemic Stress." American Psychological Association. American Psychological Association, March 11, 2021. <https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2021/03/one-year-pandemic-stress>.
- 17 "One Year on: Unhealthy Weight Gains, Increased Drinking Reported by Americans Coping with Pandemic Stress." American Psychological Association. American Psychological Association, March 11, 2021. <https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2021/03/one-year-pandemic-stress>.
- 18 Jenssen, Brian P., Mary Kate Kelly, Maura Powell, Zoe Bouchelle, Stephanie L. Mayne, and Alexander G. Fiks. "COVID-19 and Changes in Child Obesity." *Pediatrics* 147, no. 5 (May 1, 2021): e2021050123. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2021-050123>.
- 19 CDC. "People with Certain Medical Conditions." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, April 29, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/people-with-medical-conditions.html>.
- 20 "Parenting and Educating in the Era of COVID: The Importance of Family-School Partnerships in Supporting Children's Health and Education." Action for Healthy Kids, 2020. <https://www.actionforhealthykids.org/parenting-and-educating-in-the-era-of-covid/>.
- 21 "Parenting and Educating in the Era of COVID: The Importance of Family-School Partnerships in Supporting Children's Health and Education." Action for Healthy Kids, 2020. <https://www.actionforhealthykids.org/parenting-and-educating-in-the-era-of-covid/>.
- 22 "Parenting and Educating in the Era of COVID: The Importance of Family-School Partnerships in Supporting Children's Health and Education." Action for Healthy Kids, 2020. <https://www.actionforhealthykids.org/parenting-and-educating-in-the-era-of-covid/>.
- 23 Safe Routes Partnership, "One Step Forward Two Steps Back," 2021, <https://saferoutespartnership.org/resources/report/one-step-forward-two-steps-back>.
- 24 Sandt, Laura, et al., "Leveraging the Health Benefits of Active Transportation: Creating an Actionable Agenda for Transportation Professionals," *TR News*, May-June 2012, <http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/trnews/trnews280.pdf>.
- 25 Sandt, Laura et al., "Leveraging the Health Benefits of Active Transportation: Creating an Actionable Agenda for Transportation Professionals," *TR News*, May-June 2012, <http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/trnews/trnews280.pdf>.
- 26 Litman, Todd., Evaluating Transportation Benefits and Costs, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, February 2015, <http://www.vtpi.org/nmt+tdm.pdf>.
- 27 Cohen DA, McKenzie TL, et.al. Contribution of public parks to physical activity. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2007;97(3):509-14.
- 28 Carlson SA, Fulton JE, Pratt M, Yang Z, Adams EK. Inadequate physical activity and health care expenditures in the United States. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis*. 2015;57:315-323, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4604440/>.
- 29 "Call to Action: Walking and Walkable Communities - Hhs.gov." Accessed May 3, 2022. <https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/call-to-action-walking-and-walkable-communities.pdf>.
- 30 Heinrich, Katie M. et al., "How Does the Built Environment Relate to Body Mass Index and Obesity Prevalence Among Public Housing Residents?" *Journal of Health Promotion*. 2008, 22(3):187-194.
- 31 "Childhood Obesity Facts | Overweight & Obesity | CDC," March 21, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/obesity/data/childhood.html>.
- 32 Lincoln, Karen D. "Social Stress, Obesity, and Depression among Women: Clarifying the Role of Physical Activity." *Ethnicity & Health* 24, no. 6 (August 18, 2019): 662–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13557858.2017.1346190>.
- 33 Hornbuckle, Lyndsey M. "Running while Black: A distinctive safety concern and barrier to exercise in White neighborhoods." *Preventive Medicine Reports* 22 (2021): 101378.
- 34 Williams, David R., Jourdyn A. Lawrence, Brigitte A. Davis, and Cecilia Vu. "Understanding how discrimination can affect health." *Health services research* 54 (2019): 1374-1388.
- 35 CDC. "Benefits of Physical Activity for Children." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, January 12, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/basics/adults/health-benefits-of-physical-activity-for-children.html>.
- 36 CDC. "Benefits of Physical Activity." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, November 1, 2021. <https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/basics/adults/health-benefits-of-physical-activity-for-adults.html>.
- 37 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Physical Activity and Health: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, 1996. <https://www.cdc.gov/hccddphp/sgr/pdf/sgrfull.pdf>.
- 38 Step It Up! The Surgeon General's Call to Action to Promote Walking and Walkable Communities. <http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/calls/walking-and-walkable-communities/call-to-action-walking-and-walkable-communities.pdf>.
- 39 "Status Report for Step It Up!" Accessed May 3, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/walking/call-to-action/pdf/status-report.pdf>.
- 40 Pucher, J., and J. Renne, "Socioeconomics of Urban Travel: Evidence from the 2001 NHTS," *Transportation Quarterly*, 57, 49-77, 2003; Van Lenthe et al., in Krizek, K., et al., *Walking and Cycling International Literature Review*, 2005.
- 41 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Vital signs: walking among adults — United States, 2005 and 2010. *MMWR Morbid Mortal Wkly Rep*.2012;61(31):595-601.

- 42 See, e.g., Addy C, Wilson D, Kirtland K, et al. "Associations of Perceived Social and Physical Environmental Supports with Physical Activity and Walking Behavior." *American Journal of Public Health*, 94(3): 440–443, March 2004; Rodriguez D and Joo J. "The Relationship between Non-Motorized Mode Choice and the Local Physical Environment." *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 9(2): 151–173, March 2004; Sharpe P, Granner M, Hutto B, et al. "Association of Environmental Factors to Meeting Physical Activity Recommendations in Two South Carolina Counties." *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 18(3): 251–257, January/February 2004; Owen N, Humpel N, Leslie E, et al. "Understanding Environmental Influences on Walking: Review and Research Agenda." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 27(1): 67–76, July 2004; Reed J, Wilson D, Ainsworth B, et al. "Perceptions of Neighborhood Sidewalks on Walking and Physical Activity Patterns in a Southeastern Community in the US." *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 3(2): 243–253, April 2006; Ewing R, Schroeder W and Greene W. "School Location and Student Travel: Analysis of Factors Affecting Mode Choice." *Transportation Planning and Analysis* 2004, 1895: 55–63, 2004.
- 43 See, e.g., Boarnet M, Day K., Anderson C, et al. "California's Safe Routes to School Program-Impacts on Walking, Bicycling, and Pedestrian Safety." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 71(3): 301–317, September 2005 Hoehner C, Ramirez L, Elliott M, et al. "Perceived and Objective Environmental Measures and Physical Activity Among Urban Adult." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 28(2): 105–116, February 2005; Sharpe P, Granner M, Hutto B, et al. "Association of Environmental Factors to Meeting Physical Activity Recommendations in Two South Carolina Counties." *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 18(3): 251–257, January/February 2004; Krizek K, El-Geneidy A and Thompson K. "A Detailed Analysis of How an Urban Trail System Affects Cyclists' Travel." *Transportation* 34 (5): 611–624, September 2007; Garrard J, Rose G and Lo S. "Promoting Transportation Cycling for Women: The Role of Bicycle Infrastructure." *Preventive Medicine*, 46(1): 55–59, January 2008; Wardman M, Hatfield R and Page M. "The UK National Cycling Strategy: Can Improved Facilities Meet the Targets." *Transport Policy*, 4(2): 123– 133, April 1997.
- 44 National Complete Streets Coalition, "What Are Complete Streets?" Smart Growth America, <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/program/national-complete-streets-coalition/what-are-complete-streets/>.
- 45 National Complete Streets Coalition, "What Are Complete Streets?" Smart Growth America, <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/program/national-complete-streets-coalition/what-are-complete-streets/>.
- 46 Public Health Law Center, "Complete Streets," <http://publichealthlawcenter.org/topics/active-living/complete-streets>.
- 47 The ten elements of an ideal Complete Streets policy are: "1. Vision and intent: Includes an equitable vision for how and why the community wants to complete its streets. Specifics need to create complete, connected, network and specifies at least four modes, two of which must be biking or walking. 2. Diverse users: Benefits all users equitably, particularly vulnerable users and the most underinvested and underserved communities. 3. Commitment in all projects and phases: Applies to new, retrofit/reconstruction, maintenance, and ongoing projects. 4. Clear, accountable expectations: Makes any exceptions specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high-level approval and public notice prior to exceptions being granted. 5. Jurisdiction: Requires interagency coordination between government departments and partner agencies on Complete Streets. 6. Design: Directs the use of the latest and best design criteria and guidelines and sets a time frame for their implementation. 7. Land use and context sensitivity: Considers the surrounding community's current and expected land use and transportation needs. 8. Performance measures: Establishes performance standards that are specific, equitable, and available to the public. 9. Project selection criteria: Provides specific criteria to encourage funding prioritization for Complete Streets implementation. 10. Implementation steps: Includes specific next steps for implementation of the policy." National Complete Streets Coalition, "Elements of a Complete Streets Policy," <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/resources/elements-complete-streets-policy/>.
- 48 Alliance for Biking and Walking, Bicycling and Walking in the United States: 2016 Benchmarking Report, <http://www.bikewalkalliance.org/resources/benchmarking>.
- 49 Benchmarking Report By the League of American Bicyclists. "TOPIC VII: PLANS & POLICIES." Accessed May 3, 2022. <https://data.bikeleague.org/show-your-data/state-data/section-vii-plans-policies/>.
- 50 "Transportation Alternatives Annual Report." U.S. Department of Transportation/Federal Highway Administration. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), July 6, 2020.
- 51 Powell, L. M., S. Slater, and F. J. Chaloupka, "The relationship between community physical activity settings and race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status." *Evidence Based Preventive Medicine*. 135-44. 21 May 2009.
- 52 M. Maciag, "Pedestrians Dying at Disproportionate Rates in America's Poorer Neighborhoods," *Governing* (August 2014), <http://www.governing.com/topics/public-justice-safety/gov-pedestriandeaths-analysis.html>.
- 53 Duncan DT, Kawachi I, White K, Williams DR. "The geography of recreational open space: Influence of neighborhood racial composition and neighborhood poverty." *J Urban Heal*. 2013; 90(4):618-631. doi:10.1007/s11524-012-9770-y.
- 54 Federal Highway Administration. "Summary of travel trends: 2009 National household transportation survey." <http://nhts.ornl.gov/2009/pub/stt.pdf>.
- 55 Initially, we sought to use the Federal Highway Administration's Financial Management Information System (FMIS) dataset on state spending of federal funds on bicycling and pedestrian projects. However, due to inconsistency in what states consider projects benefitting pedestrians and bicyclists and inconsistencies in how states report cost of these improvements, we made the decision to use funds states report to set-aside for walking and bicycling.
- 56 Initial assessments were made based upon analysis of guidelines, application materials, and other descriptions on each state DOT's website. Outreach to confirm the collected data was made to state DOT staff in each state, with at least one follow up contact to encourage response. Confirmations were received for 90 percent of states.
- 57 For this indicator, the 10 points for ongoing funding is only awarded where the ongoing funding is more than \$.10 per capita; in contrast, the 5 points is awarded for any level of funding.
- 58 Cui, Yuchen & Mishra, Sabyasachee & Welch, Timothy F., 2014. "Land use effects on bicycle ridership: a framework for state planning agencies," *Journal of Transport Geography*, Elsevier, vol.41(C), pages 220-228.
- 59 Note that the complexity of funding arrangements required determinations regarding inclusion of resources. We did not include designated pots of funding for general areas like infrastructure, parks, smart growth, or transportation that were considerably broader than active transportation; however, if an agency summed up its active transportation awards annually, we did award credit. For trails funding pots, we did not include the funding if the focus was largely recreational, but did include pots where connectivity and transportation were stated as a significant consideration. In addition, where a state funding source was designated by statute for a non-governmental actor, we did not consider this to be state active transportation funding, even where the recipient was a bicycle pedestrian advocacy organization.
- 60 Initial assessments were made based upon analysis of guidelines, application materials, and other descriptions on each state DOT's website. Outreach to confirm the collected data was made to state DOT staff in each state, with at least one follow up contact to encourage response. Confirmations were received for 90 percent of states.
- 61 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Health Impact in Five Years," <https://www.cdc.gov/policy/hst/hi5/index.html>.
- 62 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Health Impact in Five Years: Safe Routes to School," <https://www.cdc.gov/policy/hst/hi5/saferoutes/index.html>.
- 62 Omura, J.D., Hyde, E.T., Watson, K.B., Sliwa, S.A., Fulton, J.E. and Carlson, S.A., 2019. Prevalence of children walking to school and related barriers—United States, 2017. *Preventive medicine*, 118, pp.191-195.
- 64 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System," http://webappa.cdc.gov/sasweb/ncipc/leadcaus10_us.html.
- 65 National Center for Statistics and Analysis. (2022, April). Children: 2020 data. (Traffic Safety Facts. Report No. DOT HS 813 285). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/813285>
- 66 DR Lubans, CA Boreham, et al. (2011). "The relationship between active travel to school and health-related fitness in children and adolescents: a systematic review." *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 8(1): 5.
- 67 Davison K, Werder J and Lawson, C. "Children's Active Commuting to School: Current Knowledge and Future Directions." *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 5(3): A100, July 2008.
- 68 JA Mendoza, K Watson, N Nguyen, E Cerin, T Baranowski, TA Nicklas. "Active Commuting to School and Association with Physical Activity and Adiposity among US Youth." *J Phys Act Health*. 8.4 (2011): 488-495.

- 69 McDonald, Noreen C., Ruth L. Steiner, Chanam Lee, Tori Rhoulac Smith, Xuemei Zhu, and Yizhao Yang. "Impact of the Safe Routes to School Program on Walking and Bicycling." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 80, no. 2 (April 3, 2014): 153–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2014.956654>.
- 70 Stewart, Orion, Anne Vernez Moudon, and Charlotte Claybrooke. "Multistate Evaluation of Safe Routes to School Programs." *American Journal of Health Promotion* 28, no. 3_suppl (January 2014): S89–96. <https://doi.org/10.4278/ajhp.130430-QUAN-210>.
- 71 DiMaggio, C. and Li, G. 2013. Effectiveness of a Safe Routes to School program in preventing school-aged pedestrian injury. *Pediatrics*, 131 (2), pp. 290–296.
- 72 Guide to Community Preventive Services. Physical Activity: Interventions to Increase Active Travel to School. <https://stgdaiss.thecomunityguide.org/findings/physical-activity-interventions-increase-active-travel-school>. Page last updated: January 29, 2021.
- 73 Zimmerman, S. and M. Lieberman, "The Safe Routes to School Program Census Project: 2019 National Program Assessment Report," Safe Routes Partnership, 2020, https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource_files/national_srts_census_report_final.pdf.
- 74 NC McDonald, Y Yang, SM Abbot, AN Bullock. "Impact of the Safe Routes to School program on walking and biking: Eugene, Oregon study." *Transport Policy* 29 (September 2013): 243-248.
- 75 Initial assessments were made based upon analysis of guidelines, application materials, and other descriptions on each state DOT's website. Outreach to confirm the collected data was made to state DOT staff in each state, with at least one follow up contact to encourage response. Confirmations were received for 90 percent of states.
- 76 See, e.g. Smith, L, Norgate, SH, Cherrett, T, Davies, N, Wistanley, C and Harding, M. (2015.) Walking school buses as a form of active transportation for children: A review of the evidence. *Journal of School Health*. 85, 197-210; see also Orion Stewart, Anne Vernez Moudon, and Charlotte Claybrooke (2014). Multistate Evaluation of Safe Routes to School Programs. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 28(sp3), S89-S96.
- 77 Zimmerman, S. and M. Lieberman, "The Safe Routes to School Program Census Project: 2019 National Program Assessment Report," Safe Routes Partnership, 2020, https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource_files/national_srts_census_report_final.pdf.
- 78 Zimmerman, S., M. Lieberman, K. Kramer, and B. Sadler, "At the Intersection of Active Transportation and Equity: Joining Forces to Make Communities Healthier and Fairer," 2015, <https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/resources/report/intersection-active-transportation-equity>.
- 79 Safe Routes Partnership, "Equity in Safe Routes to School," <https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/safe-routes-school/101/equity>.
- 80 Safe Routes Partnership, "Engaging Students with Disabilities in Safe Routes to School," 2018, <https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/resources/fact-sheet/engaging-students-disabilities-safe-routes>.
- 81 Zimmerman, S. and M. Lieberman, "The Safe Routes to School Program Census Project: 2019 National Program Assessment Report," Safe Routes Partnership, 2020, https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource_files/national_srts_census_report_final.pdf.
- 82 Initial assessments were made based upon analysis of guidelines, application materials, and other descriptions on each state DOT's website. Outreach to confirm the collected data was made to state DOT staff in each state, with at least one follow up contact to encourage response. Confirmations were received for 90 percent of states.
- 83 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Strategies to Prevent Obesity and Other Chronic Diseases: The CDC Guide to Strategies for Increasing Physical Activity in the Community. In: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, editor. Atlanta 2011.
- 84 Safe Routes Partnership, "The Shared Use Spectrum," 2015, <https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/resources/spectrum-shared-use-0>.
- 85 Center for Disease Control and Prevention (2011) Social Determinants of Health <http://www.cdc.gov/socialdeterminants/Definitions.html>.
- 86 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Healthy People 2020: Physical Activity Objectives (PA-10). 2010. Available at: www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topicsobjectives2020/objectiveslist.aspx?topicid=33.
- 87 American Academy of Pediatrics. Policy statement. Active healthy living: prevention of childhood obesity through increased physical activity. *Pediatrics*. 2006; 117(5): 1834–1842. <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/117/5/1834.%20full?sid=1683e4b9-4c9b-4045-84f1-051d3546796f>.
- 88 Farley T, Meriwether R, Baker E, Watkins L, Johnson C, Webber L. "Safe place spaces to promote physical activity in inner-city children. Results from a pilot study of an environmental intervention." *Am J Pub Health*. 2007; 97:1625-1631y.
- 89 Spengler JO, Carroll MC, Connaughton DP, Evenson KR. Policies to Promote the Community Use of Schools: A Review of State Recreational User Statutes. *Am J Prev Med*. 2010; 39: 81–88.
- 90 "CLASS - Classification of Laws Associated with School Students." National Cancer Institute. Accessed February 11, 2022. <http://class.cancer.gov/>.
- 91 Confirmations were received for 59 percent of states.
- 92 McDonald NC. Children's Travel: Patterns and Influences (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). 2005. Available at: www.uctc.net/research/diss118.pdf.
- 93 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "KidsWalk: Then and Now – Barriers and Solutions." 2008. Available at: www.cdc.gov/nccdp/hnpha/kidswalk/then_and_now.
- 94 Martin S, Carlson S. "Barriers to children walking to or from school - United States," 2004. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, reprinted in MMWR, <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5438a2.htm>.
- 95 Initial assessments were made based upon legal analysis of state statutes and analysis of handbooks and guidelines on each state's department of education website or other website. State department of education or school facilities staff were contacted in each state and leads as to more knowledgeable staff were pursued. Interviews were conducted in 2017 and 2018 with one or more state department of education or school facilities staff where staff were responsive, in 60 percent of states. Where no interview could occur, additional research into guidelines was conducted. Information from 2018 and 2020 was sent to staff in each state to confirm or update with subsequent changes, with confirmations were received for 47 percent of states.
- 96 "Is It Physical Education or Physical Activity?" SHAPE America, Accessed March 13, 2020. www.shapeamerica.org/publications/resources/teachingtools/qualitytype/pa_vs_pe.aspx.
- 97 "Is It Physical Education or Physical Activity?" SHAPE America, Accessed March 13, 2020. www.shapeamerica.org/publications/resources/teachingtools/qualitytype/pa_vs_pe.aspx.
- 98 "Average Hours per Weekday Spent by High School Students in Various Activities: Data from 2011-2015," United States Dept of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Accessed March 13, 2020. <https://www.bls.gov/tus/charts/students.htm>.
- 99 Masurier, G. and Corbin, B, " Top 10 reasons for quality physical education," 2006, *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 77(6). Accessed March 13, 2020. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ794467.pdf>.
- 100 SHAPE America, "Guidance Document: The Essential Components of Physical Education," 2015, Accessed March 13, 2020. <https://www.shapeamerica.org/uploads/pdfs/TheEssentialComponentsOfPhysicalEducation.pdf>.
- 101 American Heart Association, "Physical education in public schools," Accessed March 13, 2020. www.heart.org/idc/groups/heart-public/@wcm/@adv/documents/downloadable/ucm_474319.pdf.
- 102 SHAPE America, 2016 Shape of the Nation, www.shapeamerica.org/shapeofthenation.
- 103 "Health Policies By Category | State Policy Database." Accessed May 3, 2022. <https://statepolicies.nasbe.org/health/categories>.
- 104 Education Commission of the States. "50-State Comparison: High School Graduation Requirements," February 14, 2019. <https://www.ecs.org/high-school-graduation-requirements/>.
- 105 North Carolina dedicates \$470,000 in annual state planning funds for local governments to develop active transportation plans. However, because the state also has a law (HB817) prohibiting the use of state funds for standalone bicycle and pedestrian projects, we made the decision to not award points for dedicated/ongoing funds.



Safe Routes PARTNERSHIP

Active Paths for Equity & Health