Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee (SRAC)
May 29, 2019
12:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.
Location: Chemeketa Center for Business and Industry,
626 High St NE, Salem, OR 97301

SRAC Members: Scott Bohl, Anthony Buczek, Sonny Chickering, Kim Crabtree, Laughton Elliot-Deangelis, Steve Dickey, Mavis Hart, Rob Inerfeld, Dana Nichols, Luis Ornelas, Brian Potwin, Kari Schlosshauer, Leticia Valle, Tom Venables, John Vial, JD Tovey, Lisa Mielke

ODOT Staff: LeeAnne Fergason, Heidi Manlove, Amanda Pietz, Susan Peithman, Tami Weil, Traci Pearl, Alan Thompson

Facilitator: Chris Watchie, Cogito

Join by web option: Join through Skype, https://meet.lync.com/odot.state.or.us/leeanne.fergason/PMK4MVMD?sl=1, do not join the skype audio, then call-in at 1-888-251-2909; 868544. Please notify leeanne.fergason@odot.state.or.us if you are skyping in and join 15 minutes before the meeting (11:45 a.m.) so we can address any technical issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Facilitator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Welcome to the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Mavis/Kari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>Overview of the day (agenda review) Meeting Summary approval (call for vote)</td>
<td>Chris Watchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>Chris Watchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>Guiding Principles (call for vote)</td>
<td>Mavis/Kari/Mychal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>Rapid Response Program Guidelines update from Subcommittee</td>
<td>LeeAnne Fergason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>PIP Application and Scoring review</td>
<td>LeeAnne Fergason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>Non-Infrastructure Application and Scoring review</td>
<td>Heidi Manlove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45</td>
<td>Next steps (for staff) and homework (for SRAC)</td>
<td>LeeAnne Fergason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:50</td>
<td>SRAC Check In</td>
<td>Mavis/Kari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next meetings:**
July 9, 2019
October 21, 2019
Welcome
## Committee Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kari Schlosshauer (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.D. Tovey</td>
<td>Pendleton</td>
<td>Oregon Tribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mavis Hartz (Chair)</td>
<td>La Grande</td>
<td>Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Venables</td>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Potwin</td>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>SRTS practitioner and SRTS Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Crabtree</td>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>School district and pupil transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vial (RR)</td>
<td>Jackson County</td>
<td>County representative from Association of Oregon Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Nichols</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Small city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Inerfeld</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>City representative from League of Oregon Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughton Elliot-Deangelis (RR)</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>School district, SRTS practitioner, pupil transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Bohl</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Dickey</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Ornelas</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Oregon Transportation Safety Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Buczek (RR)</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leticia Valle</td>
<td>Hood River</td>
<td>Health and equity representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonny Chickering</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>ODOT representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mychal Tetteh</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Equity and Safe Routes to School Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Mielke</td>
<td>Coos Bay</td>
<td>Oregon Tribes, health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TODAY’S KEY CHARGE

Understand the scoring matrix and SRAC review process for the Non-Infrastructure (education and encouragement) grants and Project Identification Program to prepare for our workshop to recommend investments in July.
Overview

Notes, Charter, Updates

Public Comment

Guiding Principles

Rapid Response Grant Program Update

Review Process Overview

Homework
I am fully supportive of this decision or choice.

While I may not be fully supportive of this decision or choice, I can live with it and I will not oppose it.

I oppose this decision or choice and need more discussion.
What has happened since our last meeting?

- **Feb: SRAC Meeting**
  - Survey results
  - See SRAC notes

- **March: OTSC**
  - Staff learned more accurate decision tree
  - OTSC decision differed from SRAC recommendation

- **April: OTSC Mavis presentation**
  - Focus on leveraging, safety, and alignment of goals

**Result:**

- **PIP Leverage**
  - No Non-IN investment for IN projects
DECISION TREE:
SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL GRANTS

**Infrastructure Grants**
- Per HB 2017 funding available annually

**Non-Infrastructure Grants**
- OTC delegates
  - Authority to TSD annually
  - Funding in 3 year cycles

**SRAC makes** INFRASTRUCURE recommendations in consultation with OTSC and OBPAC.

**OTC Decision**

**Grantees Build**

**SRAC makes** NON-INFRASTRUCTURE recommendations in consultation with OTSC and OBPAC.

**OTSC Decision**

**Grantees Educate**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair/Vice Chair</th>
<th>2-year terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review meeting agenda &amp; provide ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start and close meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome SRAC members’ ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand subcommittee work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Guiding Principles annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represent SRAC at OTSC, OBPAC, OTC, etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Competitive Grant Program Projects
Update

1. Funding 22%
   Applicant Projects 17%

2. Funding 27%
   Applicant Projects 37.5%

3. Funding 38%
   Applicant Projects 25%

4. Funding 3%
   Applicant Projects 8%

5. Funding 10%
   Applicant Projects 12.5%
Public Comment

• 3 minutes for each person providing comments
Guiding Principles (GP): How we got here...

1. Rulemaking Advisory Committee (RAC) discussion about GP
2. RAC deliberation and agreement on GP
3. Write Rule using GP
4. Form SRTS Advisory Committee (SRAC)
5. Use RAC Guiding Principles for 2018 Infrastructure Recommendation
6. SRAC Discussion about GP
7. Gather SRAC feedback
8. Chair and Vice Chair with support from Mychal update
9. SRAC vote to adopt GP!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Principles Updates</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Equity</strong></td>
<td>Historically marginalized communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand and address barriers with community based best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Balance</strong></td>
<td><em>Equity</em> change to <em>Balance</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure rural and small communities can participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td>All ages and abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address Vision Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Address health equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutionalize walking/biking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication, Coordination,</strong></td>
<td>Projects aligned internally and externally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Collaboration</strong></td>
<td>Technical support provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparent process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximize Resources</strong></td>
<td>Planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leverage IN and Non-IN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rapid Response (RR) Update
Infrastructure Programs: 10M/annually

- Competitive
- Rapid Response
- Project Identification

**RR**

Up to 10% of funds will be used for urgent needs or systemic safety issues.
1. Rulemaking Advisory Committee (RAC) split funding

2. Write Rule

3. Form SRTS Advisory Committee (SRAC)

4. SRAC create RR Subcommittee

5. Subcommittee determine same priorities as Competitive

6. Subcommittee determine project eligibility

7. Subcommittee determine recommendation process

8. Guidelines to OBPAC and SRAC

9. June 1- Program Launch!
Subcommittee Discussions and Decisions

Discussions
- Eligibility
- Priorities
- Decision Structure

Decisions
- RR overages back to Competitive
- Define urgent and safety need
- Consider competitive score
- Require LOI to determine eligibility - 2 step decision
- Subcommittee strives for consensus. SRAC make recommendation if consensus cannot be reached.
Start to Finish: Review Process for PIP and Non-IN
Review Process Overview

All PIP/Non-IN Applications

1. Staff Score
2. Staff Eligibility Review
3. Staff Red Flag Review

200% list

SRAC focus: 100% and 150% list
Steps 1 and 2:
Project Identification Program (PIP) scoring process
Infrastructure Programs: 10M/annually

- Competitive
- Rapid Response
- Project Identification

**PIP**

Up to 2.5% of funds will be used by ODOT to help communities identify projects.
## Project Identification Program (PIP) Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Up to 20 Plans Created</th>
<th>Working with ALTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019 Timeline: Application- Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Authorities and School Districts Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation Process: Staff and SRAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety, Equity, C/C/C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PIP Scoring Matrix: Equity

#### PIP SCORING MATRIX: MAXIMUM 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students receiving FR lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of people in poverty in the city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% and over</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score:** 130
### PIP Scoring Matrix: Safety

#### Lanes
- Over 2 lanes or 30ft crossing distance: 5
- Over 3 lanes or 40 ft crossing distance: 10
- Over 4 lanes or 50 ft crossing distance: 25
  - within .51-1 mile: 0
  - within .26-.5 mile: 5
  - within .25 mile but not adjacent: 10
  - adjacent to school property: 25

#### Speed
- 21-30 mph: 5
- 31-40 mph: 10
- 41-50 mph: 20
- Over 50 mph: 25
  - within .51-1 mile: 0
  - within .26-.5 mile: 5
  - within .25 mile but not adjacent: 10
  - adjacent to school property: 25

#### AADT
- 3,000-5,999: 5
- 6,000-11,999: 10
- 12,000 or over: 25
  - within .51-1 mile: 0
  - within .26-.5 mile: 5
  - within .25 mile but not adjacent: 10
  - adjacent to school property: 25

#### Crashes
- Injury occurred: 35
- Fatality occurred: 70

**SUBTOTAL:** 220

### Pie Chart

- **Safety**
- **Equity**
- **Statute**
- **Capacity**
## PIP Scoring Matrix: Statute, Capacity, Extra Credit

**STEP 1**

**Statute**
- School type: any combination of grades including kindergarten through 8th grade

**Capacity**
- Population or Unincorporated area:
  - 10,001-50K: 60 points
  - 5,001-10K: 80 points
  - 2,501-5K: 90 points
  - 2,500 or under, or unincorporated community: 100 points

**Equity**
- Applicant's description of need for the program:
  - Program Manager can provide up to 25 points of extra credit total for relevant items mentioned in the application that make this community process urgent that were not already given points for. Examples: TSP update timeline, no planner on staff.

### PIP Scoring Matrix: MAX 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statute</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Extra Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School type</td>
<td>any combination of grades including kindergarten through 8th grade</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population or Unincorporated area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-50K</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-10K</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,501-5K</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 or under, or unincorporated community</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's description of need for the program</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 points - extra credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL**: 150
1. Program Manager will review the answer to the question: “Why is the community unable to create this plan on their own?” and note any clarification that need to be made.

       Staff will Red Flag any applications that don't describe a meaningful need for the service or needs clarification.

2. Once the application is Red Flagged and scored:

       Staff will reach out to applicant in 200% list for clarification. If clarified, Red Flag will be removed.

3. If Red Flag is not mitigated:

       The Red Flag will be noted for the SRAC to review.
Steps 1 and 2: Non-Infrastructure Program Scoring Process
# What is SRTS Non-Infrastructure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Programs/Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Training kids - pedestrian, rolling and bicycle safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encouragement</strong></td>
<td>Walk + Roll program - encouragement promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walking school bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike night/bike rodeos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcement</strong></td>
<td>Collaborating with local police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crossing Guard programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Active Transportation surveys - local program effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall SRTS program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td>Providing resources to incorporate populations of need</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-IN Scoring Matrix: Safety

**NI SCORING MATRIX: MAXIMUM 440**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>No education programming included</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly or other one time bike/ped education event</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ped and/or Bike education (on bikes, in school or after school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- will use a bike curriculum (Time intensive)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE or health teacher included in education plans (train-the trainer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use curriculum year after year, sustainable education model</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IN</strong></td>
<td>Infrastructure projects that are funded and planned to be completed in the next 5 years (ODOT Infrastructure SRTS funded or other)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed infrastructure project(s) in the last 5 years within 1.5 miles of benefitting school(s).</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Non-IN Scoring Matrix: Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefitting Schools are Title I (40% Students receiving FR lunch)</th>
<th>Safety 50%</th>
<th>Equity 25%</th>
<th>CCC 15%</th>
<th>Other 10%</th>
<th>Other 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No benefitting schools in the project are Title I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the benefitting schools in the project are Title I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of benefitting schools in project are Title I (&gt; 50%)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All benefitting schools in project are Title I</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New SRTS Program</th>
<th>NI SCORING MATRIX: MAX 440</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant received ODOT Non-infrastructure funding in the last grant cycle 2017-2019</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant did not get ODOT Non-infrastructure funds last cycle, but has received in the past</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has never received ODOT Non-Infrastructure funds</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Non-IN Scoring Matrix: Communication, Collaboration, Coordination

### NI SCORING MATRIX: MAX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-IN Scoring Matrix:

- **Communication, Collaboration, Coordination**
  - **Detail coordination with local and community partners, included plans of working with partners, letters of support**
    - Did not discuss plans of collaboration with community partners: 0
    - Listing potential local partners and discussion of some plans to partner with them: 5
    - At least one of the following: Detailed level of partnership plans in application and budget, letters of support, discussion of sustainable long term goals by collaboration with local partners: 10
  - **Coordinator/Capacity building**
    - Application budget includes funding a dedicated SRTS coordinator (At least partial funded FTE): 50

---

*STEP 1*
Non-IN Scoring Matrix: Other Priorities

NI SCORING MATRIX: MAX

Safety 50%
Equity 25%
CCC 15%
Other 10%

Inclusion of 6 E's in project plans (Holistic programming)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E's</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 E's</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 E's</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 E's</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plans/visions for long term sustainability after ODOT grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not discuss plans of sustainability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant answered question of sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant included specific/detailed plans on funding and programming</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability after ODOT grant</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TSD Program Manager will review the application in regard to scoring along with the following guidance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Specific</strong></td>
<td>Does the application give enough specific details to understand the full scope of goals, objectives, and activities of the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Measurable</strong></td>
<td>Does the application have enough measureable objectives and activities to understand the full scope of results they expect to see?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Attainable (Achievable)</strong></td>
<td>Are the goals, objectives and activities achievable in the timeframe, capacity and the proposed budget?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Relevant or Realistic</strong></td>
<td>Are the goals, objectives and activities relevant to the mission of the grant given budget and resource constraints?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Time-bound</strong></td>
<td>Does the application give realistic goals within the time frame for each grant year and for the overall grant period?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. TSD manager will initially review each application and if there are any red flags present in the initial review, the applicant will be notified for clarification.

2. Once the application is Red Flagged and scored:
   Staff will reach out to applicant in 200% list for clarification. If clarified, Red Flag will be removed.

3. If Red Flag is not mitigated:
   The Red Flag will be noted for the SRAC to review.
STEP 3:
SRAC Homework
PIP Review Process

All PIP Applications

Staff Score

Staff Eligibility Review

Staff Red Flag Review

200% list

SRAC focus: 100% and 150% list

STEP 3
Things SRAC to consider:

- Review all applications (focus on 100% and 150% lists).
- Any major concerns with 100% list.

Things SCAC not to consider:

- Changing the score of projects.
- Adding or subtracting content from an application.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 9</td>
<td>Recommendation Workshop</td>
<td>Workshop Goals: Staff presentation for Non-IN grants and IN Project Identification applications, Discussion, (Recommendation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting Goals: Prioritization focus areas for 2020 Competitive Infrastructure Program (Recommendation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!

Next meeting:

July 9, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Lunch provided.
SRAC and Infrastructure
Contact:
LeeAnne Fergason
LeeAnne.Fergason@odot.state.or.us
(503) 986-5805

SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program Contact:
Heidi Manlove
Heidi.Manlove@odot.state.or.us
(503) 986-4196

Program Website:
http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.aspx
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Attendees: Scott Bohl, Anthony Buczek, Sonny Chickering, Steve Dickey, Rob Inerfeld, Dana Nichols, Luis Ornelas, Brian Potwin, Kari Schlosshauer
Phone: Laughton Elliot-Deangelis, Mychal Tettah, Brian Potwin, John Vial, Leti, Mychal, Tom, Laughton, Mavis, JD Tovey, Kim Crabtree
ODOT Staff: Amanda Pietz, Susan Peithman, LeeAnne Fergason, Heidi Manlove, Tami Weil, Traci Pearl, Alan Thompson
Facilitator: Chris Watchie

Welcome:
LeeAnne Fergason welcomed the group and highlighted the goals for the meeting:
  - Agree upon program focus areas for both Infrastructure Project Identification Program (PIP) and Non-Infrastructure (NI) program.

She then invited the SRAC for celebratory piece of cake for completing the recommendation process for the first round of SRTS Infrastructure funding. The Oregon Transportation Commission approved the SRAC's project list represented in the map to the right:

Meeting Overview:
Chris Watchie provided an overview of the agenda. She noted there was much to cover in a short period of time and reviewed the SRAC decision-making structure. She then asked the SRAC for any comments on the draft December SRAC meeting notes.

ACTION: SRAC reached a consensus to approve the SRAC December Meeting Summary

Public Comment:
No public comment received
LeeAnne announced the SRAC’s preference for their 2019-2021 Chair and Vice Chair, Mavis Hartz and Kari Schlosshauer, and noted their consulting role in setting the agenda and leadership role with the SRAC.

**Guiding Principles:**
Chris reviewed the SRAC’s Guiding Principles and reiterated that they were an iterative list for the SRAC’s periodic review. Staff sent out a survey to the SRAC to begin the revisions discussion. (See Attachment A) Staff suggested that the SRAC’s Chair and Vice Chair revise the Guiding Principles based on the committee feedback with assistance from Mychal Tettah on the Equity Principle’s language.

**ACTION:** Mavis, Mychal and Kari agreed to revise the Guiding Principles based on the survey feedback report back to SRAC at their May meeting.

**Rapid Response Program (RRP)**
LeeAnne reviewed the RRP and showed funding allocation in relation to other SRTS programs from 2019-2024.

**Key program elements:**
- Up to 10% of funds will be used for urgent needs or systemic safety issues.
  - 2019-2020: $1,833,000
  - 2021-2022: $3,000,000
  - 2023-2024: $3,000,000
- Open up program in summer 2019
- Eligibility written in rule. Same at the competitive program.
- Requests for projects in between competitive cycle.
- Allowable amounts between $0-$500k.

**SRAC Comments/Questions:**
Q: Can the RRP fund smaller projects not eligible for larger competition?
  Staff response: Yes, and the applicants must meet the other Rapid Response criteria of being an urgent need (something unexpected has happened and the project needs to be addressed immediately) or meeting the safety criteria (injury or fatality of a pedestrian or a bicyclist in the last year)
Q: Will RRP help fund overruns?
  Staff response: I could in specific instances. Anything currently in a scope of a funded project will not be funded through RR program however, if something completely unexpected happens, the RRP could potentially add additional funds through the application process.
Q: What if bike/ped element was cut out of a project scope because of cost overruns? Can the bike/ped element be funded by the RRP?
  Staff response: Need to be careful but don’t rule it out. Reserve RRP for urgent needs.
Comment: Transportation Enhancements discretionary program would back fill other projects quite frequently. Be careful of potential problems if we don’t account for cost overruns.

**ACTION:** LeeAnne will review language to ensure that RRP is not interpreted to address overruns.
Q: If a project that applied for the competition and didn't get money, can they get RRP funding?
   Staff response: Answer, it could if the conditions have change (ex: crashes, new development, etc.) then the project can apply for RRP.

Q: Can we reduce the $500k max?
   Staff response: The rule says up to $500k so we'll need to keep it as is.

Q: Because the dollar amount for the projects are small, bias will be towards overly optimistic timelines that communities may not be able to achieve. Agency needs to understand that there is a predisposition to underestimate how long things take and how much they cost. Staff could have a reference class forecasting to look at similar projects of size a cost and seeing how long it usually takes. Concerned that there will be budget overruns. We should have a plan in place for cost overruns and be prepared for the worst but hope for the best.
   Staff response: Staff implemented three things to try and mitigate this. 1) We told applicants to add contingency into their budgets and followed up with applicants whose estimates seemed low 2) We were really upfront about grantees being on the hook for and cost overages. It was covered in the grantee training and it included in the IGA 3) RR program is a potential for overages in certain unexpected circumstances.

Q: How will full committee know about projects recommended going to Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC)?
   Staff response: The RRP sub-committee will determine and communicate back to SRAC through the Chair.

Q. We need to ask, what are the consequences if the project does not get funded?
   Staff response: This information will be gathered in the application.
   Comment: Process seems a bit onerous. Put the burden on the applicant instead of requiring ODOT and subcommittee to review the projects twice.
   Staff response: Letter of intent should be very simple. Just eligibility. Process could be simplified.

Comment: The RRP doesn't align with the proposed timeline. Think it should be a rolling program. Don't think it should be open for a specific timeframe. Slides indicate open and closing.
   Staff response: The timing reflects a rolling program with a window between competitions. In future cycles, plan to open RRP right after the Competitive Program. Staff will be careful that our language shows it is an open and rolling program.
   Staff Comment: The Subcommittee will determine the criteria for “Urgent.”

Q: Would you be penalized if you don’t receive a grant and can apply for future competitive grants?
   Staff response: No.
   Comment: Proposals will be reviewed one at a time. Concern that this will be a significant amount of staff/SRAC member time.
   Staff response: the RRP sub-committee will respond to demand as necessary by batching or individual evaluation.

Q: What happens once all the funds have been distributed? Will a notice be sent out? How do we address?
   Staff response: Staff will update the RRP page on the ODOT website and stop accepting applications.

Q: Can we do temporary and cheaper projects to address any immediate need before a permanent solution is funded/built?
Staff response: Projects should aim for a permanent bike/ped solution, but we should not rule it out.

Q: Is there a life expectancy on the funds?
   Staff response: Funds that are not allocated for RRP will add into the next Competitive Program cycle.

LeeAnne requested volunteers for the RRP Subcommittee.

**ACTION:** John Vials, Anthony Buczek and Laughton Elliot-Deangelis volunteered with LeeAnne as the ODOT representative.

LeeAnne next highlighted that the focus areas for the RRP would mirror the same ones for the Competitive Program: Safety, Equity, and Project Readiness. She noted that staff may need to change the scoring a bit but it would be similar to the Competitive Program's scoring structure.

**SRAC Comments/Questions**

Q: How is “bang for the buck” going to be integrated into the RRP criteria?
   Staff response: Suggest it gets discussed at RRP Sub-committee.

Q: If this is not competitive in the same way as the larger program, should this be more of a screening than a ranking?
   Staff response: The RRP Sub-committee will determine project scoring/screening.

Q: “What happens if we don’t fund this” question for the applicant.
   Staff response: We will gather this information in the application process.

Q: Is ODOT eligible to apply for the grants?
   Staff response: Yes

**ACTION:** The RRP Sub-committee will present criteria/parameters of the RRP to SRAC in May.

**Non-infrastructure (NI) Program Overview**

Heidi Manlove provided a historical overview and current status of the Non-infrastructure program highlighting the key areas: Education, encouragement, enforcement, evaluation, and equity.
What is SRTS Non-Infrastructure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Training kids, pedestrian, cycling safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>Walk + Roll program, encouragement promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walking School bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike Night/Bike Rodeos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Collaborating with local police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crossing Guard Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Active Transportation surveys, local program Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall SRTS Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Providing resources to incorporate populations of need</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key program elements:
- Have $1m each year for the program.
  - 2019-2020: $1,000,000
  - 2021-2022: $1,000,000
  - 2023-2024: $1,000,000
- Increase maximum grant amount to $100k.
- Examples of benefits: larger programs, fund coordinators at full time.
- Higher level of usual match (10.27%) of 12% or more (dependent on grantee) creates an equitable way to ensure match is covered.
- Keep program as 60% local and 40% statewide split.

Focus areas:
- Safety (sustainable education programs)
- Communication/coordination/collaboration (fund a coordinator)
- Equity

SRAC Comments/Questions
Q: What are your outreach strategies? Coastal communities are unaware and do not have the capacity to put in grant applications.

Staff response: Technical assistance from Commute Options for action plans. Want to offer more.
Q: Where does the match come from the 40% statewide programs?
   Staff response: Can use earned media value as match.
Q: How oversubscribed is your grant program?
   Staff response: Every applicant was funded.
Comment: Suggest you include Association of Oregon Counties and League of Oregon Cities in your communications.
   Staff response: We also doing webinars to promote the program in March and April.
Q: Are there two technical assistance grants?
   Staff response: Currently, yes. Two separate technical assistance programs. In the future, would like to combine.
Q: Jumpstart program at the Street Trust (ST)? What is the program model now?
   Staff response: Received a grant about 10 years ago for $75k for a fleet and to teach at schools in Eugene, Ashland, etc. Grant was reduced and ST asked communities to take ownership of the program. Jumpstart program gets a bike fleet and training for a year. It’s flawed in the sense that after a year, the fleet goes away and community is expected to raise money for fleet and staffing. Staff response: Bike safety education (BSE) is funded by NHTSA. Potential 40% statewide could be used to expand BSE such as purchasing another fleet.
Comment: There has not been a SRTS Committee on Non-infrastructure funding since 2012. Now the SRAC fulfills that role.
Q: Where within focus area can there be an opportunity to tag along to IN projects to develop a robust SRTS program? Need to coordinate efforts.
   Staff response: Staff is working to coordinate IN and Non-in efforts. Prioritizing IN projects in places where there are Non-IN programs.
Q: What does the Equity Focus mean for the NI focus area mean? Clarify.
   Staff response: This means that we will prioritize applications that focus on Title 1 schools and grantees who have not received ODOT NI funding in the past and not in the last grant cycle.
Q: What is the funding source for the NI program?
   Staff response: All the SRTS funding is now Transportation Alternatives (TA) program dollars.
   Staff Comment: A consideration for the SRAC is to create a “carve out” of NI funds for projects in locations that have received recent IN dollars to support and leverage investment for both NI and Infrastructure Programs. Can add some funding to the PIP projects so that they can do NI/IN together. For instance, move $100K for current Infrastructure projects to do education, encouragement, enforcement, evaluation, and equity work with $50K going to the PIP.
Q: If we leverage money to PIP for NI/IN we may not get as broad of opportunity because PIPs are focused on communities that do not have the capacity to put forth and apply for the IN programs.
   Staff response: To start off, the PIP process will focus on small communities that cannot afford the planning process.
Q: Looking at current cycle priorities, do you recommend changing the “applicants not previously having a SRTS NI grant?”
   Staff response: The recommendation is prioritizing applications that have never been funded with and not funded in the last funding NI SRTS funding cycle.
Comment: There are workshops for NI. We are planning three around the state plus webinar. Focus on how to apply for funds. Focusing on PE education.
Comment: Support dedicated funding stream to jurisdictions that have received IN funds.
Q: Does Commute Options have money from ODOT to do technical assistance?
   Staff response: Yes, they receive grant funds to provide this service. These funds come from the state share of 40%.

Comment: We should open up the dedication to communities that have received any IN $ for SRTS.
   Staff response: A minimum of $100k could go towards communities that have received IN funds with $50k would go in addition to the PIP ($150k per year).

Comment: Confused on timing.
   Staff response: If a community gets an IN award, then there would be a one time NI award.

Comment: Adding money to the PIP helps blend NI/IN in community program development.

Comment: When small amounts of money are granted, expectation is that existing staff will do the coordination work.

Q: Is this the best investment of these funds because worried about longevity of a program when distributing money to oversubscribed staff.
   Staff response: Staff will work with IN grantees to determine if they have the capacity to use these funds. We won’t grant funds to an entity who does not want them or cannot use them in an effective way.

Q: How do we measure our outcomes?
   Staff response: Staff (LeeAnne and Heidi) will work with potential grantees to develop a scope detailing how they will use the funds and they will be evaluated by competing the scope. In addition, ODOT is already performing before and after studies on the IN grantees so we will be able to measure the effectiveness of the IN and NI countermeasures.

Comment: Focus on hiring coordinator position to add capacity. Lane MPO pays for one of the two coordinators at the MPO level.

Q: Should we reduce money every year?
   Staff response: Tapering the funding does not work. First year they’re just hiring a coordinator, second year they’re developing a program, third year is the most work. On day one, they need to start on a plan to develop a local funding mechanism.

Comment: I can live with the proposal but the IN projects won’t be built for awhile. Maybe do a soft launch of the IN associated NI work.
   Staff response: The state could provide a $5k service (education service, etc) to communities that do not have staff capacity to take on coordination grant.

Comment: Support the proposal so we can do more coastal outreach.
   Staff response: Heidi will present to OTSC on 3/12/19 to review SRAC input.

**Project Identification Program:**
LeeAnne reviewed the PIP and showed funding allocation in relation to other SRTS programs from 2019-2024.

**Key program elements:**
- Up to 2.5 % of funds will be used by ODOT to help communities identify projects
  - 2019-2020: $458,250
  - 2021-2022: $750,000
  - 2023-2024: $750,000
• Creation of 20 IN plans in 20 different communities unless one district wants to do multiple schools.
• Eligible entities will work with Alta Planning + Design for service not funding.

SRAC Comments/Questions:
Q: Does the PIP give communities an advantage?
   Staff response: Seems applicable for smaller communities without significant resources. Not bigger city or ODOT. The idea was for ODOT to provide technical assistance.
   Staff comment: Propose to use the same focus areas as the main competition (safety, CCC, equity). Need to screen so staff can bring back recommendations to the SRAC.
Q: What is the accountability mechanism for communities receiving the PIP?
   Staff response: Staff will evaluate the program after the first round and determine what an appropriate mechanism is depending on how many communities fail to complete the process.
Comment: OTSC is very supportive.
Comment: Concern is that you don’t know what you’re going to get from the $5k.
   Staff response: Could provide a template for expectations.
Comment: Only get $2-3k additional NI funds, if they want to do NI.
   Staff response: The cost will be an additional 1.5K for each PIP SRTS Plan. For a total of 30K for each PIP round.
Q: What’s the rational out of the 60% side?
   Staff response: There is more statewide demand to offer services, that is why it’s 40% side.
   Staff Comment: Working on timelines for $ on how the coordinated programs
Comment: Can you run the PIP in same application process at the same time as the NI process?
   Staff response: Yes!
Q: What programs need buy-in from what entities?
   Staff response: See below for a diagram on the decision making structure. Infrastructure grants are recommended by the SRAC in consultation with OBPAC and the OTSC, and approved by the OTC. Non-Infrastructure grants are recommended by the SRAC in consultation with OBPAC and the OTSC, and approved by the OTSC.

DECISION TREE: SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL GRANTS

Chris called for the SRAC to weigh in on the proposal to continue the 60/40% split of NI between state and local programs and to move NI funding to support existing infrastructure projects’ education efforts and
expand the Project Identification Program grants to complete full action plans. Funding overview of proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-In funding for ODOT SRTS IN projects</th>
<th>2018-2020</th>
<th>2021-2023</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to $120,000</td>
<td>Up to $120,000</td>
<td>Up to $240,000</td>
<td>To require Non-In activities as part of ODOT’s IN projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-In funding for PIP</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>To include Non-In program goals in the SRTS Plan created by the PIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Up to $150,000</td>
<td>Up to $150,000</td>
<td>Up to $300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION:** SRAC reached a consensus to continue the 60/40 % split approve and the proposal to move NI funds to both Infrastructure Program and Project Identification Program to create a higher level of integration between them. Brian Potwin abstained due to potential conflict of interest since Commute Options serves as an existing ODOT SRTS contractor.

Comment: Questions around sequence and timing.
Staff response: Need to prioritize communication so the end user understands requirements.

LeeAnne noted next steps:
- Staff will meet with Chair/Vice Chair to review roles and responsibilities
- Staff will meet with RRP Subcommittee
- Staff will coordinate with Chair/Vice Chair and Mychal Tettah on Guiding Principles revisions based on SRAC survey input
- Heidi will meet with Transportation Safety Division Administrator and the Transportation Safety Commission to review the SRAC’s proposal
- SRAC will receive a survey to assist with weighting of Non-infrastructure and PIP program focus areas (Equity, Communication and Coordination, and Safety)

**Next Meeting**
May 29, 2019
12:00 – 3:00 p.m.
CCBI, 626 High St NE, Salem, OR 97301
Oregon Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee (SRAC)
Charter
Revised 5-6-2019

Background
The Oregon Safe Routes to School Program consists of two parts: infrastructure and non-infrastructure both administered by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). Both programs focus on efforts that improve safety conditions for children to walk or bike to school. These programs are intended to address safety risks, such as any one of the components of a Priority Safety Corridor, and other safety needs considering the unique perspectives and behavior of children who walk or bike. A comprehensive Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program is inclusive of both non-infrastructure and infrastructure elements.

Since 2006, ODOT has invested in SRTS program to increase safety and encouragement of children walking and biking to school. Due to new state funding from 2017 Keep Oregon Moving Act (House Bill 2017) the SRTS Infrastructure program will allocate $10 million annually for SRTS infrastructure projects, which increases to $15 million in 2023 and beyond. By fall 2019, the SRTS Non-Infrastructure program, will increase its distribution of federal funding from $500,000 to $1M annually. Within ODOT the SRTS program is housed within two divisions. The SRTS Infrastructure Program is managed by the Transportation Development Division and the Non-Infrastructure Program by the Transportation Safety Division.

Purpose of Charter
The Oregon Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee (SRAC) Charter provides a clear and mutually agreeable statement of the roles and responsibilities of SRAC members and ODOT staff. It identifies the ways in which the SRAC will operate, including decision-making processes and meeting protocols. The charter will guide the work and conduct of the SRAC to create and maintain an open and transparent process.

Committee Purpose
The SRAC is formed to guide the Safe Routes to School Infrastructure and Non-Infrastructure programs. The SRAC is advisory to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC), and in
consultation with the Oregon Transportation Safety Committee (OTSC). The SRAC’s charge is outlined in Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 737-025.

Committee Composition
The SRAC is composed of 10-18 volunteer members representing interests including, but not limited to: the OTSC, Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (OBPAC), Safe Routes to School practitioners, school districts, eligible entities, and equity and safety representatives.

SRAC Responsibilities
The SRAC is charged with two key tasks:

• Providing ODOT with program guidance and developing recommendations for the OTSC and OTC as appropriate. Recommendations for non-infrastructure programs go first to the OTSC before going to the OTC, that serves as the decision-making body over both programs.
• Setting project selection criteria and making project selection recommendations.¹ Project selection recommendations go to the OTC for infrastructure projects and to the OTSC prior to the OTC for non-infrastructure. The OTSC and OBPAC will be consulted on policy direction to the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee.

Members of SRAC agree to fulfill their responsibilities through attending and participating in quarterly SRAC meetings and additional meetings as needed, studying all available information prior to meeting, and fully participating in the development of recommendations. Members of SRAC agree to participate in good faith and to act in the best interests of the SRAC and its charge. For purposes of the SRAC, “good faith” means honesty in fact and conduct.

ODOT Staff Responsibilities
ODOT staff will provide:

• Technical support for SRAC’s informed discussions and decision making
• Expertise on SRTS infrastructure and non-infrastructure processes
• Logistical and administrative assistance
• Advice to the SRAC when warranted

¹ For the initial 2018-19 Competitive Grant cycle, project selection criteria was determined by the SRTS Rule Advisory Committee. The SRAC will be charged with this responsibility for all subsequent grant application processes.
A representative from ODOT regions’ staff has been appointed to the SRAC by the ODOT Director to represent the agency’s perspective in the discussions. Otherwise, ODOT staff will not participate in the SRAC’s decision and recommendation processes but may provide comments or make suggestions prior to relevant decision points.

Key staff includes:

- Amanda Pietz, Program Implementation and Analysis Unit Manager
- Susan Peithman, Active Transportation Policy Lead
- Heidi Manlove, Oregon SRTS Outreach and Education Program Manager
- LeeAnne Fergason, Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Program Manager
- Tami Weil, Safe Routes to School and Connect Oregon Coordinator

**Terms**

SRAC members will serve a four-year term and a maximum of two terms.

**SRAC Officers**

After the initial 2018-19 funding cycle recommendation process, staff will request the SRAC provide nominations for the SRAC Chair and Vice-Chair for a term of two-years.

Chair and Vice-Chair Roles and Responsibilities:

**Internal**

- Provide feedback on SRTS agendas
- Open and close each SRTS meeting
- Assist in creation and review of SRTS Committee annual work plans
- Serve as a conduit for SRTS Committee members’ ideas and issues
- Maintain understanding of all SRTS subcommittee work and facilitate communication/updates to SRAC members as needed (e.g., Rapid Response)
- Assist in recommendation and recruitment process of new SRAC members
- Provide annual review of SRAC Guiding Principles

**External**

- Represent SRAC at other ODOT committees including but not limited to: Oregon Transportation Commission
- Oregon Transportation Safety Committee

The Chair will work with the SRTS Program Manager to provide leadership in SRAC meetings and funding recommendation processes.

The Vice-Chair will serve in a supporting role should the Chair be unable to attend.
Meeting Protocols

- Meetings will be set by the SRAC for the following year by December of the previous year.
- All meetings will be led by ODOT staff and/or facilitated by a neutral third party facilitator to ensure the discussions are consistent with the SRAC Charter, and to ensure that feedback and recommendations advance from the group and adhere closely to the project schedule.

- Upon review and discussion at the first SRAC meeting, members will be asked to accept the SRAC Charter and proposed SRAC Meeting Agreements.

2 Election of a Chair and Vice Chair will occur after the SRTS 2018-19 Competitive Grant Recommendation process and prior to presentation to the OTC and OTSC.
• Members will make their best effort to attend all meetings ideally in-person or via phone and notify ODOT staff if unable to attend. If a meeting is missed, it is the responsibility of the SRAC member to contact the ODOT SRTS Program Manager and set up a phone meeting to remain updated and not slow the overall SRAC progress.

• **No alternates will be allowed** unless directed by the ODOT Director to ensure consistency for informed discussions and decision-making.

• SRAC recommendations will not be revisited unless agreed to by a majority of the members present.

• Public notification of SRAC meetings will occur at least one-week in advance and the agenda and meeting materials will be made available on the project website.

• ODOT will make every effort to ensure meeting materials are finalized one-week prior to meetings; however, there may be instance where updated versions of materials are provided. In these cases, staff will describe any changes and allow for questions at the time of review.

• Meetings will begin and end on time. If agenda items cannot be completed on time, the SRAC will decide if the meeting should be extended, an additional meeting schedule, or the discussion continued at the next scheduled meeting.

• Meeting summaries will be produced for each meeting to reflect key discussion items, feedback, outcomes, and tasks and assignments related to advancement of the group’s work. Draft summaries will be distributed within seven (7) workdays and SRAC members will be given the opportunity to clarify or propose edits to a meeting summary for an accurate record.

• A public comment period will be at the beginning of every meeting with a three-minute limit to any person who signs to comment.

**Decision-Making Process**

• While the SRAC has no final decision-making authority, its purpose is to engage diverse perspectives in its recommendations to OTC and OTSC subject to infrastructure or non-infrastructure projects. All SRAC feedback will be respectfully considered. OTC and OTSC may or may not make decisions based on advice received from the SRAC.
• All members are encouraged to challenge themselves to approach their SRAC responsibilities with creativity, curiosity, and commitment and come fully prepared to all meetings. This is essential for well-informed discussions and decision-making.

• It is important for all points of view to be expressed in SRAC meetings and for all to give serious consideration to the comments made by all SRAC members and ODOT staff. Listening to wide ranging opinions and evaluating the merit of differing points of view is critical to develop reasoned and thoughtful funding recommendations.

• During the recommendation process, it is crucial the SRAC member not advocate for particular projects which they may have had a role in creating but to consider it as any other project and apply the same considerations and facts to it.

• To facilitate SRAC’s decision-making and to ensure that the SRAC receives the collective benefit of the individual views, experience, background, training and expertise, a consensus decision-making model will be used to assist the SRAC in drafting, editing and refining its recommendations.
• Consensus decision-making is a process that allows meeting participants to consider proposals, express opinions, and discuss options for reaching general agreement. This model provides an opportunity for discussion of underlying values and concerns in the overall effort of developing widely accepted solutions. Consensus does not mean 100% agreement on every aspect of every issue. Instead, consensus means general support for a decision taken as a whole. This allows group members to vote in support of a recommendation even though they might prefer to have it modified in some manner in order to give it their full support.

• Members will work together to fulfill the SRAC Charter and seek to achieve consensus to the extent possible. For the purpose of the SRAC, consensus is achieved when all members can say:

   *I am fully supportive of this decision or choice.*

   or

   *While I may not be fully supportive of this decision or choice, I can live with it and I will not oppose it.*

• With such a diverse membership, differences of opinion are expected. If the SRAC is unable to reach consensus, the staff or facilitator will call for a traditional vote if a quorum is in attendance. A quorum is defined as half of the SRAC roster’s voting members plus one.

• A minority report will accompany all SRAC’s recommendations to the OTC and OTSC unless unanimous in nature.

**Communication with Media**

SRAC members are requested to:

• Defer to ODOT staff for all media communications related to SRAC process and its recommendations.

• Not negotiate through the media, or use the media to undermine the work of the SRAC.

• Raise all of their concerns, especially those being raised for the first time at a SRAC meeting and not in or through the media.
SRAC as Public Officials

SRAC members are considered public officials in their volunteer SRAC roles.

According to ORS 244.020(14), “Public Official” means any person who, when an alleged violation of this chapter occurs, is serving the State of Oregon or any of its political subdivisions or any other public body as defined in ORS 174.109 as an elected official, appointed official, employee or agent, irrespective of whether the person is compensated for the services.

This includes:
- Public Employees
- Elected Officials
- Members of Boards and Commissions
- Volunteers
- Relative:
  - ORS 244.020(15) “Relative” means:
    - (a) The spouse, parent, stepparent, child, sibling, stepsibling, son-in-law or daughter-in-law of the public official or candidate;
    - (b) The parent, stepparent, child, sibling, stepsibling, son-in-law or daughter-in-law of the spouse of the public official or candidate;
    - (c) Any individual for whom the public official or candidate has a legal support obligation;
    - (d) Any individual for whom the public official provides benefits arising from the public official’s public employment or from whom the public official receives benefits arising from that individual’s employment; or
    - (e) Any individual from whom the candidate receives benefits arising from that individual’s employment.

Safeguard of the Public Trust

“The Legislative Assembly declares that service as a public official is a public trust, and that as one safeguard for that trust, the people require all public officials to comply with the applicable provisions of this chapter.” ORS 244.010 (1)

Conflict of Interest

In brief, a public official is met with a conflict of interest when participating in an official action could result in a financial effect to the public official, a relative of the public official or a business with which either are associated.
Statutory conflicts of interest have three components:
1. An "action", "decision", or "recommendation" made in an "official capacity", which causes;
2. A private pecuniary benefit or detriment, for;
3. The "public official", the public officials "relative"(s), or a "business associated with which the person is associated", the public official or the public official’s relative.

Types of Conflict of Interest

Oregon Government Ethics law identifies and defines two types of conflicts of interest. An actual conflict of interest is defined in ORS 244.020(1) and a potential conflict of interest is defined in ORS 244.020(12).

Actual Conflict of Interest

• Any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which would be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the persons relative or any business with which the person or a relative of the person is associated unless the pecuniary benefit or detriment arises out of circumstances described in subsection (12) of this section.

• If the financial effect of an action is both specific and certain, then that action presents an actual conflict of interest.

Potential Conflict of Interest

• Any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which could be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the persons relative, or a business with which the person or the persons relative is associated, unless the pecuniary benefit or detriment arises out of the following:

  (a) An interest or membership in a particular business, industry, occupation or other class required by law as a prerequisite to the holding by the person of the office or position.

  (b) Any action in the persons official capacity which would affect to the same degree a class consisting of all inhabitants of the state, or a smaller class consisting of an industry, occupation or other group including one of which or in which the person, or the persons relative or business with which the person or the
persons relative is associated, is a member or is engaged.

(c) Membership in or membership on the board of directors of a nonprofit corporation that is tax-exempt under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code.

When to Declare a Conflict of Interest

Officials on Boards or Commissions and Elected Officials ORS 244.120(2)

• When any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which would be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the person’s relative or any business with which the person or the person’s relative or any business with which the person or a relative of the person is associated.

• When any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in the capacity as a public official, the effect of which could be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the person’s relative, or a business with which the person or the person’s relative is associated.

• Disclosure must occur when appointed officials are met with a conflict of interest, regardless whether the conflict is actual or potential.

How to Declare a Conflict of Interest

Officials on Boards or Commissions & Elected Officials ORS 244.120(2)

• Must publicly announce the nature of the conflict of interest on each occasion the conflict arises.

• Must publicly announce potential conflicts of interest, on each occasion before taking action.

• Must publicly announce actual conflicts of interest, on each occasion, and refrain from participating in discussion, debate, or voting on the issue out of which the actual conflict arises.
LeeAnne,

Please pass this information onto the 'Safe Routes To School Advisory Committee'.

I live in the City of Hood River, in the neighborhood commonly called: 'The Heights'. Both of my daughters are visually impaired (one is legally blind, the other may become so soon). Except for the yellow Braille squares at newer intersections, none of the intersections in the City of Hood River have adaptive technology for the visually impaired.

The year after next, Sept. 2021, my oldest daughter will begin attending middle school. Currently, my daughters walk to school from my house in our quiet neighborhood. But, there is a State Hwy (OR-281) between my home and the middle school. Additionally, very dangerous intersections have been allowed to persist while traffic volumes have dramatically increased over time in Hood River. See below:

One particularly bad situation that persists is the intersection of 12th and May Street (Hwy OR-281). Down-hill traffic has been trained to not yield, despite turning left across an oncoming lane of May St:
The intersection worked well enough when horses were pulling carts; it does not work now. This intersection is on the main walking route between the two schools. Also, elementary school children regularly walk this route to get to the local swimming pool (including for school sanctioned events). Lastly, they are currently building a new elementary school on the same property. The number of children attending May Street School will increase next year.

My legally blind children cannot navigate these intersections safely; they are not safe for adult pedestrians that are fully sighted.

This is one of the busiest intersections in the community. I understand that there is not an easy solution to resolve this concern. I know that there is no way to make these intersections safe for pedestrians without reducing the speed and volume of traffic moving through these intersections.

I want to see traffic calming features installed and better protected bike lanes and cross-walks (with audio signals) at these intersections. I also wish that 12th and 13th streets (OR-281) were returned to single-lane streets. Two-lane-one-way streets are not safe for pedestrians; they are death traps for the visually impaired.

Further, I have heard rumors that sidewalks will be removed from the areas along 12th and 13th Streets (Hwy OR-281) because they do not comply with ADA requirements. This will make walking more dangerous than it already is. I hope that funding is earmarked to ensure that this is a safe neighborhood for everyone (including children).

With Providence Hospital continuing to grow, and with the population of Hood River (and surrounding areas) increasing, this is becoming an urgent issue. Next year, the number if elementary children will increase at May Street School. If a solution is not found, my daughters will loose their independence when the graduate to middle school (which is the opposite most children experience).
Thank you for considering this issue. Feel free to contact me directly if you have questions or wish for me to testify at committee.

Regards,

Ian Stromquist, REHS/RS
Environmental Health Specialist
1121 8th St.
Hood River, Oregon, 97031
Communication, Coordination, and Collaboration - We support communities with resources to create community-based decision making, project prioritization, and ensure collaboration between roadway agencies, school districts, and other relevant parties. Safe Routes to School grants are selected using a public and transparent process, and projects and programs are aligned to build on one another, with technical support provided. Opportunities to share photos, success stories, and lessons learned are built in to the granting process, in order to provide peer-to-peer learning among practitioners, agencies, school districts, elected officials, and the public.

Geographic Balance - We work to ensure that rural and small communities in Oregon receive the support they need to compete for funds. Grant funds are dispersed across a geographically diverse landscape to serve the population and reach communities of all sizes and characteristics.

Health - We support projects and programs that achieve health equity in our communities and allow students to use active transportation to get a portion of their daily required physical activity, and recognize this also improves mental health and independence. Programs and projects work to institutionalize walking and biking as healthy and safe modes of travel.

Maximize Resources - We ensure that projects and programs are funded as part of community-supported comprehensive planning processes, that seeks to create systems of safe active transportation routes. Projects are scoped for cost-effectiveness, readiness, prioritize leveraging opportunities between infrastructure and non-infrastructure grants, and consider other funding that may be available in larger communities.

Safety - We seek to proactively develop projects and programs to overcome safety barriers and build physical environments that support and promote active transportation to and from schools, for students of all abilities. In Oregon’s work to realize Vision Zero, which pursues a redesigned roadway system with no fatalities or serious injuries, community members of all ages and abilities feel secure and competent in using active transportation to meet their everyday needs. In order to achieve high standards of safety and injury prevention, we strive to comprehensively address all of the components of a successful Safe Routes to School program: equity, education, encouragement, enforcement, evaluation, and engineering.

Social Equity - We recognize that people from different backgrounds have unique barriers to living healthy, fulfilled lives. To support breakthrough outcomes for all historically marginalized communities throughout Oregon, we seek to understand the barriers and opportunities that affect different groups, craft programs and strategies, and prioritize projects with those challenges and needs in mind. We are committed to delivering solutions that are based in community best-practices and support the success of historically underserved individuals.
Chapter 3: Rapid Response Grant Program

The ODOT Safe Routes to School Rapid Response Infrastructure Grant Program funds projects that are eligible for the Competitive Infrastructure Grant program but cannot wait for the next cycle, which runs every two years. Road authorizes are encouraged to apply for urgent projects that address barriers for students walking and biking to school. For information on ELIGIBLE ENTITIES, LOCAL CASH MATCH REQUIREMENTS, PROJECT DELIVERY AND AGREEMENTS, and GRANT PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION, see Sub-Chapters 2A, 2D, and 2E.

Sub-Chapter 3A: Unique Eligibility Requirements

Most eligibility requirements for the Rapid Response Grants are the same as the Competitive Infrastructure Grants. However some added eligibility requirements are unique to the Rapid Response Grant Program.

Eligible entities are the same as the Competitive Grant Program and can be found in Sub-Chapter 2A.

Eligible projects are the same as the Competitive Grant Program and can be found in Sub-Chapter 2A except for the following noted differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT MUST</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Be at or within funding request minimum and maximum | Funding request minimum: $0  
Funding request maximum: $500,000 |
| Be an urgent safety need or opportunity. | Project must include proof of circumstances that trigger an urgent safety need or urgent opportunity that cannot wait until the next Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Competitive Grant Program which runs every two years. |

See Appendix A for a non-comprehensive list of effective counter measures. Some examples of projects that would be eligible for the Rapid Response Grant Program are listed below.

- Example of a project that meets an urgent safety need.
  - A recent crash occurred in the last year involving a pedestrian or a bicyclist and the pedestrian/bicyclist was injured, seriously injured, or killed and the proposed project specifically addresses this incident effectively and cost effectively.

- A timely and urgent opportunity means that something substantial and unexpected has changed and must be addressed before the next Competitive Grant cycle. Examples of projects that are timely and urgent opportunities.
  - A natural disaster occurs and triggers an urgent project. Rapid Response funds could add features to a funded project that is slated for construction like a pedestrian refuge island.
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- An economic opportunity that significantly reduces the price of a needed item. Rapid Response Grants could fund a project that takes advantage of this opportunity.
- The applicant will lose funds unless the community gets additional funds. Rapid Response Grants could be used as the funds to help keep allocated funds and address a Safe Routes to School project.
- Local cash match is available and will not be available for the next Competitive Grant cycle. Note that actual funds may be considered as match up to two years prior to the project application deadline.
- Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Grant recipients and other entities building a Safe Routes to School specific project are eligible to apply if an unexpected project condition arises and significant change occurs that the entity was unable to plan for and adds additional cost to the existing Safe Routes to School project. A Safe Routes to School project is defined as primarily a bicycle and pedestrian focused project that meets all of the criteria for the Safe Routes to School Competitive Infrastructure Program.
- Eminent domain becomes available and needs to be acquired immediately. Rapid Response funds could be used to purchase and build on the new public right of way that is only available for purchase for a short period of time.

Sub-Chapter 3B: Rapid Response Grant Program Project Application Process

APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS & PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program Manager announces available funding for Rapid Response and opens solicitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Solicitation opens continuously and applicants submit a Letter of Intent then an Application on a rolling basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program Manager stops accepting Letters of Intent and Applications when all funds are allocated and until funds are available again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current application materials can be viewed on the Safe Routes to School Program website. An application must be submitted online through the website, [http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.aspx). The Oregon Department of Transportation will provide online templates for submissions and additional supporting documentation may be requested. The application is based on the Safe Routes to School Competitive Infrastructure Grant application. The Rapid Response Grant Program is an open process where applications can be submitted at any time and evaluated on a rolling bases. Projects will be awarded first-come first-serve based on urgency.

LETTER OF INTENT AND APPLICATION
In order for an application to be considered, applicant must first submit a Letter of Intent. The Letter of Intent will include eligibility information that will be reviewed by the Program Manager and the Safe Routes to School Rapid Response Subcommittee. The applicant will then receive an invitation to complete the full application if all eligibility requirement are met. The applicant must then complete the application in full. When submitting an application, applicants must:

- Meet the same eligibility as the Competitive Grant Program laid out in Sub-Chapter 2B
- Provide proof of urgency.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND TIPS**

See Sub-Chapter 2B.

---

**Sub-Chapter 3C: Rapid Response Grant Program Project Selection**

**PROJECT SELECTION**

In each Safe Routes to School Competitive Infrastructure Grant cycle of funding, the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee selects a focus area and determines prioritization criteria to be used in the staff scoring of the project that will also be used to prioritize Rapid Response Grants for that cycle. For the structure for selecting prioritization criteria as well as current priorities and focus area, see Sub-Chapter 2C.

**DECISION MAKING STRUCTURE AND ROLES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Opportunity for Public Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cities, Counties, Tribes, Transit Districts, other Road Authorities, and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Area Managers</td>
<td>Letter of Intent submittal: Eligible entities submit ODOT prescribed Letter of Intent.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ODOT staff</td>
<td>Initial eligibility review of Letter of Intent: ODOT staff reviews Letter of Intent for applications for objective eligibility requirements.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Rapid Response Subcommittee (Subcommittee)</td>
<td>Subcommittee reviews Letter of Intent: Subcommittee reviews Letters of Intent for urgent and safety eligibility requirements and notifies applicant with an invitation to proceed if eligible.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cities, Counties, Tribes, Transit Districts, other Road Authorities, and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Area Managers</td>
<td><strong>Application submittal:</strong> Eligible entities submit ODOT prescribed Application materials.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ODOT staff</td>
<td><strong>Initial eligibility review Application:</strong> ODOT staff reviews Application for objective eligibility requirements.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Rapid Response Subcommittee (Subcommittee)</td>
<td><strong>Subcommittee reviews Applications:</strong> Subcommittee reviews and scores all applications and considers score and urgency to determine which projects to recommend for funding.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC)</td>
<td><strong>Final approval:</strong> OTC reviews and has authority to approve Subcommittee recommendations. OTC meetings have an opportunity for public comment.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Program Manager</td>
<td><strong>Notification and contract signed:</strong> Program Manager notifies project applicants of award and works with Grant Recipients to sign the Intergovernmental Agreement or ODOT Region contract, described below.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rapid Response Subcommittee Role Continued:** Three to five members of the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee in addition to the Safe Routes to School Program Manager make up the Rapid Response Subcommittee. This Subcommittee reviews Letters of Intent for eligibility and scores each full application using the scoring matrix created for the Competitive Grant Program (Appendix B). The Subcommittee considers the project score relative to the scores in the Competitive Grant Program as well as the applicant’s description of the project’s urgency and determines which projects to recommend for funding. The Subcommittee recommends projects monthly or as needed.

Rapid Response program funds that are not allocated before the next Safe Routes to School Competitive Infrastructure Grant cycle will be added to the Safe Routes to School Competitive Infrastructure Grant allocation total.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Max pts per category</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Students receiving FR lunch</td>
<td>under 40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of people in poverty in the city</td>
<td>10-19%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-29%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-39%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40% and over</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>over 2 lanes or 30 ft crossing distance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 3 lanes or 40 ft crossing distance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 4 lanes or 50 ft crossing distance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w/in .51-1 mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w/in .26-.5 mile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w/in .25 mile but not adjacent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adjacent to school property</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>21-30 mph</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-40 mph</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-50 mph</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 50 mph</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w/in .51-1 mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w/in .26-.5 mile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w/in .25 mile but not adjacent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adjacent to school property</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AADT</td>
<td>1,000-5,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000-11,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000 or over</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w/in .51-1 mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w/in .26-.5 mile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w/in .25 mile but not adjacent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adjacent to school property</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crashes</td>
<td>injury occurred</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fatality occurred</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statute</td>
<td>School type (Elementary, Middle, High school)</td>
<td>any combination of grades including kindergarten through 8th grade</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population or Unincorporated area</td>
<td>10,001-50K</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,001-10K</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,501-5K</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500 or under, or unincorporated</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant's description of need for the program.</td>
<td>Program Manager can provide up to 25 points of extra credit total for relevant items mentioned in the application that make this community process urgent that were not already given points for. Examples: TSP update timeline, no planner on staff.</td>
<td>25 points extra credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Manager must provide documented reasons for adding extra credit points and apply those reasons consistently across all applications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Review: Program Manager will review the answer to the question "why is the community unable to create this plan on their own" and red flag any applications that don’t describe a meaningful need for the service. Once the application is red flagged staff will reach out to applicant for clarification. If red flag is not mitigated, the issue will be noted for the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee to review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Max pts available</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
<th>Max pts per criteria</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety= 50%</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>No education programming included</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly or other one time bike/ped event</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ped and/or Bike education (on bikes, in school or after school): will use a bike curriculum (Time intensive)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE or health teacher included in education plans (train the trainer), Use curriculum year after year, sustainable education model</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure projects that are funded and planned to be completed in the next 5 years (ODOT Infrastructure SRTS funded or other)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed infrastructure project(s) in the last 5 years within 1.5 miles of benefitting school(s),</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Schools are Title I (Students receiving FR lunch)</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>No benefitting schools in the project are Title I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some of the benefitting schools in the project are Title I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of benefitting schools in project are Title I (&gt; 50%)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All benefitting schools in project are Title I</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity= 25%</td>
<td>New SRTS Program</td>
<td>Applicant received ODOT Non-infrastructure funding in the last grant cycle 2017-2019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant did not get ODOT Non-infrastructure funds last cycle, but has received in the past</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has never received ODOT Non-Infrastructure funds</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/ Collaboration/ Coordination = 15%</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Detail coordination with local and community partners, included plans of working with partners, letters of support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did not discuss plans of collaboration with community partners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listing potential local partners and discussion of some plans to partner with them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At least one of the following: Detailed level of partnership plans in application and budget, letters of support, discussion of sustainable long term goals by collaboration with local partners</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator/Capacity building</td>
<td>Application budget includes funding a dedicated SRTS coordinator (At least partial funded FTE)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Program Priorities = 10%</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Inclusion of 6 E's in project plans (Holistic programming)</td>
<td>0-3 E’s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-5 E’s</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-6 E’s</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans/visions for long term sustainability after ODOT grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did not discuss plans of sustainability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant answered question of sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant included specific/detailed plans on funding and programming sustainability after ODOT grant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring Evaluation TOTAL: 440

Applications will be scored on a range of 0-max points for each category. Applications will be reviewed for content in the above matrix using the criteria below:

1. **Specific**: Does the application give enough specific details to understand the full scope of goals, objectives, and activities of the project?
2. **Measurable**: Does the application have enough measurable objectives and activities to understand the full scope of results they expect to see?
3. **Attainable (Achievable)**: Are the goals, objectives and activities achievable in the timeframe, capacity and the proposed budget?
4. **Relevant or Realistic**: Are the goals, objectives and activities relevant to the mission of the grant given budget and resource constraints?
5. **Time-bound**: Does the application give realistic goals within the time frame for each grant year and for the overall grant period?

**** TSD manager will initially review each application and if there are any red flags present in the initial review, the applicant will be notified for clarification. If the red flag is not mitigated, the issue will be noted for the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee to review.