

2019-2020  
Safe Routes to School  
Competitive  
Infrastructure Grants

**FINAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT**

MARCH 2019

# Contents

---

Program Development.....	4
Rulemaking .....	4
Program Oversight.....	5
Oregon Secretary of State Audit.....	5
Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee .....	7
Program Guidance .....	8
Guidelines .....	8
Project Solicitation Process.....	9
Letter of Intent .....	9
Application.....	10
Application Review .....	10
Eligibility review and Empirical score .....	10
Ground Conditions Review .....	11
Advisory Committee Review.....	11
Final Recommendation.....	11
Appendices .....	12
Appendix A: Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee.....	12
Appendix B: Empirical Scoring Matrix .....	13
Appendix C: Program Guidelines 2019-2020.....	16
Appendix D: Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Competitive Grant Program Application .....	17
Part 1: General Information .....	17
Part 2: Eligibility Requirements .....	17
Part 3: Background .....	18
Part 4: Project Details and Schedule .....	20
Part 5: Project Cost and Cash Match .....	22
Part 6: Additional Information.....	23
Part 7: Attachments.....	24
Appendix E: Eligibility Matrix.....	26
Appendix F: Meeting Packets .....	28
10/24/2018 Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Meeting.....	28
12/17/2018 Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Meeting.....	28
02/12/2019 Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Meeting.....	28

2019-2020 Safe Routes to School Competitive Infrastructure Program Final Recommendation Report  
February 2019

01/17/2019 Oregon Transportation Commission Meeting: Agenda E – Approve Recommended 2019  
Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Projects.....28

Appendix G: Recommended and Approved Project List .....29

“Safe Routes to School” refers to efforts that improve, educate, or encourage children safely walking (by foot or mobility device) or bicycling to school.

This report summarizes the 2019-2020 Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Competitive Grant development and project selection process, which ran from January 30<sup>th</sup> 2018 through January 17, 2019. As this is the first selection process, it is important to memorialize the process to understand and improve the process going forward into future grant cycles.

The Program Development Section of the report describes the development of rules and guidelines leading up to the Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Competitive Grant Program. The Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Section details who and how final recommendations were made to the Oregon Transportation Commission. The Application Development and Review Sections explain the process for the first round of applications.

## Program Development

---

The Oregon Department of Transportation has two main types of Safe Routes to School programs: infrastructure and non-infrastructure. Infrastructure programs focus on making sure safe walking and biking routes exist through investments in crossings, sidewalks and bike lanes, flashing beacons, and the like. Non-Infrastructure programs focus on helping children to bike or walk to school safely through education and encouragement programs.

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), in consultation with stakeholders, developed the following organizational structure for administrative rules, application process, and review processes to implement the Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Competitive Program.

### Rulemaking

In response to 2017 Keep Oregon Moving Bill (HB 2017), ODOT formed the Safe Routes to School Rulemaking Advisory Committee to align administrative rules for the Safe Routes to School Fund with the new legislation requirements.

The Rulemaking Advisory Committee included diverse such as the League of Oregon Cities, the Oregon Transportation Safety Committee, the Safe Routes to School National Partnership and the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

The Rulemaking Advisory Committee established six values for the Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Program. The values were used to guide the development of the rules, guidelines, application and scoring for the program:

- Safety
- Health
- Maximize Resources
- Communication/Coordination/ Collaboration
- Social Equity
- Geographic Equity

The Committee met six times and held a public hearing before recommending rule language to the Oregon Transportation Commission. The Oregon Transportation Commission adopted the revised Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) [737-025](#) in June 2018. The Rule establishes how funds will be divided, and describes the overall parameters and processes.

Three grant types were established for the Infrastructure Program;

- 1) Competitive Infrastructure Grants, receiving a minimum of 87.5% of total program funding to build street safety projects and is the focus of this report;
- 2) Rapid Response Grants for urgent needs or systemic safety issues outside of the Competitive Infrastructure Grants, and receiving up to 10% of total program funding; and
- 3) A Project Identification Program to help communities identify and prioritize Safe Routes to School infrastructure projects, receiving up to 2.5% of total program funding.

The focus of this report is on the first round of Competitive Infrastructure Grants.

## Program Oversight

### Oregon Secretary of State Audit

Throughout 2018, the Oregon Secretary of State's Audits Division engaged in a real-time audit of ODOT's implementation of HB2017 requirements. The new Safe Routes to School program was part of the audit. As the audit occurred during the development of the program, recommendations were incorporated into the program before the first grant cycle was complete. These recommendations included:

- Maintaining neutrality between ODOT applications and those submitted by external partners; and
- Verifying information submitted by program applicants
- Training staff who will score and prioritize projects
- Creating and Communicating well-defined expectations and job duties for Active Transportation Liaisons
- Automating some aspects of the application process to reduce human error.

ODOT responded by establishing robust guiding policies to shape the program as it grows and matures.

### *Guiding Policies*

ODOT created the policy document [Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Funding Program: ODOT Policies and Procedures](#). The document incorporates the guiding policies developed to address the findings in the audit and to establish clear principles for the program. The policies are further described in this section and include:

- Develop and manage a fair and impartial process
- Foster equal access to the funds
- Run a transparent program
- Help ensure accountability
- Make program adjustments as needed

### *Develop and Manage a Fair and Impartial Process*

ODOT has been put in the role of both managing a funding program for cities, counties, and tribes, and also being an eligible applicant. ODOT must assure that all applications are treated fairly and that no bias is introduced when projects are selected. To accomplish this, the Agency has initiated several procedures and processes including:

- Separation of duties when submitting, scoring applications to have separation between ODOT submitted applications and external partner applications
- Training scorers to provide consistent scoring for all applications
- Automate some functions of the application to help reduce errors
- Empirical, objective scoring, which is publicly available
- Third party review and recommendations via the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee

### *Foster Equal Access to the Funds*

Prospective applicants have differing levels of capacity and ability when it comes to applying for funds. It is important that all cities, counties, tribes and ODOT know about the Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Funding Program and how to apply. To help ensure awareness, several communication strategies will be used. Communication strategies include:

- Up to date website information
- Informational flyers
- Announcements in Association of Oregon Counties and League of Oregon Cities publications
- Targeted comprehensive tribal correspondence
- Social media posts
- Presentations upon request
- Project identification consultant support for small communities through the Project Identification Program
- Online information, tutorials, webinars and responses to individual questions regarding the application process and submission

### *Run a Transparent Program*

When and how projects are selected within the Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Funding Program should be clear and understandable. To accomplish this, ODOT has sought to:

- Develop a comprehensive website
- Provide up-to-date guidance through the program guidelines
- Conduct outreach and host opportunities for public comment prior to each project solicitation cycle

### *Help Ensure Accountability*

When and how projects are selected within the Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Funding Program should be clear and understandable. Mechanisms to help ensure accountability include:

- Provide updates to the Oregon Legislature and Oregon Transportation Commission upon request, including the Infrastructure funding program, project identification processes and timelines, project status, budget outlook and performance measures results.
- Develop and monitor programmatic performance measures in consultation with the Safe Routes to School Advisory committee
- Closely manage project delivery deadlines through performance measures, readiness factors, and funding agreements
- Establish Active Transportation Liaison roles, job duties and expectations.

### *Make Program Adjustments as Needed*

Using performance measure data tracked and reported over time, as well as feedback from the public and applicants, ODOT will consult with the Advisory Committee on needed program adjustments. Implement program adjustments, within program limitations (e.g. budget, staffing, etc.) and update guidelines accordingly.

Policies created during the process to document internal ODOT processes are posted on the ODOT's Safe Routes to School website: They are:

- <https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/TDD%20Documents/SRTS-Procedures-and-Process-Policies.pdf>
- <https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/TDD%20Documents/SRTS-Procedures-and-Process-Policies-Appendices.pdf>

### **Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee**

The formation and use of a Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee was defined in the Rule. The Committee is responsible for establishing the Safe Routes to School Infrastructure application process, the review and ranking of applications, and recommendations to the Oregon Transportation Commission regarding awards.

The Committee is charged with two key tasks:

1. Providing ODOT with program guidance and developing recommendations for the Oregon Transportation Safety Committee and Oregon Transportation Commission as appropriate.
2. Setting project selection criteria and making project selection recommendations. The Oregon Transportation Safety Committee and Oregon Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee will provide input and policy direction and guidance to the committee.

The Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee was established in September 2018. The committee approved a charter that details the roles and responsibilities of the participants in the process, including a section on conflict of interest. The charter can be found on the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee website. (<https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS-SRAC.aspx>).

The Committee is comprised of 17 members (Appendix A), with representatives from different areas of expertise and geographic distribution. Members represent Oregon Department of Education, school districts, Safe Routes to School Coordinators, health and equity advocates, League of Oregon Cities, Association of Oregon Counties, tribes, small cities and more.

## Program Guidance

The Safe Routes to School Rule identified the major attributes of the program, such as who is eligible, general timing and overall evaluation criteria. In order to run the first round of Competitive Infrastructure Grants, more guidance was needed on how and when project proposals should be submitted and evaluated. Given the interest to run the program in the fall of 2018, the Rulemaking Advisory Committee provided guidance in these areas, which was later used to recommend projects by the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee.

The Rulemaking Advisory Committee prioritized project selection criteria identified in the rule, heavily favoring equity, with additional priority to projects addressing safety and readiness. Per the Rule and Statute, school type was also a priority area. Staff then used this general sense of weighting to come out with prioritization scores. The resulting Empirical Scoring Matrix was approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission. It is summarized in the below table:

<b>Empirical Scoring Matrix Summary*</b>		
<b>Priority Area</b>	<b>Categories</b>	<b>Total Possible Score</b>
Equity	Title 1 school and percentage Title 1	200
Safety	Crashes Speed Lanes or Crossing Distance	90
School Type	K-8 or any combination	90
Readiness	Elements completed or underway, such as Right of way, utility relocation, environmental, Engineering	80
Multiple School Benefit	Two or more schools affected	15
Proximity to School	½ mile or less	15
Education/Encouragement	Past, planned or current	10
<b>Total Possible Points</b>		<b>500</b>
<i>*The complete Empirical Scoring Matrix is listed in Appendix B.</i>		

The empirical matrix was published online so that prospective applicants could see how their project may score. Overall guidance was also provided, as described below.

## Guidelines

The guidelines for the Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Grants are included in Appendix C, and describe the roles and responsibilities of the major participants, establish what entities are eligible for projects, what projects are eligible, the match requirements, and the application process.

## Project Solicitation Process

---

On January 30<sup>th</sup> 2018 the 2019-2020 Safe Routes to School Competitive Infrastructure Grant project solicitation period was announced for July-October 2018. The total amount available was \$16 million.

Six outreach events were held between June and August 2018 to notify cities, counties, tribes and others of the available Safe Routes to School Competitive Infrastructure Grant funding and project selection process. ODOT Headquarters established schedules and workshops in each of the five ODOT regions, plus one webinar to communicate and educate locals about the upcoming SRTS funding opportunity. The purpose was to educate potential applicants on the program and the process for applying for grant funding. The first workshop was held on June 18, 2018. Nearly 300 participants attended the workshops and 120 participated in the webinar.

A two-step process was identified for applying on projects, including a Letter of Intent and formal Application. Based on stakeholder feedback at the advisory committee meetings, ODOT staff streamlined the application and application instructions into online forms. Application materials and program guidelines were posted on ODOT's website (<https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS-SRAC.aspx>) under Competitive Grant Program-How to Apply section.

### Letter of Intent

Eligible applicants submitted a Letter of Intent for projects meeting Safe Routes to School requirements. The purpose of the Letter of Intent is to:

- provide basic information regarding eligibility of the proposed project
- allow the Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Program Manager to gauge how many applicants will apply for the current round of funding
- allocate adequate staffing resources for effective application review and scoring.

One hundred forty three Letters of Intent, totaling over \$100 million, were submitted by August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2018. The Program Manager (ODOT headquarters) determined eligibility, and for eligible projects, sent a packet of relevant letters to the ODOT Regional staff. The regional staff, Active Transportation Liaisons (ATLs) reviewed the packets, and as local area experts, identified eligibility issues, specific areas of concern or other potential issues regarding the intended projects and notified the Program Manager of those concerns.

On September 10<sup>th</sup> 2018, applicants who submitted eligible Letters of Intent were invited to submit formal applications due by October 15<sup>th</sup> 2018. A sample of the application is provided in Appendix D.

For those letters determined ineligible, the ODOT staff worked with the applicants to help make the project eligible, or to help the applicant develop an alternative project application within the October 15<sup>th</sup> deadline.

## Application

Project applications for the first cycle were due on October 15, 2018. ODOT received 112 eligible applications for 206 project locations, and totaling \$85 million. Applications were then reviewed using the process described below.

## Application Review

---

The following five step process was used to review applications and recommend projects:

1. Eligibility review and empirical score
2. Grounds Conditions Review
3. Advisory Committee Review
4. Final recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission

### Eligibility review and Empirical score

Once all 112 project applications were received, five staff members from ODOT headquarters reviewed all applications for completeness, administrative eligibility, and technical feasibility.

Headquarters Staff communicated with applicants to clarify specific information contained in the applications. The completeness, eligibility, and feasibility reviews were completed in November 2018. Based on these assessments, 19 applications were edited by the applicant and all eligibility concerns were addressed.

Staff provided feedback to three applicants that requested funding for budget line items that would primarily be used by automobiles and not by pedestrians and bicyclists. Two applicants updated their applications to remove the budget line items and amended their scope and one did not.

As staff completed the eligibility review, empirical scores were given to applications based on the Empirical Scoring Matrix (see table under Program Guidance).

All 112 applications were scored using the same Empirical Scoring Matrix by one of five ODOT headquarters staff trained on the scoring technique. All 112 applicants remained eligible for funding. Projects were scored and tiered at 200% of eligible funding, 150% of eligible funding, and 100% of eligible funding.

Forty-Two (42) projects were included in the 200% list with requests adding up to approximately \$32 million.

Thirty-Five (35) projects were included in the 150% list with requests adding up to \$24 million

The eligibility matrix is included in Appendix E, and lists all projects alphabetically in each tier (100%, 150% and 200%) after scoring.

## Ground Conditions Review

The 200% list was provided to region staff (ATLs) on October 24<sup>th</sup> 2018 for onsite assessments, if necessary. ODOT Staff focused on completing ground conditions review for the top 200% list of applications based on the empirical score.

Regional ODOT Staff (ATLs) reviewed project from local entities. ODOT Headquarters staff reviewed applications from ODOT. Staff specifically reviewed project details listed in the application in relation to the actual ground conditions ascertained through on-line or in-person observations. No applicants were removed for consideration during this review.

## Advisory Committee Review

Committee members were given the list of applicants, empirical scores, and all application materials for review at their October 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting. Members were asked to review the materials and suggest additional filters that could be applied to all applications and be used to further reach committee goals, particularly around social equity and geographic balance.

Comments were gathered from members prior to the meeting and staff compiled a presentation of the material (Appendix F). The Committee discussion resulted in a recommended prioritized projects list. Throughout the workshop, committee members used the opportunity to respond to the different scenarios presented and created during the meeting.

Committee members identified concerns around entities receiving a large portion of the funding and making sure that small communities were able to compete. Some committee members suggested a lens<sup>1</sup> that addressed these issues. The proposed lens was to limit each applicant to one award. When this lens was implemented and some applicants were limited to one project, the committee chose to fund the project that was ranked highest by the applicant and that fell above the funding cut line. The discussion was captured in the meeting notes (Appendix F).

## Final Recommendation

On December 17, 2018, the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee met to discuss and recommend \$16M in infrastructure projects to the Oregon Transportation Commission. Through the process identified in this section, the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee unanimously supported the projects on the recommended list that was submitted to the Oregon Transportation Commission and approved on January 17, 2019. The list includes 24 projects from across the state (Appendix G).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Safe Routes to School Advisory defined a lens as a filter that can be applied to applicants based on the information provided in the application.

# Appendices

---

## Appendix A: Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee

Scott Bohl, Program Analyst,  
Oregon Department of Education Pupil Transportation

Dana Nichols, City Planner,  
City of Bandon

Anthony Buczek, Traffic Engineer,  
Metro

Luis Ornelas,  
Oregon Transportation Safety Committee Co-chair

Sonny Chickering,  
ODOT Region 2 Manager

Kari Schlosshauer, Policy Manger,  
Safe Routes to School National Partnership

Kim Crabtree, Director of Transportation,  
Bend-La Pine School District

Brian Potwin, Active Transportation Manager,  
Commute Options

Steve Dickey, Director of Transportation Development,  
Salem-Keizer Transit

Mychal Tetteh, Fixing Our Streets Program Manager,  
City of Portland

Laughton Elliot-Deangelis, Safe Routes to School  
Coordinator, Springfield School District

Leticia Valle, Community Program Manager,  
Blue Zones in Hood River

Jonetta Everano, Public Works Director,  
Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation

Corporal Tom Venables, Special Services,  
Medford Police Department

Mavis Hartz,  
Oregon Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

John Vial,  
Director, Jackson County Roads

Rob Inerfeld, Transportation Planning Manager,  
City of Eugene Public Works

## Appendix B: Empirical Scoring Matrix

Priority Area	Categories	Sub-categories	Score for each sub-category	Total score possible in each category	Notes
Equity	Title I school		160	200	Title I schools will automatically get 160 points then get additional points for higher percentages of students who receive free/reduced lunch.  OAR 737-025-0095(1)(b)(C)
	Title I school percent	41-60%	10		
		61-80%	20		
		81-100%	40		
Readiness	Right of Way <sup>2</sup>	started: 0.5 credit completed/mitigated: 1 credit (total credits = score)	1 = 0	80	Scoring will be assessed based on the total number of risk factors addressed. A project with no risk factors will get 80 points. There are six categories of risk. All six categories must be completed/ mitigated (or N/A) to get 80 points. Partial completion/mitigation will earn a project half a credit for addressing the risk. The total number of credits for addressing risks dictates the score. OAR 737-025-0092(1)(d)(B)
	Utilities <sup>3</sup>		2 = 0		
	Storm water <sup>4</sup>		3 = 20		

<sup>2</sup> Example: 1 credit if the applicant or the agency delivering the project owns the ROW or have an easement; .5 credit if they are in the process of figuring it out; 0 credit if they don't know if they own the ROW.

<sup>3</sup> Example: 1 credit if they don't need to move utilities or if they have figured out all of the details; .5 credit if they know it's an issue but hasn't figured it out yet; 0 credit if they don't know

<sup>4</sup> Example: 1 credit if they don't need to address storm water or if they have figured out all of the details; .5 credit if they know it's an issue but hasn't figured it out yet; 0 credit if they don't know

	Environmental <sup>5</sup>		4 = 30		
	Public Process <sup>6</sup>		5 = 70		
	Design <sup>7</sup>		6 = 80		
Safety	Crashes	Non-serious injury or fatal <sup>8</sup>	5	90	<p>Projects that are on a Priority Safety Corridor (PSC) will receive 50 points then get additional points for the aspects of PSC that they have. All projects will receive points for including any aspects of a PSC, in accordance with the scores shown.</p> <p>OAR 737-025-0092(1)(b)(A)</p>
		Serious injury or fatal	10		
	Speed	30 mph <sup>9</sup>	5		
		35 mph +	10		
	Lanes or crossing distance	3 lanes, or greater than 30 feet	5		
		4 lanes + or greater than 40ft crossing	10		
	Average Annual Daily Traffic	3000-5,999	5		
		6000+	10		
Priority Safety Corridor		50			

<sup>5</sup> Example: 1 credit if the don't need to address environmental or if they have figured out all of the details; .5 credit if they know it's an issue but hasn't figured it out yet; 0 credit if they don't know

<sup>6</sup> Example: 1 credit if they have completed public process or have done due diligence; .5 if they have done outreach but it was a long time ago or not relevant for the scope or if design is not complete; 0 credit for no outreach

<sup>7</sup> Example: 1 credit if they have attached design documents; .5 credits if they are started design or have attached conceptual design; 0 credit if they have not started design.

<sup>8</sup> Example: If they mention crashes, they get points.

<sup>9</sup> Use 85th percentile if listed, if not, use posted speed

Multiple School Benefit	two or more schools affected		15	15	OAR 737-025-0095(1)(b)(C)
Proximity to School	1/2 mile or less		15	15	OAR 737-025-0092(1)(c)(B)
School Type	K-8 or any combo		90	90	OAR 737-025-0092(1)(c)(A)
Education / Encouragement	Past programming		5	10	Education and Encouragement programming at the school will gain points for the projects depending if the programs are in the past, present, or planned. OAR 737-025-0092(1)(c)(C)
	Planned programming		8		
	Current programming		10		
TOTAL				500	

## Appendix C: Program Guidelines 2019-2020

<https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/TDD%20Documents/SRTS-Infrastructure-Program-Guidelines.pdf>

# Appendix D: Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Competitive Grant Program Application

## Part 1: General Information

- Applicant Contact Information
  - Name:
  - Title:
  - Agency:
  - Phone:
  - Email:
- Roadway Authority Information (if different than applicant)
  - Contact's Name Title:
  - Agency Phone:
  - Email:
- Will applicant oversee design and construction of the project? Y/N
- If no, list agency who will oversee design and construction of the project and explain why: Maximum 750 characters.
- Is the applicant submitting more than one application? Y/N
- If yes, rank this application: Example: 1 of 4 (1 being highest priority)

## Part 2: Eligibility Requirements

- Did the applicant submit a Letter of Intent? Y/N
- Is the project within a one-mile radius of a public school? Y/N
  - Optional tool: Use map generated from the Safe Routes to School Web Application, <https://geo.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=33d00a3d7181433d85abfce78b8ae879>.
- Is the project in or aligned with a plan that meets the requirements of ORS 195-115? Y/N
  - Tool: ORS 195.115 (<https://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/195.115>), OAR 737-025-0060 (<https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/displayDivisionRules.action?selectedDivision=3453>)
- List the plan, the date adopted or completed, and how the project is aligned with the plan:
  - Maximum 250 characters. Example: Name of Plan, Date Adopted/Completed
- Is the project supported by the school or school district? Y/N
  - You are required to include a letter of support from the school or school district as an attachment in Part 7.

- Is the project in the public road right of way or will the project widen the road right of way to include your project? Y/N
- Does your project reduce barriers and hazards to children walking or bicycling to and from school? Y/N

*If you answered yes to the above questions, please continue.*

## Part 3: Background

Information can be provided for one project or a bundle of projects if applicable.

- Provide a high-level PROBLEM statement that describes the barriers of children walking or bicycling to school. Provide a summary of the problem in a concise manner that can be used on a website or publication.
  - Note: Maximum 250 characters.
- Provide a high-level description of your PROJECT. Project should be a viable solution to the above problem. Provide a summary of the project in a concise manner that can be used on a website or publication.
  - Note: Maximum 250 characters.
- Additional Problem/Project Description: Describe any further details about the problem, the project, and how this project will help remove barriers for children walking and bicycling to the primarily affected school:
  - Note: Maximum 750 characters.
- Is the project located in a city with 5,000 people or fewer? Y/N
- Is the project primarily serving students at a Title I school (40% or more students receiving free and reduced lunch)? Y/N
  - Tool: Find percentage of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch, <https://www.ode.state.or.us/sfda/reports/r0061Select.asp>
  - If yes, what percentage of children that attend the primarily affected school is eligible to receive free and reduced price meals?
- Describe the status/progress to date of school engagement for this project.
  - Note: Maximum 750 characters.
- Does the applicant own the right of way (ROW)? Y/N/I don't know
  - Note: An easement can count as owning sufficient ROW in this instance.
  - If, no
    - Does the ROW need to be acquired? Y/N
    - Who owns the right of way? Maximum 250 characters.
    - Does the ROW owner concur with your project request? Y/N
      - If the applicant answered No or I don't know, describe why: Maximum 250 characters.
- Who will maintain the improvements once the project is completed, including landscaping?
- Will any utilities need to be relocated? Y/N/I don't know
  - Examples of utilities include water, gas, electric, etc.
  - If yes, please list and explain how you plan to mitigate: Maximum 750 characters.

- Describe how your project impacts storm water drainage.
  - Note: Maximum 750 characters. Include information like if you will be adding or relocating curb and gutter.
- For the next two questions, see the following links for further assistance with environmental resources or hazards: Local Agency Guidelines Manual – Environmental Chapter 05 (<https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/LocalGov/Pages/LAG-Manual.aspx>), ODOT GeoEnvironmental (<https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/GeoEnvironmental/pages/index.aspx>)
  - Are there any environmental resources within or adjacent to the project area? Y/N/I don't know
    - Examples: Wetlands and waterways, endangered species (fish, plants and wild life), water quality and quantity (storm water), flood plains, historic structures, and archaeological sites.
    - If yes, please list and explain how you plan to mitigate: Maximum 750 characters.
  - Are there any environmental hazards within or adjacent to the project area? Y/N/I don't know
    - Examples include but are not limited to: Hazardous waste sites/materials, and geologically unstable slopes.
    - If yes, please list and explain how you plan to mitigate: Maximum 750 characters.
- Briefly describe public outreach process around this project to date.
  - Note: Maximum 750 characters.
- Identify any concerns that have been raised in the public outreach process or that you anticipate being raised and how you anticipate addressing these issues.
  - Note: Maximum 750 characters.
- Is additional public outreach process necessary?
  - If yes, describe: Maximum 750 characters.
- Is the proposed project included in a larger project?
  - Note: Safe Routes to School dollars may not be used to supplement funding on a project that already triggers [ADA facility requirements](#) or [ORS 366.514](#) requirements. ADA, walkway and bikeway enhancements that go beyond minimum requirements are eligible.
  - If yes, describe larger project and funding sources:
- Describe any design work started or completed on the project? Maximum 750 characters.
  - Note: Maximum 750 characters. Example: Not started yet, started but not complete, or completed. Attach draft or completed designs in Part 7.
- Does the project include a railroad crossing or is it within 500 feet of one? Y/N
  - If yes, do the railroad company and the ODOT Rail Crossing Safety Unit concur with the project request?
- Are any bridges, tunnels, retaining walls or other structures required? Y/N
  - If yes, describe: Maximum 750 characters.

## Part 4: Project Details and Schedule

- List the proposed improvements/countermeasures/methods and location to provide a detailed project description. Use the format below. Applicants may add multiple locations.

Location Information: Applicants can choose to list more than one location though a drop down menu. Applicants will provide the below information for each location.

### Location 1

- Latitude:
  - Example: 45.456. Optional: Use map generated from the Safe Routes to School Web Application to determine latitude and longitude, <https://geo.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=33d00a3d7181433d85abfce78b8ae879>.
- Longitude:
  - Example: -123.123. Optional: Use map generated from the Safe Routes to School Web Application to determine latitude and longitude, <https://geo.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=33d00a3d7181433d85abfce78b8ae879>.
- Name of street, road or highway on which the project is located:
- Cross street or other reference point (include state highway milepost begin/end if applicable):
- Project length in feet:
- Which side of the street is the project located?
  - Example: Both, North, South, East, West
- Is there a history of school-related crashes at this location that this project would address?
  - Example: Crashes on or very near a route that students generally take to school.
  - If yes, describe and include number of crashes and if crashes were non-serious, serious injury, or fatal:
    - Note: Maximum 750 characters.
  - At the proposed project location what is the:
    - Note: Below questions use a drop menu that includes: less than 25 mph, 25 mph, 30 mph, 35 mph, 40 or greater
    - Posted travel speed (mph)?
    - Optional: Posted travel speed (mph)?
    - Optional: Operating speed (85th percentile) (mph)?
    - Optional: Operating speed (85th percentile) (mph)?
    - Optional: Desired speed (the target speed) (mph)?
    - Optional: Desired speed (the target speed) (mph)?
- What are the number of travel lanes and the crossing width of the road? Example: 2 lanes, 35 feet
- At the project location(s) what is the average annual daily traffic (AADT)?
  - Note: This question uses a drop menu that includes: 3,000-5,999, 6000 - 8,999, 9,000 - 10,999, 11,000 - 11,999, ≥ 12,000

Improvement Descriptions: Applicants can choose to list more than one improvement. Applicants will provide the below information for each improvement.

- Description of Improvement: Example: Rapid Flashing Beacon or Sidewalk
- What are the current crossing accommodations at the proposed project location(s) and how many are there?
  - Note: This question uses a drop menu that includes: None; Marked crosswalks; Marked crosswalks, plus traffic calming, Crossing guard or student safety patrol; Stop sign, traffic signal, flashing beacons

Priority Safety Corridor: In order to qualify as a Priority Safety Corridor at least one of the projects must be located on a road where the posted speed or 85th percentile speed of traffic is 40 miles per hour or greater OR if any two of the following apply:

- ✓ Posted speed limit 30 miles per hour or greater;
- ✓ More than 2 lanes or a crossing distance greater than 30 feet;
- ✓ 12,000 or greater annual average daily traffic;
- ✓ Has a demonstrated history of crashes related to school traffic.

More information can be found in the [Program Guidelines](#).

- Does your project qualify as a Priority Safety Corridor? If you have multiple projects, does at least one of your projects qualify as a Priority Safety Corridor?

Project Schedule

Provide a project schedule using the applicable phases below. Program anticipates awarding grants in spring of 2019. Make sure to include Scoping and Planning and other mandatory phases. Note: Projects must start construction within 2 years of signed agreement and be completed within 5 years of signed agreement.

Scoping and Planning (mandatory):	Phase Completed in X weeks after Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) is executed, or date if already completed
Permits (if applicable)	Phase Completed in X weeks after IGA is executed, or date if already completed
Right-of-way and Land Acquisition (if applicable)	Phase Completed in X weeks after IGA is executed, or date if already completed
Community Outreach/Engagement (mandatory)	Phase Completed in X weeks after IGA is executed, or date if already completed
Final Plans/Bidding Engineering Documents (mandatory)	Phase Completed in X weeks after IGA is executed, or date if already completed
Construction Contract Award (if applicable)	Phase Completed in X weeks after IGA is executed, or date if already completed

Utilities Relocation (if applicable)	Phase Completed in X weeks after IGA is executed, or date if already completed
Project Completion (mandatory)	Phase Completed in X weeks after IGA is executed, or date if already completed

## Part 5: Project Cost and Cash Match

### Project Cost and Funding Request

Provide a cost estimate. Note that any cost overages are the responsibility of the applicant. Note: Applicants are encouraged to include accurate cost estimates. Make sure to include all of the appropriate drop-down fields in your cost estimate. Attach back up for project cost estimates in Section 7.

Item	Item Cost Estimate
Right of Way Costs	Provide estimate
Preliminary Engineering/Design Costs	Provide estimate
Utility Costs	Provide estimate
Construction Costs	Provide estimate
Other Costs	Provide estimate
Total Project Cost	Provide estimate

- Grant Award Request:
  - Note: Minimum grant request is \$60,000 and maximum grant request is \$2 million.
- Recipient Match:
  - Note: Minimum 20% cash match

Note: The sum of the Grant Award Request and Recipient Match should equal the total cost of the project.

### Cash Match

"Cash Match" is actual funds provided by the applicant that are reasonable, necessary and directly related to the project and funded by the applicant. Cash match shall include project expenditures made within 24 months prior to the application deadline. Education and outreach efforts at the school do not constitute cash match. Examples of "cash match" include engineering, design, utility, right of way, and construction costs. Program match requirement is 40%. See Program Guidelines (<https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.aspx#CompetitiveGrantDescrip>) to determine if your project may be eligible for a reduced match of 20%.

- Percent Cash Match:
  - Note: Certain projects may be eligible for a reduced match from 40% to 20%.
- Source of Match:

- Note: If Federal funds are used a Cash Match, make sure to include potential side-effects in your timeline and cost.
- Does the applicant intend to use any prior work as cash match?
  - Describe any prior work:
    - Maximum 250 characters. Be sure to indicate how the work is part of the same project and within the public road right of way.
  - Was the prior work completed within 2 years of the application deadline?
    - If you answered no, the match is not eligible.
  - If yes, how much of the prior work do you intend to count as match? Maximum 50 characters.
  - If yes, describe how the prior work is part of the project: Maximum 250 characters.

Licensed Engineer Review Confirmation: Confirm that a licensed engineer has reviewed your cost estimates and scope by providing contact information.

- Licensed Engineer Name:
- Agency/Employer
- Email
- Phone

## Part 6: Additional Information

The following information may be used by the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee to help prioritize your project.

Primarily Affected School Information: Applicants can choose to list more than one school. Applicants will provide the below information for each school.

### School 1

- School Name
- Contact's Name
- Title
- Phone
- Email
- How far from the school is the project? Example: 0.25 mile
- What grades are taught at the school? Example: K-8
- Describe past, present, or upcoming Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure programs at the school or school district. Safe Routes to School programs includes education, encouragement, and evaluation activities that reduce barriers to children walking and bicycling to school.
  - Note: Maximum 750 characters. Example: Describe the goals laid out in the affected school or school district Safe Routes to School Action Plan and what has been accomplished to date.
- Select an option that best describes the barrier for walking and bicycling to this school: Example: There is a list of option to determine how passable the barrier is.

- Note: This question uses a drop menu that includes: Barrier or gap is passable for school-age users with mobility limitations; Barrier or gap is passable for school-age users with considerable mobility and safety limitations; Barrier or gap is impassable for most school-age users; Other.
- Describe why you selected this barrier description: Maximum 750 characters
- Is the project located within the boundary of a Metropolitan Planning Organization or Transportation Management Association? Y/N
  - Optional resource: Metropolitan Planning Organization Database, <https://www.planning.dot.gov/mpo.asp>

Program Evaluation The following information is helpful data for overall program evaluation.

- Does this project address a need in the supplemental busing plan (also known as a hazard busing plan) for the school district? Y/N/ I don't know
  - If yes, describe: Maximum 750 characters.
- Does the community count and collect the number of children that get to the affected school by the following modes: Walking, Biking; Family Vehicle; Other? Y/N/ I don't know
  - If yes, provide the latest counts, the date and the method of data collection or indicate that you will upload the latest counts in Part 7: Maximum 750 characters.
- Does your community collect and document parent, student, and/or school staff's safety concerns about the project area or larger school one-mile radius? Y/N/ I don't know
  - If yes, provide the latest quantitative or qualitative data or other information, and the date and the method of gathering input, or indicate that you will upload the latest counts in Part 7: Maximum 750 characters.

## Part 7: Attachments

- Cost estimate: Attach the notes or back up information for how you determined your cost estimate.
- Photos: Attach photos of the project area
- Letter of School Support: Applicants are required to submit a letter of support from the affected school or school district on school or district letterhead and signed by the district superintendent or school principal.
- Project location map, scale bar, north arrow, street labels, aerial photograph of map.
  - Optional: Use map generated from the Safe Routes to School Web Application, <https://geo.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=33d00a3d7181433d85abfce78b8ae879>.
- Completed Signature Sheet(s)
  - <https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.aspx#HowToApply>
- Optional: Attach draft or completed design (see Part 3)
- Optional: Any additional letters of support
- Optional: Attach a map of the school's identified walking and bicycling routes to school
- Optional: Data Counts (see Part 6)
- Optional: Any additional information

Disclaimer: Since this is the first application cycle for the Safe Routes to School Competitive Infrastructure Program, contact LeeAnne Ferguson, 503-986-5805, if you have any comments or concerns about the application or have an inability to provide required information.

## Appendix E: Eligibility Matrix

### How to read the empirical score chart:

All of the Tier 1 applications are listed first alphabetically, followed by Tier 2, then Tier 3. \$16 million was available to allocate during the 2019-2020 Competitive Grant Program.

Tier 1 (Light Blue) means the project score was equal to or greater than 419  
This is the 150% list based on score the projects that add up to \$24 million maximum  
Light Blue means the project score was 465-420. This is the 150% list based on score the projects that add up to \$24 million maximum

Tier 2 (Green) means the project score was between 411 and 419. This is the 200% list based on score the projects that add up to \$32 million maximum

Tier 3 (light yellow) means the project score was 410 or below

Application Number	Name of Applicant	Tier	Application Number	Name of Applicant	Tier
72	City of Albany	1	123	Clackamas County	1
102	City of Coos Bay	1	113	Clackamas County	1
69	City of Cottage Grove	1	116	Clackamas County	1
157	City of Eugene	1	121	Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation	1
48	City of Florence	1	40	Coos County	1
94	City of Forest Grove	1	41	Deschutes County	1
46	City of Gaston	1	85	Douglas County	1
161	City of La Grande	1	87	Josephine County	1
45	City of Madras	1	101	Milton-Freewater	1
127	City of Medford	1	77	Multnomah County	1
89	City of Mill City	1	151	ODOT Region 1	1
164	City of Milwaukie	1	134	ODOT Region 2	1
137	City of Milwaukie	1	99	ODOT Region 3	1
55	City of Portland	1	109	ODOT Region 5	1
98	City of Portland	1	78	ODOT Region 5	1
111	City of Salem	1	91	ODOT Region 5	1
96	City of Salem	1	145	Polk County	1
52	City of St. Helens	1			

43	City of Bend	2
37	City of Brookings	2
117	City of Gresham	2
125	City of Shady Cove	2

126	Klamath County	2
106	Lane County	2
149	Washington County	2

131	Benton County	3
-----	---------------	---

83	City of Salem	3
----	---------------	---

130	City of Adrian	3
86	City of Albany	3
166	City of Amity	3
61	City of Ashland	3
35	City of Beaverton	3
54	City of Condon	3
88	City of Corvallis	3
62	City of Creswell	3
144	City of Dayton	3
159	City of Dufur	3
160	City of Eagle Point	3
104	City of Elgin	3
100	City of Estacada	3
28	City of Grants Pass	3
81	City of Harrisburg	3
110	City of Hermiston	3
124	City of Hillsboro	3
50	City of Hood River	3
65	City of Irrigon	3
132	City of Keizer	3
129	City of Keizer	3
39	City of King City	3
148	City of Klamath Falls	3
71	City of Lincoln City	3
92	City of Monroe	3
162	City of Mosier	3
42	City of Newberg	3
158	City of Ontario	3
169	City of Pendleton	3
168	City of Pendleton	3
97	City of Portland	3
74	City of Redmond	3
142	City of Rivergrove	3
119	City of Roseburg	3

146	City of Silverton	3
154	City of Silverton	3
36	City of Springfield	3
139	City of Stayton	3
79	City of Sutherlin	3
51	City of Sweet Home	3
90	City of the Dalles	3
80	City of Tigard	3
66	City of Tillamook	3
115	City of Tualatin	3
95	City of Turner	3
156	City of Veneta	3
58	City of Waldport	3
93	City of Westin	3
114	City of Yamhill	3
108	Lane County	3
122	Lane County	3
103	Lane County	3
59	Linn County	3
150	Marion County	3
163	Marion County	3
155	Marion County	3
165	Marion County	3
112	Multnomah County	3
53	ODOT Region 4	3
152	ODOT Region 1	3
153	ODOT Region 1	3
141	ODOT Region 1	3
140	ODOT Region 1	3
49	ODOT Region 4	3
56	ODOT Region 4	3
57	ODOT Region 4	3
133	Washington County	3
136	Washington County	3

## Appendix F: Meeting Packets

10/24/2018 Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Meeting

<https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/TDD%20Documents/10.24.18-SRAC-Meeting-Packet.pdf>

12/17/2018 Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Meeting

<https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/TDD%20Documents/SRAC-12-2018-Packet.pdf>

02/12/2019 Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Meeting

<https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/TDD%20Documents/02.12.19-SRAC-Meeting-Packet.pdf>

01/17/2019 Oregon Transportation Commission Meeting: Agenda E –  
Approve Recommended 2019 Safe Routes to School Infrastructure  
Projects

[https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Get-](https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Get-Involved/OTCSupportMaterials/Agenda_E_Safe_Routes_For_School_Ltr.pdf)

[Involved/OTCSupportMaterials/Agenda\\_E\\_Safe\\_Routes\\_For\\_School\\_Ltr.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Get-Involved/OTCSupportMaterials/Agenda_E_Safe_Routes_For_School_Ltr.pdf)

## Appendix G: Recommended and Approved Project List

Region	Applicant Agency	Project Name	Grant Award Request	Request Match Reduction to 20%
5	ODOT Region 5	Sidewalk and ramps for Grant Union Junior High School	\$1,136,000	no
5	City of Milton-Freewater	Crosswalks and sidewalks for Gib Olinger Elementary School	\$249,599	yes
5	City of La Grande	Sidewalks and ramps for Central Elementary School	\$140,000	yes
<b>Region Sub-Total</b>			<b>\$1,525,598</b>	
4	Deschutes County	Sidewalks for Terrebonne Elementary School	\$349,271	yes
4	City of Madras	Sidewalks and ramps for Madras Elementary School	\$212,000	yes
<b>Region Sub-Total</b>			<b>\$56,271</b>	
3	ODOT Region 3	Rapid Flashing Beacon and Pedestrian Refuge Island for North Bend Middle School	\$97,400	no
3	Josephine County	Sidewalks for Williams Elementary School	\$154,000	yes
3	Douglas County	Sidewalks and Bike Lanes for Green elementary School	\$2,000,000	no
3	Coos County	Sidewalks, curb ramps and bike lanes for Winter Lakes Elementary School	\$1,499,034	yes
3	City of Medford	Sidewalks, ramps and safety enhancements at crosswalks for Wilson and Washington Elementary Schools	\$208,000	yes
3	City of Coos Bay	Sidewalk, ramps, crosswalk, rapid flashing beacon and bike lanes for Millicoma and Eastside Elementary Schools	\$2,000,000	no
<b>Region Sub Total</b>			<b>\$5,958,434</b>	
2	Polk County	Bike Lanes and crossing enhancements for Ash Creek Elementary School	\$704,400	yes