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Executive Summary

The City of North Las Vegas (CLNV) and the North Las Vegas Fire Department (NLVFD), circa 2007, embarked on a mission to create a safety village for children. The initial intent of the program is to provide a place where children can learn real-life strategies for dealing with emergencies while developing a positive attitude towards safety. The fire department has accomplished a significant amount of preliminary work; however, the program currently remains in the conceptualization phase, as they have been unable to develop a tangible product. This, in large part, is due to the economic crisis Southern Nevada has been experiencing over the past several years, commonly referred to as the Great Recession by everyone in the country affected by this financial crisis.

The NLVFD sought assistance from the University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV) School of Environmental and Public Affairs (SEPA) in the latter part of 2011. Captain Cedric Williams, the sole remaining NLVFD stakeholder from an initial team of many, requested assistance with building a business plan – a document by which he could use to seek both private- and grant-based funding opportunities.

Graduate students with the Master of Public Administration program subsequently contacted Captain Williams to evaluate his project. The group assessed the North Las Vegas Safety Training and Rescue Skills (STARS) Safety Village program (Northern STARS Safety Village). Based on the evaluation, the graduate team identified a need for the following: 1) statistical research to determine whether Southern Nevada has a need for such a facility; 2) identification of additional public- and private-sector partners; and 3) strategic planning for purposes of identifying a path towards funding opportunities should the desire for a Northern STARS Safety Village concept continue.
The graduate team gathered national, state, and local statistical information related to the Northern STARS Safety Village program elements: pool safety, water safety, heat-related safety, traffic safety, internet safety, and fire safety. Both national and local statistics show a general decrease in the areas that the Northern STARS Safety Village program is targeting; however, the Clark County Child Death Review Team is interested in being involved in the project.

The team also reviewed best practices and suggestions for project development from other safety villages located throughout the country. Telephone survey responses from directors of these safety villages show a wide range of practices and practical experience that the CNLV team can employ.

The graduate team also conducted an extensive grant search, but unfortunately, no truly viable funding opportunities exist for a capital building project such as the Northern STARS Safety Village. The literature review revealed that the only evaluation study of another safety village occurred in 1994.

While the CLNV and the NLVFD have worked for several years to develop the Northern STARS Safety Village, they can take additional steps at this time to more fully develop the concept to help with future success. The graduate team recommends three stages of project development, as listed below.

**Phase One Recommendations**

**Governance Board, Bylaws, and Stakeholders**

The team strongly suggests that development and expansion of the governance board is critical. Several of the surveyed safety villages were very vocal in their recommendations that
for success, the board must consist of community leaders that have the ability to shape public opinion and assist in fundraising and the capital campaign.

**Formal Partnerships with Other Municipalities**

The graduate team recommends the development of a formalized Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) document to provide to each potential partner. These MOUs should outline what resources, whether financial, personnel, or in-kind support, the partner will provide to help the Northern STARS Safety Village during creation and ongoing implementation. Partners would include the City of Las Vegas, City of Henderson, Clark County, and the various public safety agencies such as police departments and fire departments.

**Clark County Child Death Review Team**

The graduate team recommends that the leadership of the Northern STARS Safety Village contact the Clark County Death Review Team within the near future to present the proposed program to their membership. This team consists of many highly engaged stakeholders that are concerned with the health and safety of Clark County children. CNLV should utilize this group to assist in defining local needs. The Child Death Review Team can also assist in appropriate messaging on prevention topics.

**Phase Two Recommendations**

**Website**

The current Northern STARS Safety Village website needs updating. Revision of the website will allow for use as a tool to drive interest in the project and it must include a revised timeline.
Coordination with Other Safety Villages

The team recommends exploration of best practices from safety villages other than the Frisco Fire Safety Town. The graduate team found that all of the safety villages had highly dedicated staff that would be very happy to help the CLNV develop their site. Each site has suggestions for best practices, areas of concern, and tips for success, as noted in the section above. The team suggests Northern STARS Safety Village leadership attend the international safety village conference this fall to learn from a broad group of safety village leaders.

Location

The team recommends the full board review the location of the Northern STARS Safety Village to determine if the proposed location at Statz Street and Centennial Parkway in North Las Vegas, Nevada, would be a barrier to attendance by the locals and tourists CNLV officials hope to attract to the site.

Phase Three Recommendations

Community Support

The team recommends the new board strategize on building community support for the Northern STARS Safety Village project immediately upon formation. Every safety village the graduate team interviewed indicated that community support is one of the most critical, if not the most critical, aspects of the program. The board will need to determine how the development of community support for this project can occur within Las Vegas’ unique urban culture.

UNLV Partnership

The new UNLV Non-Profit Center and the School of Environmental and Public Affairs should be critical partners to this project. The Northern STARS Safety Village has the potential
to include appropriate performance measures and formalized evaluation from the beginning of their program implementation, which can serve as a “model” for other safety villages.

At this time, the graduate team recommends that CNLV and NLFD reassess several strategies they have put in place, and concentrate on additional planning activities rather than implementation. Clark County is still suffering from the Great Recession, and philanthropic giving is low. The team recommends that the Northern STARS Safety Village concentrate on building a strong board, formalizing partnerships, and developing a comprehensive evaluation system until the economy recovers. Laying this foundation gives the Northern STARS Safety Village a stronger stance for vital future fundraising activities.

**Initial Assessment of Program Status**

**Initial Meeting with NLVFD**

On April 9, 2012, the graduate team met with NLVFD representatives Captain Cedric Williams and Beverly Bolton. Captain Williams is the fire department’s Public Information Officer (PIO) and Community Liaison Officer (CLO); Beverly Bolton is the Public Education Specialist.

Captain Williams first provided the team with a pamphlet that outlines both a basis and process for the Northern STARS Safety Village (attached as Appendix A); he then utilized a PowerPoint presentation to discuss the status of the proposed safety village concept. In general, the fire department and the CNLV envision building a multi-structure facility near the intersection of Centennial Parkway and Statz Street in North Las Vegas, Nevada. They modeled their vision on the Frisco Fire Safety Town, a program that is currently operational in the city of Frisco, Texas, which is managed by the Frisco Fire Department. They also evaluated a similar facility in Hagerstown, Maryland, but they did not base their ideas on this location.
Captain Williams visited the Frisco Fire Safety Town to obtain information on their program. He learned that this educational training facility utilizes approximately 8,000 square feet of space to educate children and adults. The facility is a miniature town modeled after the city of Frisco, Texas, and it is populated with numerous structures created in 5/8 scale. Besides the realistic buildings, the safety village includes paved and marked streets, and working traffic and crosswalk signals. Captain Williams stated that over 10,000 children and 3,000 adults were educated on approximately 873 educational components within the first six months of operation.

Captain Williams believes the CLNV will realize several advantages by creating a safety village of their own. These future benefits include:

- Providing public safety presentations utilizing real-life scenarios;
- Creating an establishment that can become a regional safety destination park;
- Providing an opportunity to foster a public-private partnership;
- Fulfilling the community safety goals for both the CLNV and the NLVFD; and
- Providing positive leadership and vision to adult visitors and their children.

The CLNV has already secured ten acres of land for the facility through an acquisition from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Captain Williams estimates the land value to be approximately $5 million, based on $500,000 an acre. The BLM had allocated this land to build a park and police station, but restructured the authorization to allow the construction of a safety village; there was no cost for this procurement. Captain Williams has also worked with AssemblageSTUDIO, a local architecture firm, to design the safety village facility (graphical representation attached as Appendix B). This firm donated their time and produced an architectural blueprint on which to build the Northern STARS Safety Village. This conceptual
drawing has already received awards for layout and design (example of one award attached as Appendix C).

Based on the work that Captain Williams and his team completed, they created an internet-based portal to educate the public about the proposed project\(^1\). This website contains sections explaining the project overview, location and timeline, programs offered, sponsorship potential, and a link to an information packet (Appendix A).

Captain Williams acknowledged that they have not started construction on the facility; they originally estimated project completion by July 2013. He informed the team that most of the original stakeholders have moved on to other assignments, thus he is now the primary person remaining from the original team; however, he mentioned that this is still a goal for both the CLNV and the NLVFD. He provided a strategic goal sheet from Fiscal Year (FY) 2011/2012 for the NLVFD confirming the desire to establish the Northern STARS Safety Village (attached as Appendix D).

Captain Williams concluded the meeting by asking for assistance with developing a business plan for the safety village. He indicated his goal was to use that document as a basis by which he could garner both private- and grant-based funding. According to Captain Williams, it is a lack of funding that has prevented the project from becoming reality. The original estimate for construction of the safety village was $12.5 million; however, Captain Williams now estimates construction costs for the facility will total approximately $7 million. He estimates operation costs will require approximately $175,000 each year, not including personnel expenses such as salaries and fringe.

Members of the graduate team met again with Captain Williams on May 31, 2012, to define further the vision of the Northern STARS Safety Village. The team asked Captain

\(^{1}\) [http://safetyvillage.cityofnorthlasvegas.com/SafetyVillage.shtm](http://safetyvillage.cityofnorthlasvegas.com/SafetyVillage.shtm)
Williams about whether his team followed a needs assessment process developing the need for this project. He stated that a formal process had not been in place. He and other members of the initial planning team became aware of other safety villages, and they determined such a village would be an asset in North Las Vegas.

**Planning Documents Review**

Captain Williams provided the graduate team with copies of every document he garnered, created, and/or utilized during the development of his project. The team reviewed all of the material he provided. Most of the documentation involved conceptual ideas and/or actual drawings of the Northern STARS Safety Village, legal documentation involving the project, and other documents from the Frisco Fire Safety Village.

The team’s initial review of Captain Williams’ documents focused on identifying any existing statistical research that would establish a correlation between child injuries and deaths in Southern Nevada to a need for an educational safety village in this region. Several references in his documentation alluded to national statistics for leading causes of death involving children. One graph from the United States Department of Health and Human Services provided statistics from the year 2006 involving the leading causes of death for 10,780 children in the United States. Two additional references involve unknown statistics concerning fatalities of children aged one to four years and five to eight years from 2004 to 2008; however, this representation provided no source or location information justifying the statistics.

Based on a lack of statistical information regarding Southern Nevada, the graduate team deemed it necessary to 1) identify local stakeholders involved with protecting children to acquire any statistical information they possess regarding child injuries and deaths, and 2) identify other
safety villages in the nation to establish whether local needs involving children resulted in the creation of those programs.

A second aspect sought, but not found in the existing documentation, was that of a literature review. Based on this, the graduate team determined a need to identify existing research from academic sources, as well as any relevant information from local and national newspapers, other safety villages, and anecdotal reporting (e.g., teachers). Any information garnered, whether positive or negative, would be useful in the analysis of the proposed safety village program.

Third, and in addition to the lack of statistics and literature review, the team failed to find any references to other partners involved with the development of the safety village. Captain Williams provided us with a “Board of Directors” document that listed the names of four NLVFD representatives and the name of the North Las Vegas City Manager. Captain Williams initially indicated he believed a positive attribute of this program would be the “regional benefit” to citizens of Southern Nevada, and potentially, other residents from neighboring states visiting the Las Vegas area. Based on this, and considering the potential financial benefit of including additional stakeholders, the graduate team deemed it necessary to identify other potential partners for the safety village project – and the potential assistance they could provide.

Fourth, and finally, the graduate team was unable to locate any information regarding performance measures – items that would assist safety village personnel with measuring the effectiveness of their program, should it become operational. Based on this, the graduate team determined it would be beneficial to collect performance related information during the data gathering process, should existing safety villages possess such material.
Strategic Process

Based on the above, and within the limits of the specialties possessed by the graduate team, the expected scope of deliverables to be provided to the NLVFD will be focused on strategic planning – a basis by which Captain Williams and his team can use to enhance their potential for acquiring the necessary funding to create their safety village. Captain Williams will not receive the business plan he requested, as that is outside the scope of this public administration evaluation. Rather, the graduate team will provide Captain Williams with the following:

- Statistical relevance involving injuries and deaths related to local children, as well as a compilation of information from other safety villages in the nation;
- A literature review focused on safety villages;
- A suggested framework of local stakeholders that may prove to be worthy partners in this venture; and
- Any relevant and useful performance measure information garnered during the course of this evaluation.

Identification of National Safety Villages

National Safety Village Identification

The graduate team conducted an internet-based search to identify other safety villages in the United States. The basis for this query was to obtain locations to garner qualitative operational information, as related to the safety villages’ financial information, services provided, target clients, performance measures, and recommendations from lessons learned.

The web search resulted in the identification of eight programs, two of which are original locations identified by Captain Williams (i.e., Frisco Fire Town and Hagerstown Children’s
The other six locations identified are as follows: 1) Children’s Safety Village of Southern Florida, 2) Clark County Sheriff’s Office Safety Village, 3) Cobb County Safety Village, 4) Safety Village of Darien, 5) Sioux Empire Safety Village, and 6) Tri-Town Safety Village. While the internet appears to contain information on other similar programs, including sites located outside of the United States, this evaluation will be limited to the eight; the graduate team determined this to be a reasonable number of sites from which to garner information to generate an evaluation.

The graduate team then created a matrix to list each identified safety village, the corresponding contact information, and all of the program deliverables provided by each location (attached as Appendix E). The team identified services provided by each location by analyzing each safety village website and then confirming through subsequent telephone calls to each location. The proposed program deliverables for the Northern STARS Safety Village were also included in this matrix for comparison purposes.

**National Safety Villages - Survey Synopsis**

After identifying the eight safety village locations, the graduate team developed a series of questions to assist with soliciting qualitative information from each safety village location (attached as Appendix F). The team designed the survey to generate general information for each location relating to the original need for the project, original and current partners, beginning and present-day barriers, benefits to the community, program performance measures, program delivery difficulties, and funding issues. Members of the graduate team then spoke, via telephone, to a primary stakeholder from each location, excluding the Safety Village of Darien, as no one from this location returned any of the several telephone messages left by the team. The following subsections, categorized by individual survey questions, summarize all responses.
**Survey Question 1 Summary**

*Original question:* Was there a community need that facilitated your desire to create a safety village? If so, what was it? If not, why did you create such a program?

Only one surveyed program confirmed the existence of a “community need” before establishing a safety village. The Tri-Town Safety Village experienced several child-related deaths, including an incident involving a young girl and a school bus, and several train accidents. Their focus centered on a desire to incorporate police, fire, and railroad safety elements – and was a combined effort of three different communities.

The remaining seven respondents reportedly created a safety village simply based on the personal desire of public safety employees (e.g., fire department chief) and/or the political desire of community leaders. Some of the respondents also said the discovery of other existing safety villages was the primary rationale for establishing their own.

**Survey Question 2 Summary**

*Original question:* What partners were involved in the development and implementation of your program, and what partners are actively involved now? What kind of support was provided (e.g., funding, instruction, facilities, staff, etc.)?

Regarding safety village implementation, either a fire or a police department primarily sponsored the creation and subsequent management of the programs; many also collaborated with other governmental and non-governmental entities. These public organizations then utilized various levels of financial and in-kind support, primarily through community-based solicitations. Several of the villages also utilized specific private sponsors to fund the construction of safety village buildings. The Sioux Empire Safety Village took a different path. They started as a 501(c)(3) and did not incorporate government involvement, indicating “… government does a
poor job of running these types of projects long term” (Dave Renli, personal communication, June 04, 2012).

In terms of continued operations, most of the safety village respondents indicated that the Great Recession has affected them. Nearly all are experiencing budget cuts to their sponsoring agency, which is forcing them to find alternative methods by which to obtain funding for operations and/or salaries. Many have even begun charging fees for several of the program aspects. Juanita Black, the executive director for the Children’s Safety Village of Southern Florida said, “Do not give everything away, and try to find sponsors for services delivered at no charge” (Personal communication, June 11, 2012).

An overall common factor espoused by each survey respondent is the absolute need for community support. Many labeled this as the most critical element necessary for success.

Survey Question 3 Summary

*Original question: What barriers did you experience during the development and implementation of your program?*

Regarding barriers to implementation and continued operations, many of the responses to this question were not lengthy; however, the overall theme centered on commitment and funding – for both implementation and continued operations. Two of the respondents indicated it took years (upwards of 14) to become fully operational. Sioux Empire Safety Village’s Dave Renali said, “Selling prevention is hard. Writing grants is not the answer. We have to find a way to receive private funds on a revolving basis” (Personal interview, June 04, 2012). Further, he believes it is better to receive smaller donations from many individuals, rather than larger donations from fewer contributors, as the “smaller” donors will contribute multiple times.
In addition, nearly all of the respondents opined on the effects of the Great Recession – with one indicating they nearly closed due to a loss of both funding and in-kind support.

**Survey Question 4 Summary**

*Original question:* Has your organization and community benefited from the development and implementation of a safety village? If so, please describe the benefits.

Regarding benefits to the community, most indicate that “education” is the primary benefit – in terms of the original message received by the participating students, and the secondary message delivered to each student’s family and friends. Secondary benefits involve enhanced relationships between children and public safety organizations, to include child-learning facilities (e.g., public and private schools).

Florida’s Children’s Safety Village executive director said, “Grow your program and expand the reach, with a goal of permeating your safety message throughout the community” (Juanita Black, personal communication, June 11, 2012). Ms. Black seizes the opportunity to educate the public through the news media every time there is an incident of injury or death involving a child in Southern Florida. As a result, she said she is now garnering national attention to her programs’ efforts, thereby increasing her facilities chance of saving lives.

Overall, while none of the respondents provided absolute quantitative data regarding their programs ability to mitigate child injury and death, nearly all espoused anecdotal information regard the “personal benefits” of safety village education.

**Survey Question 5 Summary**

*Original question:* How do you measure the impacts of your program on both the community and your students?
Nearly all of the surveyed safety villages fail to utilize performance measures for collecting quantifiable data regarding program impact; however, several of the programs state they recognize the potential benefit of doing so. One safety village said they use “benchmarking” – comparing their child injuries and deaths to national statistics. Another program utilizes pre- and post-tests with children, but only on an “annual” basis. Yet another utilizes feedback from schoolteachers to evaluate performance and curriculum.

Overall, most of the safety villages seem to leverage anecdotal information as the primary mechanism by which they proclaim success. As an example, one safety village claims a student learned fire safety lessons during a visit then returned home to convince the manager of her apartment complex to install fire alarms. The apartment complex experienced a large-scale fire not long after, but with no loss of life. Based on this, the program proclaims that the education provided by the safety village, and the actions of the little girl, are the reason all residents survived.

Survey Question 6 Summary

Original question: Are you having trouble with program delivery (e.g., partnerships, financial resources, attendance, program necessity, and/or public perception)?

Most of the safety villages are having trouble with elements of program delivery due to the effects of the Great Recession; however, a couple of the programs indicated that they have no problems with program delivery whatsoever. One of these villages attributes “remarkable” community support as the primary reason for sustainable efforts.

One safety village is experiencing a reduction in attendance, citing the rising cost of fuel as the primary factor. As a result, they are working with schools to obtain sponsored “field trips” to their location.
Another facility believes their difficulty in finding a qualified board of directors is the primary reason they are experiencing program delivery issues.

Overall, comments to this question were not extensive.

Survey Question 7 Summary

Original question: What funding sources did you initially utilize to develop your program, and what sources are you using now to maintain operations?

Specific funding sources regarding safety village implementation and operation vary across the seven respondents; however, nearly all utilize some element of private funding. A city-based bond allowed for the creation and continued operation of one safety village program; however, this safety village still incorporated private funding into its program. One program received a donation of profit earnings from the sale of 7.5 acres of land. This funding was sufficient to establish the facility and provide funding for ten additional years.

Cobb County Safety Village in Marietta, Georgia, has an operating budget funded by the local county, with just a small fundraising arm. All safety village staff are county employees, and the safety village budget is part of the annual county budget. They noted they had more money to start their village than other sites due to the fact they are in one of the richest counties in Georgia.

Most of the programs appear to have obtained federal nonprofit status – either initially or at some point after beginning operations. This designation, however, does not come without conflict. According to the Children’s Safety Village of Southern Florida executive director, a 501(c)(3) designation is “…both a blessing and a curse” (Juanita Black, personal interview, 06-11-12). Ms. Black indicated that when her sponsoring agency began to eliminate line items from
their budget (as a result of the Great Recession), her program lost county-based funding since they were already a nonprofit and had the ability to collect their own fees.

Many of the safety villages utilize volunteers to reduce costs. The definition of a volunteer does vary, as some state that firefighters “volunteer” to teach classes though they are actually earning overtime. Others, such as the Tri-Town Safety Village, have a staff consisting of all volunteers. The majorities have some paid staff, and they utilize volunteers to assist with program delivery.

In general and as already outlined above, most of the safety village respondents once again mentioned the necessity for outstanding community support to sustain operations.

Survey Question 8 Summary

Original question: With all of the lessons learned, what recommendations would you give to an agency looking to develop a safety village today?

Responses to “lessons learned” varied by respondent.

The Frisco Fire Safety Town believes the ownership of the village by their fire department is paramount to their success. They tout the participation of Frisco firefighters as a key to their success – indicating that many will work a regular fire shift then provide several additional hours to teaching at the village; however, Frisco also indicates that their fire personnel receive overtime for this teaching service.

The Clark County Sheriff’s Office believes each instructor must be able to connect with children to obtain success.

The Tri-Town Safety Village believes volunteers are necessary for success, as their operation does not utilize any paid staff.
Cobb County Safety Village recommends that new sites obtain 50-75\% of the funding needed to build the infrastructure of the village before they break any ground.

Hagerstown believes a sincere commitment of partners and constant publicity will aid in obtaining success. In addition, the Hagerstown executive director believes new safety villages will fail unless they find a way to obtain long-term funding and solid community support – all before breaking ground on a facility.

The Sioux City Safety Village recommends separating the safety village from government – indicating that a change in leadership at the governmental agency will affect operations. In addition, this facility believes a program’s board of directors should be contributing members of the community. The Children’s Safety Village of Southern Florida also shares these beliefs. Executive Director Juanita Black has seen her operations change each time the “managing lieutenant” transferred to a new location – which happened every two years. Further, she indicates a board should be composed of members in the community who can provide specific services to the village (e.g., attorney, doctor, teacher, construction company owner).

**Safety Village Surveys – General Information**

Nearly every individual contacted as a part of this survey was helpful. Many of the program directors have been involved in nonprofits for years, and more specifically, with safety villages and other child-based learning programs. They are extremely knowledgeable and many said they are willing to help.

Several had other great ideas regarding starting safety villages – such as collaborating with a company called *Kaboom Playgrounds* for obtaining funding support. Two mentioned a
national “safety town” conference scheduled for November 2012 in Canada – a place to garner personal contacts and helpful information.

Overall, existing safety village program directors may be a valid source of information to assist with the Northern STARS Safety Village development.

**Literature Review**

**Academic**

The graduate team conducted a review of academic journals to determine if any of the existing safety villages had undergone formal evaluation. The team located only two articles after querying UNLV Lied Library journal article databases and the Google Scholar search engine. Since Hagerstown is the only safety village to mention a formalized evaluation, the graduate team believes this search is accurate.

First, staff from the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health, Center for Injury Research and Policy, in Baltimore, Maryland, evaluated the Hagerstown, Maryland, Children’s Village program during the 1993-1994 school year. The research team developed a quasi-experimental design for two cohorts of children who attended the village, utilizing a pre-test, post-test, and a second post-test four months later (Gielen, Dannenberg, Ashburn, & Kou, 1996). Overall, 410 children were tested on their level of learning and information retention. Scores improved significantly between the pre-test and post-test. Significant learning was still evident as demonstrated by the scores received subsequent to the second post-test. Surveys presented to parents of the children yielded a 33% response, which indicated parents made changes in their homes based on information their children brought back with them after visiting the safety village.
A limiting factor of the study is that visitation to the safety village was a school requirement for all children; this limits validity as the evaluation did not have a true intervention and control group. In addition, the study only tested knowledge and did not evaluate behaviors (Gielen, Dannenberg, Ashburn, & Kou, 1996).

The researchers did outline pros and cons of the safety village concept (Gielen, Dannenberg, Ashburn, & Kou, 1996):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinct site makes learning easier to control</td>
<td>Evidence is not clear that such safety programs reduce injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program leads to knowledge gains on specific safety topics</td>
<td>Generalizability and replicability are concerns for future research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program leads to communication between students and public safety officials</td>
<td>This community experienced wide-spread support that may not be available in other communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical skills can be taught at the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researchers provided suggestions for other groups that may be interested in developing safety village programs of their own, including:

- Examine existing safety villages in detail,
- Identify community leaders willing to invest time, resources, and effort to the project, and
- Incorporate evaluation efforts from the very beginning.

Second, in 2006, researchers from Oxford Brookes University and the University of Oxford evaluated a similar safety village program in Bristol, England. The Lifeskills Training Village conducted safety education programs with 145 children aged 10-11 from seven different schools in a quasi-experimental, matched control group study (Lamb, Joshi, Carter, Cowburn, & Matthews, 2006). Knowledge-based tests and performance tests allowed for the evaluation of the participating children’s ability to demonstrate safe actions. Resulting data demonstrated that
children who received the education program passed twice as many performance tests and three times as many knowledge tests as the control children. The intervention group continued to outperform the control group at the three-month, follow-up post-test. There was some loss of knowledge on two of the more complex tasks, which lead to suggestions to change the curriculum on those topics. Overall, the researchers found that knowledge and performance were highly correlated.

An article from Injury Prevention, which relates to the Lifeskills program in Bristol, noted that evaluation should focus on behavior, if that is the trait desired for change (Thomson, 2006). Thomson gives the following suggestions for best practices for safety villages:

- Focus on changing behavior, not just on knowledge acquisition;
- Use interactive learning methods;
- Use volunteer trainers who know how to connect with children;
- Use realistic training scenarios; and,
- Develop follow-up activities for children to use in the home to reinforce learning.

Public Media

The graduate team also conducted a review of public media for information related to other safety villages in the United States. Resulting research identified several articles related to similar programs, all of which demonstrated a varying degree of support based on several factors. In addition, financial support appeared to be a major topic for most safety villages.

Fundraising

The Sioux Empire Safety Village in South Dakota has received small grants during each year of operation to help fund their driver safety programs. In 2010 they received $12,000 (ArgusLeader, 2010), but in 2012 that was down to $10,000 (ArgusLeader, 2012). The Tri-
Town Safety Village in Dyer, Indiana, obtains support from local charitable foundations, such as the Crowne Point Community Foundation, to supplement operating expenses (Times Staff, 2012).

Corporate sponsorships are also important to safety villages. In Frisco, Texas, the Fire Safety Town solicits sponsors for many events, such as their Holiday Light display. Their sponsors donate funds to support the Fire Safety Town, which entitles each to a recognition credit at both the event and on the City of Frisco’s website (Blythe, 2010). In Marietta, Georgia, Cobb County Safety Village corporate sponsors, such as the local ambulance company and several construction firms, help bolster the budget (Cobb County, 2012). In Hagerstown, Maryland, the Children’s Village recognizes their corporate sponsors on their website and in their newsletters (Newsletter, 2010).

Fundraising efforts among identified safety villages are varied. The Sioux Empire Safety Village held a *Wii* bowling tournament in February 2012 to help raise funds for their operating budget (ArgusLeader.com, 2012). In Dyer, the local gardening club sells plants and seedlings to raise money for the Tri-Town Safety Village (Time Staff, 2012). The entire area of Dyer appears to be involved in community events and fundraising for the Safety Village.

Additionally, Dyer’s Tri-Town Safety Village involves the community by holding events at the safety village site, such as child seat inspections, arts and crafts shows, and pancake breakfasts (Time Staff, 2011). The Frisco Fire Safety Town hosts various community events to increase their visibility and audience (Crenshaw, 2009). In Marietta, residents are encouraged to buy a brick (buy-a-brick program) to help fund the Cobb County Safety Village (Cobb County Safety Village, 2012). The Hagerstown Children’s Village receives community support from conducting fundraisers and soliciting community groups (Herald Mail, 2012).
Financial Strain

The Tri-Town Safety Village receives funding from participating Indiana municipalities (Wilds, North West Indian Times, 2012); however, even established programs such as Tri-Town experience problems with funding from partners. Originally, the village was designed to be a quad-town village, but local municipality Highland backed out in 2006 (Renderman, North West Indiana Times, 2010). Tri-Town experienced financial difficulties since opening. A developer originally donated land for the site as part of a new development requirement, and the town of Schererville created the nonprofit to raise funds to build the safety village. However, in 2009, Tri-Town could not meet its financial obligations and Schererville had to step in to assist them with mortgage payments (Renderman, North West Indiana Times, 2009). In 2009, two of the local partners developed a plan to keep the safety village open and cover expenses (Renderman, North West Indiana Times, 2009). In 2011, when the economy was suffering, the township of Dyer cut back its annual donation to the safety village from $6,000 to $2,000 (Wilds, North West Indiana Times, 2011).

Cobb County Safety Village is also experiencing financial difficulties. Governmental representatives of Cobb County are exploring the possibility of releasing the project, or increasing funding by requiring financial assistance from local schools (Davis, 2011). As governmental budgets become leaner, safety villages appear to require additional financial assistance, not just in-kind donations, to survive.

In Hagerstown, Maryland, the Children’s Village newsletter even made mention of the financial strain. Donations are down from all funding sources, and a reduction of volunteer time from instructors decreased due to the budget constraints (Newsletter, 2010).
Performance Evaluation Information

None of the newspaper searches in the public media resulted in a discovery of evaluation material for safety village programs. In addition, a majority of the individual safety village websites rarely mention program evaluation. The Cobb County Safety Village website does indicate a 50% reduction in fire related deaths since the safety instruction began in 1978. This is despite the population growth in the Cobb County area (Cobb County, 2012); however, there was no substantive justification for causation and/or correlation. The Cobb County Safety Village website also mentions that the safety village has reduced overtime for safety instructors by 31% and has saved $12,000 in travel expenses per year (Cobb County, 2012).

Statistical Analysis of Local Child Injuries and Deaths

One way to determine program need for a safety village is to evaluate compiled statistics regarding child injuries and deaths. Based on this, the graduate team gathered national, state, and local statistical information related to the Northern STARS Safety Village program elements: pool safety, water safety, heat-related safety, traffic safety, internet safety, and fire safety. The team examined information from a variety of sources, including the Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD), the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Safe Kids®, and the Nevada Department of Public Safety (DPS). Each of these agencies track and report to the public the injuries and deaths involving children and will often make recommendations for future prevention.

The CDC reports that drownings are the leading cause of accidental death for children ages 1 to 4, and that roughly three children die every day in the United States because of drowning (Unknown, Drowning: The Reality, 2012). In Clark County, a 2010 Child Death Report published by the Clark County Child Death Review Team indicates that there has been a
slight increase from 2009 to 2010 for child deaths related to drownings (Phebus & Ashby, 2011). The SNHD’s 2011 and preliminary report for 2012, however, show that this number is on a recent downward trend (Unknown, Injury Trends Fact Sheet, 2011). Safe Kids® reports that the number of “unintentional injury-related” deaths for children under the age of 14 has declined from 1987 to 2008 (Unknown, Burn and Scald Prevention Fact Sheet, 2011). These “unintentional injury-related” deaths include motor vehicle accidents, drownings, suffocations, and pedestrian-related deaths. The 2010 Child Death Report identified that 18.3% of all child deaths were accidental and that the top three causes of these deaths were suffocation (28.3%), drownings (21.7%), and motor vehicle accidents (17.4%), respectively.

When reviewing trends, the 2010 Child Death Report indicates that from 2006 to 2010, there have only been three child accidental injury deaths involving fire, burns, or electrocutions. Nationally, since 1999, an average of 496 children ages 14 and under died each year due to unintentional fire- or burn-related injury (Unknown, Burn and Scald Prevention Fact Sheet, 2011). In addition, the 2010 Child Death Report postulates a dramatic decrease in traffic-related injuries/deaths with the total number in 2006 being almost 50% of all child deaths to less than 20% in 2010. The graduate team could not locate any Clark County or State of Nevada specific statistics on heat-related child deaths; however, Safe Kids® reports that the nationwide number has reached 500 as of 2011. Due to the extreme weather in Clark County, specific numbers would be helpful, but as of this time are unavailable.

Regarding internet safety, “online” capabilities are constantly changing and there appears to be no concrete way of tracking usage by children. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) estimates that there are nearly 24 million children on the internet regularly, of whom sexual
predators solicit 20% of them online, and strangers solicit 70% of them at home (Unknown, Keeping Kids Safe Online, 2011).

Many jurisdictions have a Child Death Review Team (CDR). Clark County, Nevada, officials created a multidisciplinary group “pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes NRS432B.403 - NRS432B.4095 to assess and analyze cases involving the death of any child under 18 years of age in Clark County” (Unknown, Clark County Child Death Review Team, 2012). Their objectives include:

- Making recommendations for improvements to laws, policies, and practice
- Supporting the safety of children
- Preventing future deaths of children

The CDR involves participants from several different disciplines including the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD), the Clark County Department of Family Services (DFS), the Clark County District Attorney’s Office (CCDA), the Clark County School District (CCSD), the Department of Juvenile Justice, and several other local police, medical, and nonprofit organizations. This group reviews individual cases that involve a child fatality in Southern Nevada. Based on trends, the CDR indicates the top four causes of accidental deaths in Clark County result from motor vehicle accidents, drownings, guns, and sleep. While these have trended towards the higher end, there are several random causes including falls/crushes from furniture, pills/overdoses, etc.

Upon review of a case, the team then looks at trends within the county and makes recommendations to the State Administrative Team (SAT). This team determines if there are public entities already evaluating these recommendations. The SAT then sends that public entity a letter requesting feedback regarding their current practices and awareness programs. Once the
SAT receives a response, it forwards a copy to the local CDR to determine whether funding requires legislative action. If there are no public entities currently working on an awareness campaign, the SAT will send the recommendation to the State Executive Team (SET) for review. This review will evaluate the need for a prevention campaign message to educate the public. The reach of each campaign message will depend upon the need within each locality. For example, there is a much higher need for a pool safety campaign in Southern Nevada versus Northern Nevada. The CDR has promoted awareness campaigns for issues such as pool safety, suicide prevention, pedestrian awareness, and many others.

As the main objectives of the CDR are safety and child death prevention, the graduate team surveyed several members of both the Clark County and State of Nevada CDR to determine if they collaborated with representatives of the Northern STARS Safety Village to provide recommendations. None of the members of either team had met with any Northern STARS Safety Village representative and only one member was familiar with the proposed safety village. The team did express a great desire to work with the program as they have similar child safety goals. There was some general reservation from the CDR about the current structure of the Northern STARS Safety Village program. While the general concept of the program was intriguing to all, there were concerns regarding the educational aspect and a general belief that parental education and engagement needed to be a larger aspect of the program.

Both national and local statistics show a general decrease in the areas that the Northern STARS Safety Village program is targeting. While the decrease is positive for the public, the numbers are not indicative of the need for such a program; however, one can make an argument that ongoing awareness and campaigns are the very reasons for the decrease in child
injuries/deaths. This is the exact point made by the State of Nevada’s Social Services Chief, Jill Marano, during a recent interview.

**Grant Search**

At the request of the NLVFD, the graduate team conducted a search of available grant funding that might be appropriate for the Northern STARS Safety Village. Captain Williams indicated that he wanted to attempt to obtain capital improvement grants from the Lincy Foundation and the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation. Capital funding is notoriously hard to come by, but these two foundations have supported capital projects in Las Vegas, Nevada, in the past.

Unfortunately, since the NLVFD started their planning process, both the Lincy Foundation and the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation have stopped providing funding for capital projects the Las Vegas area. The Lincy Foundation transferred all of its assets to UCLA in February 2011 (Lincy Institute, 2012), while the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation terminated capital projects in June 2009 (Donald W. Reynolds Foundation, 2012).

The graduate team then conducted a search utilizing a member-only website managed by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, referred to as the Grant Resource Center (AASCU, 2012). The Grants Resource Center provides a listing of all federal grants as well as major foundation grants. The team then conducted a secondary search on the Foundation Center website, as accessed via the University of Nevada, Las Vegas University Libraries portal (The Foundation Center, 2012).

The team utilized and tried diverse search terms in various combinations. Key terms included funding for non-profits and government entities, injury prevention, safety, capital,
education, and children’s programs. The graduate team did not discover any viable grant opportunities utilizing these searches.

The graduate team then conducted a review of several local foundation websites from which to search appropriate grant opportunities. The search resulted in the discovery that the Nevada Community Foundation changed their grant processes in the last few years. Rather than providing funding via a competitive annual process, they now give funds for multi-year projects that align specifically with the Ready for Life© initiative (Nevada Community Foundation, 2012).

The new Changing Lives Community Fund, managed by the Nevada Community Foundation, provides grants of $8,000 to $20,000 for 12-month periods for projects that meet basic unmet needs and improve the lives of women and children (Nevada Community Foundation, 2011). This fund may be a resource in the future, once the Northern STARS Safety Village is operational. The Golden Nugget, also managed by the Nevada Community Foundation, typically awards grants for less than $10,000 to local nonprofits. They may be a resource after the infrastructure is in place, as well.

Another major local foundation that had previously provided many grants to the Las Vegas area is the United Way of Southern Nevada. In 2009, they refocused their efforts to meet the immediate needs of the community, such as basic shelter, food, and health care, for the many Southern Nevada residents adversely affected by the Great Recession (United Way of Southern Nevada, 2012). This foundation now provides limited grants that focus on specific topic areas. They do not appear to be a viable source of funding for the Northern STARS Safety Village at this time.
MGM Resorts Foundation provides grants to projects that “strengthen children” (MGM Resorts Foundation, 2012). They do not provide funding for capital projects, and require that sponsored projects provide a human service. Eligible entities must also have been in existence for at least 36 months, so the Northern STARS Safety Village would not be eligible at this time.

One potential funding agency might be the Nevada Women’s Philanthropy. This group of 110 women chooses a new project to fund each year (Nevada Women's Philanthropy, 2012). They have previously funded organizations such as the Salvation Army, the Rape Crisis Center, and empowerment schools. They have also previously funded some capital projects; however, their website limits funding to only those projects that are ready for implementation. They may not feel the Northern STARS Safety Village is close enough to implementation for consideration; however, the safety village’s focus on children’s injury prevention may be of interest to this group. Letters of Inquiry are generally due each February.

Unfortunately, the grant search revealed the hard truth that established nonprofits in Southern Nevada have been dealing with for years. First, there are not a large number of foundations in the Las Vegas area. Second, most foundations have tightened their financial assistance strategies since the arrival of the Great Recession. Third, sources of capital project financing are very rare. Fourth, most grants will only support existing programs, so a nonprofit must first build their program before foundations will get involved financially. The only viable funding opportunity the graduate team identified for capital projects would be the Nevada Women’s Philanthropy, which only provides a total of $325,000 per year – well below the $7 million needed to develop the Northern STARS Safety Village infrastructure.
Recommendations

While the CLNV and the NLVFD have worked for several years to develop the Northern STARS Safety Village, they can take additional steps at this time to more fully develop the village concept and help with future success. The graduate team recommends three stages of project development as listed below.

Phase One Recommendations

Governance Board, Bylaws, and Stakeholders

The Northern STARS Safety Village currently has a 501(c)3 designation with a board of directors consisting of North Las Vegas City and Fire Department staff (see Appendix G). No outside partners or community leaders are included in the current board configuration.

The team strongly suggests that development and expansion of the board is critical. Several of the other safety villages were very vocal in their recommendations that for success the board must consist of community leaders that have the ability to shape public opinion and assist in fundraising and the capital campaign. It is not wise to limit the board to CLNV officials only.

While membership from other municipalities may be a logical step and needs to occur, it may be more advantageous to concentrate on board members from the private sector. A board member from the construction industry may assist in actual construction of the village and may provide access to donated services by skilled craftsmen. A lawyer may be able to assist in developing formalized partnership paperwork and guiding this new non-profit through legal hurdles. A medical professional may build buy-in from the medical and health community, and bring expertise on pediatric issues.

To assist with fundraising for the capital campaign, and to develop future funding streams, the board must also include major community members. A non-profit organization
“cold calling” a highly visible member of the community does not generally result in a donation. A donation is much more likely if a friend of that person contacts them directly. The graduate team, as well as the other safety villages, highly recommends the recruitment of at least three board members from highly visible, major community leaders.

This board will then need to review and refine the basic bylaws that the Northern STARS Safety Village has already developed. The board will then have ownership of the organization through the bylaws revision, which will help cement their dedication to the organization. The development of a board member agreement will outline the responsibilities of the board members to ensure recruited board members are aware that this will be an active board and that they will be responsible for ensuring the success of the Northern STARS Safety Village. This board will not be a passive board that meets quarterly to rubber stamp the actions of the Executive Director. To be truly successful, the board must play an active role in the development and implementation of the project.
**Formal Partnerships with Other Municipalities**

Captain Williams and the NLVFD want this project to be a regional project, with support from other local municipalities. Though initial discussions have occurred, and other groups have indicated interest in participating in the project, no formal arrangements are in place.

The graduate team recommends the development of a formalized Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by each potential partner. These MOUs should outline what resources, whether financial, personnel, or in-kind support, the partner will provide to help the Northern STARS Safety Village during creation and ongoing implementation. Partners would include the City of Las Vegas, City of Henderson, Clark County, and the various public safety agencies such as police departments and fire departments.

Until the commitments are in writing, the Northern STARS Safety Village should not count on any support. As noted in the Tri-Town Safety Village example above, municipalities may pull out due to competing priorities or budget constraints. Obtaining buy-in to the project early in the process will help ensure the full engagement of those partners throughout construction and active program activities.

The Northern STARS Safety Village can use the state of Nevada’s standard interagency agreement form as a template for the MOU. The inclusion of a lawyer as a board member, as suggested above, will allow for the revision and tailoring of the MOU to specific partners signing the document, based on each partner organization’s resources.

**Clark County Child Death Review Team**

The graduate team recommends that the leadership of the Northern STARS Safety Village contact the Clark County Death Review Team within the near future to present the proposed program to their membership. This team consists of many highly engaged stakeholders.
that are concerned with the health and safety of Clark County children. This group may be able to provide suggestions on individuals that may be interested in joining the board. The Death Review Team also provides expertise in the needs of the local community. Captain Williams and his team should use this group to assist in defining local needs. The Child Death Review Team’s charge is recommending substantive changes in policies and regulations to decrease unsafe situations for children. Their support of the project is critical to ensure the Northern STARS Safety Village curricula meet the true needs of the community and the focus of implemented learning activities on statistical needs. The Child Death Review Team can also assist in appropriate messaging on prevention topics.

**Phase Two Recommendations**

**Website**

The current Northern STARS Safety Village website is out of date. The NLVFD obviously developed the web portal with an initial timeline, which included a ground breaking in January 2012. An updated website should include a revised timeline to show they are currently developing their board of directors and fundraising for the major construction. It should also include a realistic timeline for groundbreaking.

The website, as currently configured, gives a much-skewed perception of where they are in terms of project development. Revision of the website will allow for use as a tool to drive interest in the project. The website currently lists the sponsorship levels that were originally developed. The graduate team recommends reevaluation of those levels. Is it reasonable to assume that community partners will be able to meet the listed sponsorship levels in the current economic climate in Nevada? A revised sponsorship package may be necessary.
Coordination with Other Safety Villages

Captain Williams and the CLNV team have indicated a very strong intention of modeling the Northern STARS Safety Village after the Frisco Safety Village. They visited Frisco several times, but have not contacted any of the other safety villages to gather information or determine best practices used at those sites.

The graduate team found that all of the other safety villages had highly dedicated staff that would be very happy to help the CLNV develop their site. Each site has suggestions for best practices, areas of concern, and tips for success, as noted in the sections above.

There is no need for Northern STARS Safety Village stakeholders to “reinvent the wheel” or limit themselves to just one safety village model. Utilizing the expertise of others who have been through the same process will ultimately benefit the final product for all involved.

Several of the surveyed safety village directors recommended attending an international conference for safety villages scheduled for this fall in Canada. The team suggests Northern STARS Safety Village leadership attend this conference to learn from a broad group of safety village leaders.

Location

Captain Williams mentioned several times that he sees the Northern STARS Safety Village becoming a regional asset as well as a destination location for visiting tourists. The CLNV received donated land from the Bureau of Land Management near the northern beltway (I-215). While residents of the City of North Las may find this to be a convenient location, tourists and/or residents from other parts of the county may not feel the same way. To be more capable of attracting a larger audience, it may benefit the leadership to see if a centralized location might be available for construction of the Northern STARS Safety Village. They might
also question the BLM to see if there is other land available to trade for this site. The discussion of this proposed major change should occur once a full board is in place.

**Phase Three Recommendations**

*Community Support*

Every safety village the graduate team interviewed indicated that community support is one of the most critical, if not the most critical, aspects of the program. Many of the other safety villages are located in smaller towns and/or rural areas. The Northern STARS Safety Village will be located in a huge metropolitan area that consists of a large transient population. Developing a strong sense of community pride in the Northern STARS Safety Village may be difficult in this urban area.

Several of the other safety villages have volunteers that staff the villages, community members who run fundraising campaigns, and other community partners who provide support. While a community bake sale may work for fundraising in Dyer, Indiana, it does not seem a feasible source of income in North Las Vegas.

Utilizing the local schools may be one way to reach the children and the parents. A formalized relationship would likely be necessary for consistent communication and support. The team recommends this be a topic of discussion of the new board immediately upon formation. How can development of community support for this project occur within Las Vegas’ unique urban culture? The graduate team does not have an answer for this dilemma.

*UNLV Partnership*

The new UNLV Non-Profit Center and the School of Environmental and Public Affairs should be critical partners to this project. The literature review and interviews show that there are very limited evaluation measures at the other safety villages. The Northern STARS Safety
Village has the potential to be able to include appropriate performance measures and formalized evaluation from the beginning of their program implementation, which can serve as a “model” for other safety villages.

In the United States, the last formal evaluation of a safety village occurred in 1994. As this project is in the planning stage, future MPA students can be involved with structuring the performance measures at the same time the curriculum is under development. Inclusion of evaluation, including longitudinal evaluation, into the structure of the project can occur now. The MPA students will have the opportunity to have a test site for their evaluation skills, and the Northern STARS Safety Village will have proof their project positively impacts knowledge and actions. Having that type of proof would increase the likelihood of receiving future funding. This partnership would be beneficial for both parties.

**Conclusion**

The Northern STARS Safety Village brings an interesting concept, which has worked in various communities around the country, to Clark County, Nevada. The CLNV and the NLVFD have put considerable work into developing the idea over the past several years. They were able to obtain land donated by the BLM, have a schematic design developed by an architect, create a 501(c)3, and begin work on partnerships. The Great Recession derailed the project as both private and public funding streams dried up. The Northern STARS Safety Village remains a priority for the CLNV.

At this time, the graduate team recommends that CNLV and NLFD reassess several strategies they have put in place, and concentrate on additional planning activities rather than implementation. Clark County is still suffering from the Great Recession, and philanthropic
giving is low. Grant funding for a capital project is not currently available, so only private sources can assist with capital, which would be difficult at this time.

The team recommends that the Northern STARS Safety Village concentrate on building a strong board, formalize partnerships, and develop a comprehensive evaluation system until the economy recovers. Laying this foundation gives the Northern STARS Safety Village a stronger stance for vital future fundraising activities.
References


Table of Contents

Mission Statement ................................................................. 2
Introduction ............................................................................... 3
Pricing Estimates ..................................................................... 4
Target Audiences .................................................................... 5
Programs ................................................................................ 6
Sponsorship Package Options .................................................. 7
Timeline .................................................................................. 9

Contacts

Cedric Williams ................................................................. 702.633.1111
Public Information/Community Liaison Officer, Captain

Lenny Mayorga ................................................................. 702.633.2250
Battalion Chief

Bruce Evans ................................................................. 702.633.2249
Business and Support Services, Assistant Chief

Juliet Casey ................................................................. 702.633.2613
City of North Las Vegas Communications Department

Nancy O’Connor-Bond ................................................................. 702.633.1256
Parks Manager
Mission Statement

To educate and enlighten the youth of Southern Nevada by providing state-of-the-art, hands-on, life safety programs in a fun, exciting, life-learning, and memorable experience.
Introduction

To educate children on how to avoid dangerous situations and prevent unintentional injuries, the City of North Las Vegas proposes to construct the Northern STARS Safety Village.

What is the Northern STARS Safety Village?
A fun and interactive setting taking a proactive approach to educating children on how to prevent and handle dangerous situations.

What safety issues will be addressed?
- Bicycle Safety
- Emergency Services
- Fire Safety and Prevention
- Injury Prevention for Seniors
- Internet Safety
- Motor Vehicle Safety
- Pedestrian Safety
- Rules of the Road
- Water Safety

Northern STARS Safety Village Goals
- Provide a dynamic learning environment in North Las Vegas where every child is properly educated on safety practices.
- Devote itself to children of all ages with a particular focus on students in kindergarten through third grade.
- Teach children about the many aspects of safety through entertaining presentations, interactive games, projects, and professional instruction.
- Be the most comprehensive safety training environment in the region.

Northern STARS Safety Village Features
- To be built on a ten-acre site at the Sky View Multigenerational location.
- Will include the following facilities:
  - An administration building.
  - Education/Auditorium.
  - Education/Classrooms
  - Garage
  - Amphitheater
  - A miniature town containing sidewalks, roads, traffic signals, and up to 30 scaled-down buildings representing community structures.

Northern STARS Safety Village Funding
Building costs for the Northern STARS Safety Village are estimated at $20 million. The opportunities for community support will make a significant difference in making Northern STARS Safety Village a success:
- In-kind contributions will assist with the construction of the safety village.
- Sponsorships will allow donors to be an integral part of the safety village.
- An endowment will fund day-to-day operating expenses and expanded services.
**Pricing Estimates**

**Primary Structures**
- Administration Building: 4,775 sq ft
- Education/Auditorium: 5,275 sq ft
- Educational/Classrooms: 6,000 sq ft
- Garage: 3,500 sq ft
- Amphitheater: 3,500 sq ft

Total square footage 23,050 @ $350/sq ft = $8,067,500 Const. Cost

**Land and Landscape Cost**
- 10 acres @ $500,000/acre = $5,000,000

**Drowning Prevention Pool**
- $500,000

**Village Units (28-30)**
- Unit size: 225 sq ft each
- Cost is $0.

Units will be sponsored by community organizations or businesses.

**Total Cost**
- $20,000,000
Target Audiences

- Primary: K-3rd Grade
  - Focus is on the interactive experience.
  - The small-scale village will be the main teaching component.
  - Educate audience about basic safety skills in an age-appropriate fashion.

- Secondary: 4th-5th Grade
  - Focus is on hands-on lessons.
  - The interactive features of the safety village may still be used, but with less emphasis.
  - Educate audience about more complex safety concepts.

- Specialized: 6th-8th Grade
  - Focus is on specialized instructional lessons.
  - Educate audience about advanced safety concepts.

- Auxiliary: Parents
  - Focus is on the peripheral effects of the safety village.
  - Educate audience through the following interactions:
    - Participating in the safety village with their children.
    - Learning from children who share safety village messages.
    - Reinforcing safety village lessons and skills at home.

- Volunteers: Senior Citizens
  - Focus is on training senior citizen volunteers.
    - Reinforce and refresh safety knowledge.
  - Educate audience about advanced safety concepts.

- Volunteers: High School Students
  - Focus is on training high school volunteers.
    - Strengthen safety knowledge.
  - Educate audience about advanced safety concepts.
Programs

- Pool Safety
  - Lessons on pool and poolside behavior.
  - Advice on drowning prevention.

- Water Safety
  - Lessons on proper behavior in large bodies of water.
  - Advice on drowning prevention.

- Heat-related Safety
  - Explain dangers of extreme heat.
  - Lessons on proper outdoor summer behavior.
  - Advice on preventing heat-related problems.

- Traffic Safety
  - Lessons on bicycle & motor vehicle rules and laws.
  - Advice on preventing accidents.
  - Advice on protecting self to avoid injury.
    - Seat belts
    - Helmets

- Fire Prevention
  - Lessons on proper fire behavior.
  - Advice on fire prevention.
  - Advice on protecting self in a fire.

- Internet Safety
  - Lessons on proper online behavior.
  - Advice on protecting self from online predators.

- Senior Fall Prevention
  - Advice on how to prevent falls.
  - Advice on what to do in case of a fall.
Sponsorship Package Options

A. Chief Sponsorship Package ($150,000 or higher)
   1. Recognition
      Chief Sponsors are honored in the safety village with their names engraved on a special
      plaque that will hang at the Northern STARS Safety Village entrance. This plaque will be
      recognizable feature in marketing materials, honoring the elite Chief sponsors.

   2. Village Structure
      This is a sponsorship benefit unlike any other. Sponsors will have a 5/8 replica of their
      organization’s building erected within the safety village. With only 30 replica buildings
      located in the safety village, buildings will not be lost in a busy cityscape. Village
      participants can interact with the building directly as they explore the safety village. This
      provides the chance for sponsors to share information about their organization and
      educational opportunities with participants. *

   3. Signage
      To identify their building, sponsors will work with designers to create a sign to be display
      alongside their replica building.

   4. Marketing Materials
      Not only will the organization’s name be listed as a top sponsor, but images of the village
      will be incorporated in Northern STARS Safety Village brochures, Web sites, flyers, video
      news releases, and other promotional materials.

   5. Street Name Drawing
      Additionally, a safety village street will be named after this select group of sponsors. The
      street name will not only be highly visible in the village, but safety village maps distribute
      to visitors will include street names. We will draw four names from a fire helmet of the
      sponsors in this range during the Groundbreaking Ceremony.

B. Assistant Chief Sponsorship Package ($75,000 - $149,999)
   1. Village Structure
      Assistant Chief Sponsors will have a 5/8 replica of their organization’s building erected
      within the safety village. With only 30 replica buildings located in the safety village,
      buildings will not be lost in a busy cityscape. Village participants can interact with the
      building directly as they explore the safety village. This provides the chance for sponsors
      share information about their organization and educational opportunities with participant.

   2. Signage
      To identify their building, sponsors will work with designers to create a sign to be display
      alongside their replica building.
3. Marketing Materials
Not only will the organization's name be listed as a top sponsor, but images of the village will be incorporated in Northern STARS Safety Village brochures, Web sites, flyers, video news releases, and other promotional materials.

C. Captain Sponsorship Package ($50,000-$74,999)
1. Northern STARS Safety Village utility vehicle
This is a sponsorship benefit unlike any other. There will be three select opportunities to sponsor Northern STARS Safety Village vehicles. A Captain sponsored vehicle will have their name predominately displayed. The sponsorship will last for the life time of the vehicle.

2. Marketing Materials
Not only will the organization's name be displayed as a sponsor, but images of the vehicle will be incorporated in Northern STARS Safety Village brochures, Web sites, flyers, video news releases, and other promotional materials.

D. Engineer Sponsorship Package ($10,000-$25,000) **
1. Car or Bicycle Sponsorship
Along the streets of the safety village, participants will ride in small, power wheel-type cars and on kid-friendly bicycles as they learn the rules of the road. Engineer Sponsors will be able to sponsor their choice of a car or bicycle.
For cars, the sponsor's name will be placed on the license plate and the sponsor's logo/name will be placed on the car doors.
For bicycles, the sponsor's name will be placed on two bicycles' license plates and a decal with the sponsor's logo/name placed on a set of 5 bicycle helmets.

2. Marketing Materials
Engineer Sponsors will be listed in Northern STARS Safety Village brochures, Web sites, and other promotional materials.

E. Firefighter Sponsorship Package ($5,000-$9,999) **
1. Recognition
Firefighter sponsors are acknowledged in the safety village with their names engraved on a special plaque that will hang at the Northern STARS Safety Village entrance. This plaque will be a recognizable feature in marketing materials, acknowledging the Firefighter sponsors.

2. Marketing Materials
Firefighter sponsors will be listed in Northern STARS Safety Village brochures, Web sites, and other promotional materials.

Northern STARS Safety Village is seeking a 501(c)(3) so that sponsorships are tax-deductible.

*Northern STARS Safety Village reserves the right to monitor and filter what information is provided to participants.
**Engineer and Firefighter sponsorships last for 5 years and can be renewed at a discounted rate.
Northern STARS Safety Village Timeline

July 2007
- November: Research and visit other Safety Villages

January 2008
- May: Begin planning for Northern STARS Safety Village

July 2008
- July: Present business plan to local officials
- October: Finalize business plan

January 2009
- November: Contact organizations and place a call for sponsors
- February: Contact viable sponsorship candidates
- March: Begin design and layout of Northern STARS Safety Village

July 2010
- May: Finalize sponsorships and funding opportunities
- November: Finalize design and layout of Northern STARS Safety Village

January 2012
- December: Break ground on Northern STARS Safety Village

July 2013
- August: Grand opening of Northern STARS Safety Village
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF SPECIAL RECOGNITION
AT NORTH LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL MEETING

REQUESTING DEPT: FIRE DEPARTMENT

CONTACT PERSON: CEDRIC WILLIAMS PHONE NUMBER: 292-9127

REQUESTED COUNCIL MEETING DATE: May 18, 2011

(Please refer to Council Meeting closing dates for due date of item.)

ITEM PRESENTED (check box(es) that apply):

- [ ] Award
- [ ] Certificate
- [X] Presentation
- [ ] Proclamation


SPECIAL NEEDS: (audio visual, video, etc.) Computer/TV for 5 slide presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW:</th>
<th>Date Approved:</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Director</td>
<td>[C] 1/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>[C] 2/7/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORWARD TO: Date: 4/27/11 By: [C] 8/27/11

City Clerk

(Language to be used on Council agenda must be attached for City Clerk. Attach sample of language to be used on recognition item if available.)

RECIPIENT(S) NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE:

The City of North Las Vegas
2200 Civic Center Drive
North Las Vegas NV 89030

CEDRIC WILLIAMS

NOTE: Once approved, City Manager's office will forward to City Clerk and return a copy to Requesting Department.

It is the Requesting Department's responsibility to ensure all steps have been followed as to approval, purchase of item, preparation of proclamation and/or award, notification to recipient of date, provide script for Council presentation, and any other special needs prior to the Council meeting date.
The Las Vegas Chapter of The American Institute of Architects has presented their 2011 Unbuilt Category Honor Award to AssemblageSTUDIO, architects for the City of North Las Vegas Fire Department’s Northern S.T.A.R.S. Safety Village. This prestigious award represents outstanding architectural layout and design, showcasing the hard work and creativity of architects. It was established to recognize exemplary projects that are still on the board, creative conceptual work and innovative representations of projects. There are two award levels within this category: “Honor Award” for Excellence in Architecture, which is the higher of the two levels, and “Merit Award” for Excellence in Architecture. The Northern S.T.A.R.S. Safety Village design received the higher Honor Award.
### Appendix D

#### Goal 4: Upgraded City Facilities and Infrastructure

**Action:** Fire Safety Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issues</th>
<th>Milestone/Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- How do we secure funding for the Fire Safety Village?</td>
<td>- Submit an application for 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status</td>
<td>Q3 FY 11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How do we develop a business plan?</td>
<td>- Continue lobbying efforts for a Congressional appropriation</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Seek partners/volunteers from the business community to assist in the development and completion of a business plan</td>
<td>Q4 FY 11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Submit grant applications to identified funding agencies</td>
<td>Q4 FY 11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Explore and identify additional grant opportunities</td>
<td>Q4 FY 11/12 &amp; Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continue to search for and secure partnerships</td>
<td>In process/ Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continue contacting prospective donors, sponsors, organizations, and community leaders regarding funding and sponsorship opportunities</td>
<td>In process/ Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responsibility/Lead:** Kathy Pennell, Library

**Team:** Bethany Sanchez, City Attorney’s Office; Tony Scott, Police Department; Cedric Williams, Fire Department
## Appendix E

### NORTHERN STARS SAFETY VILLAGE EVALUATION
Other Identified Safety Villages

**Contact Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Safety Village</th>
<th>Primary Contact</th>
<th>Address/Phone</th>
<th>Person Contacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Safety Village of Southern Florida</td>
<td><a href="http://www.childrenssafetyvillagefl.org/contact.asp">http://www.childrenssafetyvillagefl.org/contact.asp</a></td>
<td>910 Fairvilla Road, Orlando, FL 32808 (407) 521-4673</td>
<td>Executive Director Juanita Black 06-11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Village of Washington County, MD (Hagerstown)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.childrensvillage.us/">http://www.childrensvillage.us/</a></td>
<td>1546 Mt Aetna Road, Hagerstown, MD 21742 (301) 733-4443</td>
<td>Executive Director Rochelle Morrell 06-12-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County Sheriff’s Office Safety Village</td>
<td><a href="http://www.clarkcountyohio.gov/sheriff/safetyvillage.htm">http://www.clarkcountyohio.gov/sheriff/safetyvillage.htm</a></td>
<td>3130 East Main Street, Springfield, OH 45505 (937) 521-2100</td>
<td>Sergeant Ralph Underwood 06-08-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb County Safety Village</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cobbcountyga.gov/safetyvillage/">http://www.cobbcountyga.gov/safetyvillage/</a></td>
<td>1220 Al Bishop Drive, Marietta, GA 30008 (770) 852-3270</td>
<td>Executive Director Captain Dodson 06-06-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco Fire Safety Town</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ci.frisco.tx.us/safetytown/">http://www.ci.frisco.tx.us/safetytown/</a> Pages/Contact.aspx</td>
<td>8601 Gary Burns Drive, Frisco, TX 75034 (972) 292-6350</td>
<td>Leslie Girdner Fire Safety Educator 06-06-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Village of Darien</td>
<td><a href="http://safetyvillageofdarien.org/">http://safetyvillageofdarien.org/</a></td>
<td>7400 Cass Avenue, Darien, IL 60561 (630) 968-0777</td>
<td>No Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Empire Safety Village</td>
<td><a href="http://www.safetyvillage.org/contact.php">http://www.safetyvillage.org/contact.php</a></td>
<td>PO BOX 90612, Sioux Falls, SD 57109 (605) 334-7233</td>
<td>Executive Director Dave Renli 06-04-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Town Safety Village, Inc.</td>
<td><a href="http://safetyvillage.us/who-we-are.html">http://safetyvillage.us/who-we-are.html</a></td>
<td>Town of Dyer, One Town Square, Dyer, IN 46311 (219) 865-2421</td>
<td>Executive Director Bill Jarvis 06-06-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. This appears to be a four-day program, not a dedicated facility.

---

Program Matrix
### NORTHERN STARS SAFETY VILLAGE EVALUATION

Other Identified Safety Villages

**PROGRAM MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Aspect</th>
<th>Children’s Safety Village of Southern Florida</th>
<th>Children’s Village of Washington County, MD</th>
<th>Clark County Sheriff’s Office Safety Village</th>
<th>Cobb County Safety Village</th>
<th>Frisco Fire Safety Town</th>
<th>Safety Village of Darien</th>
<th>Sioux Empire Safety Village</th>
<th>Tri-Town Safety Village</th>
<th>STARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddy System Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn Prevention</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Seat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Passenger Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracted/Impaired Driving</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Responders</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molestation Awareness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parked Car Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poison Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Aspect</td>
<td>Children’s Safety Village of Southern Florida</td>
<td>Children’s Village of Washington County, MD</td>
<td>Clark County Sheriff’s Office Safety Village</td>
<td>Cobb County Safety Village</td>
<td>Frisco Fire Safety Town</td>
<td>Safety Village of Darien</td>
<td>Sioux Empire Safety Village</td>
<td>Tri-Town Safety Village</td>
<td>STARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Road Crossing Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scooter Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat Belt Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Weather Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Falls Prevention (and other Senior classes)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting (Theft)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboards/Rollerblades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger Awareness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Telephone Survey Questions for other Safety Villages

Gawain Guedry, Marcie Jackson, and JoAnne Witter

PUA 725 – Professor Christopher Stream

Spring 2012

University of Nevada Las Vegas
Telephone Survey Questions
Presented to Other Safety Villages

1. Was there a community need that facilitated your desire to create a safety village? If so, what was it? If not, why did you create such a program?

2. What partners were involved in the development and implementation of your program, and what partners are actively involved now? What kind of support was provided (e.g., funding, instruction, facilities, staff, etc.)?

3. What barriers did you experience during the development and implementation of your program?

4. Has your organization and community benefited from the development and implementation of a safety village? If so, please describe the benefits.

5. How do you measure the impacts of your program on both the community and your students? (Note: If they don’t mention reduced service calls, directly ask them. Also ask if they have done any formal evaluation.)

6. Are you having trouble with program delivery (e.g., partnerships, financial resources, attendance, program necessity, and public perception)?

7. What funding sources did you initially utilize to develop your program, and what sources are you using now to maintain operations?

8. With all of the lessons learned, what recommendations would you give to an agency looking to develop a safety village today?
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