

2021-2022
Safe Routes to School
Competitive
Construction Grants

FINAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT

JANUARY 2021

Contents

Program Development.....	3
Program Oversight.....	3
Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee	5
Program Guidance	5
Guidelines	6
Project Solicitation Process.....	7
Letter of Intent	7
Application.....	7
Application Review	8
Eligibility review and Empirical score	8
Ground Conditions Review	8
Advisory Committee Review.....	9
Appendices	10
Appendix A: Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee.....	10
Appendix B: Empirical Scoring Matrix	11
Appendix C: Program Guidelines 2021-22.....	17
Appendix D: Safe Routes to School Construction Competitive Grant Program Application	17
Appendix E: Eligibility Matrix.....	19
Appendix F: Meeting Packets	23
10/20/20 Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Meeting.....	23
https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Programs/TDD%20Documents/Oct2020-SRAC-Meeting-Materials.pdf	
9/8/2020 Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Meeting.....	23
https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Programs/TDD%20Documents/SRAC-Meeting-Presentation.pdf	23
12/1/2020 Oregon Transportation Commission Meeting: Approve Recommended 2021 Safe Routes to School Construction Projects.....	23
Appendix G: Recommended and Approved Project List	23

“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 2021-2022 Safe Routes to School Construction Competitive Grant project selection process. The Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Section details who and how final recommendations were made to the Oregon Transportation Commission.

Program Development

The Oregon Department of Transportation has two main types of Safe Routes to School programs: Construction and non-infrastructure. Construction 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 an organizational structure for administrative rules, application process, and review processes to implement the Safe Routes to School Construction Competitive Program.

Program Oversight

Guiding Policies

ODOT created the policy document [Safe Routes to School Construction 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 Construction 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 Construction 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 Construction 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 Construction 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 [Safe Routes to School Rule](#). The Committee is responsible for establishing the Safe Routes to School Construction 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 18 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](#) identifies the major attributes of the program, such as who is eligible, general timing and overall evaluation criteria.

The Safe Routes to School 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:

Empirical Scoring Matrix Summary*		
Priority Area	Categories	Total Possible Score
Equity	Title 1 school and percentage Title 1	195

Safety	Crashes Speed Lanes or Crossing Distance	120
School Type	K-8 or any combination	90
Readiness	Elements completed or underway, such as Right of way, utility relocation, environmental, Engineering	80
Proximity to School	½ mile or less	15
Total Possible Points		500
<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 Construction 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 30th 2020 the 2021-2022 Safe Routes to School Competitive Construction Grant project solicitation period was announced for April-December 2020. The total amount available was \$28.3 million.

Six in-person then online outreach events were held between February and May 2020 to notify cities, counties, tribes and others of the available Safe Routes to School Competitive Construction 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. Staff reached over 200 people with in-person (prior to COVID-19) and online outreach.

A two-step process was implemented for applying on projects, including a Letter of Intent and formal Application. Application materials and program guidelines were posted on ODOT's website (<https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.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 Construction Program Manager to gage how many applicants will apply for the current round of funding
- Allocate adequate staffing resources for effective application review and scoring.

One hundred seven Letters of Intent, totaling over \$80 million, were submitted by June 15th, 2020. 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 June 30th 2020, applicants who submitted eligible Letters of Intent were invited to submit formal applications due by August 31st 2020. 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 August 31st deadline.

Application

Project applications for the first cycle were due on August 31, 2020. ODOT received 99 eligible applications totaling \$73 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 99 project applications were received, seven 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 October 2020. Based on these assessments, 8 applications were edited by the applicant and all eligibility concerns were addressed.

Staff provided feedback to one applicant that a part of the project was not on public road right of way. The applicant updated their applications to remove the budget line item that was not eligible.

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

All 99 applications were scored using the same Empirical Scoring Matrix using a score automatically calculated from the online application in addition to a small portion around readiness calculated by one of seven ODOT headquarters staff trained on the scoring technique. Staff identified a processing error in the automatically-calculated portion of the application and updated applicant scores to show all of the points earned for each applicant. This error and update was laid out for the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee during their meeting on October 20, 2020. Throughout the process, all 99 applicants remained eligible for funding. **The eligibility matrix is included in Appendix E and lists all projects alphabetically in tiers after scoring.**

Ground Conditions Review

The 150% list was provided to region staff (ATLs) in September 2020 for onsite assessments, if necessary. ODOT Staff focused on completing ground conditions review for the top 150% 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 prior to their October 20th 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.

On October 20, 2020, the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee met to discuss and recommend \$28.3M in construction 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 December 1, 2020. The list includes 43 projects from across the state (Appendix G).

Appendices

Appendix A: Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee

Kari Schlosshauer (Vice Chair)	Statewide	Safe Routes to School Network representative
Mavis Hartz (Chair)	La Grande	Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Trevor Arnold	Medford	Enforcement representative
Brian Potwin	Bend	SRTS practitioner and SRTS Network
Kim Crabtree	Bend	School district and pupil transportation
John Vial	Jackson County	County representative from Association of Oregon Counties
Dana Nichols	Bandon	Small city representative
Rob Inerfeld	Eugene	City representative from League of Oregon Cities
Laughton Elliot-Deangelis	Springfield	School district, SRTS practitioner, pupil transportation
Scott Bohl	Salem	Oregon Department of Education
Steve Dickey	Salem	Transit representative
Luis Ornelas	Portland	Oregon Transportation Safety Committee
Carolina Iraheta-Gonzales	Portland	Health representative
Sonny Chickering	Salem	ODOT representative
Lauren Morris	Coquille	Oregon Tribes representative
Noel Mickelberry	Portland	Metropolitan Planning Organization representative
Xao Xiong	Portland	Large city and SRTS practitioner representative
Dani Schulte	Pendleton	Oregon Tribes representative

Appendix B: Empirical Scoring Matrix

Eligibility Criteria	
The project description does not appear to address identified problem / barrier(s) for children biking and walking to school OAR 737-025-0092(1)(a)(B) and OAR 737-025-0092(1)(a)(C)	Staff will flag an application for further review when there is no nexus drawn between problem and solution. After an application is flagged, staff will reach out to the applicant with an opportunity to update the application.
The project scope and project description appear to be significantly out of alignment OAR 737-025-0092(1)(a)(C)	Staff will flag an application for further review when the amount requested is out of alignment with the project OR if the information in the READINESS criteria was not taken into account in the amount requested. After an application is flagged, staff will reach out to the applicant with an opportunity to update the application.
The applicants must check all of the additional criteria set by statute and the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee regarding a commitment to outreach, the project aligning with an adopted plan, within one mile of a school, school support, and support of all road authorities involved.	Automation in the application will remove applicants who don't commit to these criteria.

	A ground conditions review was conducted and a potential issue was identified OAR 737-025-0092(1)(a)(B)	Staff will perform ground conditions to assess whether the information provided in the READINESS and SAFETY portions of the application seem accurate. The use of federal funding as match automatically triggers an in person ground conditions review. Staff completing ground conditions reviews will also weigh in on the questions in ELIGIBILITY criteria 1 and 2. After an application is flagged, staff will reach out to the applicant with an opportunity to update the application.
	An issue was identified at some point during the review of the application that needs to be discussed	Staff will only use this category if there is an unforeseen issue with an application. After an application is flagged, staff will reach out to the applicant with an opportunity to update the application.

Scoring

	Priority Area	Categories	Sub-categories	Score category	Total score	Notes	Implementation
Focus Area	Equity	Free/ Reduced Lunch rate	10-19%	15	195	Title I schools will be prioritized by measuring the rate of students eligible for	Automatically scored with information from the application. Applicants can find this data in school report cards, https://www.ode.state.or.us/data/reportcard/reports.aspx .
			20-29%	35			
			30-39%	55			
			40-49%	80			

			50-59%	100			
			60-69%	120			
			70-79%	140			
			80-89%	160			
			90-100%	180			
		Other vulnerability assessment data points	Ever English Learner rate is above state average (23%)	5			
			Non-white student rate is above state average (35%)	5			
			Chronic Absenteeism is above state average (20%)	5			

Heavily Weighted	Readiness	High risk	Right of Way	0-20	80	Scoring will be assessed based on the risk factors associated with readiness. Partial completion/mitigation	20 points will be awarded if the applicant or the agency delivering the project owns the ROW, have an easement, or have permission to purchase the ROW. 10 points if they are in the process of figuring it out; 0 points if they don't know if they own the ROW.
-------------------------	-----------	-----------	--------------	------	----	---	---

			Public Process	0-20	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)	20 points will be awarded if the applicant have completed public process, have done due diligence, or are currently in the process; 10 if they have done outreach but it was a long time ago (for example 5 years), not relevant for the project, or if the community was opposed but approaches have been identified to mitigate; 0 points for no outreach or if the majority of the community is currently opposed.
			Environ-mental	0-20		20 points will be awarded if the applicant doesn't need to address environmental issues or if they have figured out all of the details; 10 points if they know it's an issue but haven't figured out how to address it; 0 points if they don't know.
		Lower risk	Storm water	0-7		7 points will be awarded if the applicant doesn't need to address storm water or if they have figured out all of the details; 5 points if they know it's an issue but haven't figured out how to address it; 0 points if they don't know.
			Utilities	0-7		7 points will be awarded if the applicant doesn't need to move utilities or if they have figured out all of the details; 5 points if they know it's an issue but haven't figured out how to address it; 0 points if they don't know.
			Design	0-6		6 points will be awarded if the applicant has attached design documents; 3 points if they are started design or have attached conceptual design; 0 points if they have not started design.

Safety	Bicyclist or Pedestrian crash b/w 6am and 9pm	Non-serious injury or serious	7	120	Projects that are on a Priority Safety Corridor (PSC) will receive 40 points then receive 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. OAR 737-025-0092(1)(b)(A)	Automatically scored with information from the application.
		Fatality	20			
	Speed (use 85 % if avail., posted speed if not.)	30 mph	7			
		35 mph +	20			
	Lanes or crossing distance from curb to curb	3 lanes, or greater than 30 feet	7			
		4 lanes + or greater than 40ft crossing	20			
	Average Annual Daily Traffic	3000-5,999	7			
		6000+	20			
	Priority Safety Corridor		40			
School Type	Pre-kindergarten to 8th grade or any combo		90	90	OAR 737-025-0092(1)(c)(A)	Automatically scored with information from the application.
School Proximity to	1/2 mile or less		5	15	OAR 737-025-0092(1)(c)(B)	

	1/4 mile or less		15		OAR 737-025-0092(1)(c)(B)		
TOTAL SCORE				500			

Appendix C: Program Guidelines 2021-22

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Programs/TDD%20Documents/2021-2022-SRTS-Construction-Program-Guidelines.pdf>

Appendix D: Safe Routes to School Construction Competitive Grant Program Application

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/2020-SRTS-Grant-WORKSHEET.doc>

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix E: Eligibility Matrix

Region	Applicant Name	Application #	Grant request	Score Tier
Region 2	City of Albany	49	\$239,300.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Albany	54	\$1,280,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 3	City of Brookings	118	\$1,372,950.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Dayton	81	\$600,145.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Eugene	111	\$255,840.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Eugene	114	\$447,896.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Falls City	14	\$471,520.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Florence	22	\$400,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 1	City of Forest Grove	21	\$80,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Gervais	62	\$182,858.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 3	City of Grants Pass	56	\$1,380,828.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 1	City of Gresham	52	\$197,047.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 1	City of Gresham	63	\$398,100.53	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 1	City of Hillsboro	93	\$216,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 1	City of Hillsboro	94	\$412,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 1	City of Hillsboro	96	\$112,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 4	City of Madras	12	\$300,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 3	City of Medford	99	\$62,400.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 3	City of Medford	100	\$395,200.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 3	City of Medford	101	\$369,600.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Newberg	105	\$122,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 5	City of Ontario	27	\$360,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 1	City of Portland	32	\$2,000,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 1	City of Portland (NOT FUNDED \$2 million max)	79	\$2,000,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370

Region 3	City of Powers	13	\$787,688.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Salem	110	\$112,800.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Salem	112	\$1,763,200.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Salem	115	\$124,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Springfield	37	\$320,200.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Sweet Home	30	\$117,812.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 1	City of Tigard	28	\$792,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Waldport	108	\$1,670,920.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Warrenton	15	\$400,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 1	Clackamas County	19	\$1,977,975.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 5	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	36	\$900,097.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 3	Douglas County	70	\$2,000,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	Lane County	44	\$931,616.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	Marion County	45	\$460,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	Marion County	61	\$160,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	Marion County	58	\$380,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	Marion County	59	\$300,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 3	ODOT Region 3	73	\$1,600,000.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 4	ODOT Region 4	43	\$1,393,518.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 5	ODOT Region 5	75	\$474,936.00	Tier 1: Score 500-370
Region 2	City of Creswell	34	\$489,039.00	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 4	City of Dufur	64	\$1,080,000.00	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 4	City of Malin	82	\$2,000,000.00	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 2	City of Mill City	76	\$1,950,000.00	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 1	City of Oregon City	88	\$1,343,659.00	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 3	City of Roseburg	18	\$1,536,325.00	Tier 2: Score 369-350

Region 1	City of Sandy	78	\$718,768.57	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 3	City of Sutherlin	40	\$1,810,880.00	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 1	City of Tigard	48	\$424,000.00	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 3	Josephine County	98	\$258,000.00	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 3	ODOT Region 3	85	\$1,494,000.00	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 4	ODOT Region 4	42	\$300,000.00	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 5	ODOT Region 5	65	\$489,217.33	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 1	Washington County	90	\$615,000.00	Tier 2: Score 369-350
Region 2	Benton County	68	\$689,696.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 5	City of Baker City	47	\$75,000.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 4	City of Bend	50	\$633,060.48	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 4	City of Chiloquin	91	\$1,312,000.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 2	City of Corvallis	80	\$435,680.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 2	City of Corvallis	92	\$333,548.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 5	City of Irrigon	26	\$307,200.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 2	City of Lyons	104	\$1,562,380.80	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 3	City of Medford	97	\$697,600.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 1	City of Milwaukie	53	\$2,000,000.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 1	City of Milwaukie	55	\$642,960.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 3	City of Myrtle Creek	39	\$733,040.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 2	City of Salem	113	\$388,000.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 2	City of Sweet Home	11	\$785,590.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 2	City of Veneta	25	\$725,000.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 3	Josephine County	102	\$300,000.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 2	Lane County	41	\$1,045,460.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 2	Linn County	95	\$448,000.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 1	ODOT Region 1	116	\$731,984.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300

Region 1	Washington County	89	\$1,144,000.00	Tier 3: Score 349-300
Region 2	City of Amity	57	\$697,000.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 3	City of Ashland	84	\$809,574.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 3	City of Bandon	77	\$572,000.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 4	City of Bend	51	\$60,000.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 5	City of Boardman	117	\$197,620.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 4	City of Condon	60	\$544,000.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 3	City of Eagle Point	67	\$615,000.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 3	City of Eagle Point	69	\$224,000.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 2	City of Gaston	106	\$209,600.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 2	City of Harrisburg	83	\$500,000.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 1	City of Hood River	31	\$902,704.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 4	City of Klamath Falls	35	\$417,200.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 4	City of Paisley	107	\$1,577,393.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 5	City of Pendleton	17	\$224,000.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 2	City of Salem Public Works Department	109	\$688,000.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 2	City of Scappoose	38	\$892,555.80	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 2	City of Silverton	66	\$159,552.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 2	City of Yamhill	87	\$576,000.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 3	Josephine County Public Works	103	\$90,000.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 2	Marion County Public Works	72	\$195,000.00	Tier 4: Below 300
Region 2	ODOT Region 2	74	\$596,074.20	Tier 4: Below 300

Appendix F: Meeting Packets

10/20/20 Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Meeting

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Programs/TDD%20Documents/Oct2020-SRAC-Meeting-Materials.pdf>

9/8/2020 Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Meeting

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Programs/TDD%20Documents/SRAC-Meeting-Presentation.pdf>

12/1/2020 Oregon Transportation Commission Meeting: Approve Recommended 2021 Safe Routes to School Construction Projects

https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Get-Involved/OTCSupportMaterials/Consent_06_Attach_02_2021-22_SRTS_Recommended_Construction_Projects.pdf

Appendix G: Recommended and Approved Project List

Region	Applicant Agency	Project Name	Grant Award Request	Request Match Reduction to 20%
Region 5	ODOT, Region 5	The project constructs sidewalk and bike lanes for students at West Park Elementary.	\$474,936	no
Region 5	City of Ontario	The project constructs sidewalk and pedestrian ramps for students at Alameda and May Roberts Elementary Schools.	\$360,000	yes
Region 5	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	The project constructs crosswalk and pedestrian visibility improvements, a pedestrian walkway, and school zone sign installation for students at Nixyaawii Community School.	\$900,097	yes
		Region Sub-Total	\$1,735,033	
Region 4	ODOT, Region 4	The project constructs sidewalks and an improved crossing for students at Merrill Elementary School.	\$1,393,518	no
Region 4	City of Madras	This project constructs sidewalk and ramps for students at Madras Elementary School.	\$300,000	yes
		Region Sub-Total	\$1,693,518	
Region 3	ODOT, Region 3	The project constructs sidewalks and pedestrian crossing improvements for students at Phoenix Elementary School.	\$1,600,000	no
Region 3	City of Brookings	The project constructs sidewalks for students at Kalmiopsis Elementary School.	\$1,372,950	yes
Region 3	City of Grants Pass	Project constructs new and infill pedestrian facilities for students at Lincoln Elementary School.	\$1,380,828	yes

Region 3	City of Medford	The project constructs crosswalk improvements and enhances existing crossings for students at Kennedy School.	\$395,200	yes
Region 3	City of Medford	Project constructs a rectangular rapid flashing beacon for students at Jefferson Elementary School.	\$62,400	yes
Region 3	City of Medford	The project constructs a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon and curb ramps and sidewalks for students at Howard Elementary School.	\$369,600	yes
Region 3	City of Powers	The project constructs walkways, high-visibility crosswalks, and school zone signage for students at Powers Elementary School.	\$787,688	yes
Region 3	Douglas County	The project constructs sidewalks. Buffered bicycle lanes, school warning signs, street markings, and high visibility crosswalks for students at Canyonville Elementary School.	\$2,000,000	no
		Region Sub-Total	\$7,968,666	
Region 2	City of Albany	This project constructs flashing beacons and bicycle and pedestrian crossing improvements for students at Sunrise Elementary School.	\$239,300	yes
Region 2	City of Albany	The project constructs sidewalk, improved pedestrian crossings with flashing light systems for students at Lafayette Elementary School.	\$1,280,000	yes
Region 2	City of Dayton	The project constructs continuous sidewalk for students at Dayton Junior High.	\$600,145	yes
Region 2	City of Eugene	The project constructs a separated pedestrian space, a bike lane, a sidewalk, and wayfinding for students at Howard Elementary School.	\$447,896	yes
Region 2	City of Eugene	The project constructs rapid flashing beacons, crossing island, and crosswalk markings for students at Prairie Mountain School.	\$255,840	yes
Region 2	City of Falls City	The project constructs a well-lit walkway, a pedestrian island, flashing beacons, and crosswalks for students at Falls City Elementary School.	\$471,520	yes
Region 2	City of Florence	The project constructs improved crossings and crosswalks for students at Siuslaw Middle School.	\$400,000	yes
Region 2	City of Gervais	The project constructs solar powered flashing beacons, sidewalk, and a bicycle lane for students at Gervais Elementary School.	\$182,858	yes
Region 2	City of Newberg	The project constructs pedestrian crossing signs, stop signs, curb ramps, crosswalk markings, and infill of sidewalks for students at Edwards Elementary School.	\$122,000	yes
Region 2	City of Salem	The project constructs a median island, an improved pedestrian crosswalk, ramps, and	\$112,800	yes

		street lighting for students at Highland Elementary School.		
Region 2	City of Salem	The project constructs a median island, an improved pedestrian crosswalk, ramps, and street lighting for students at Swegle Elementary School.	\$124,000	yes
Region 2	City of Salem	The project constructs sidewalk and a median island with crosswalk for students at Mary Eyre Elementary School & Miller Elementary School.	\$1,763,200	yes
Region 2	City of Springfield	This project constructs rectangular rapid flashing beacons and a pedestrian refuge island for students at Douglas Gardens Elementary School.	\$320,200	yes
Region 2	City of Sweet Home	The projects constructs school zone flashers with a pedestrian-activated rapid flashing beacon for students at Oak Heights Elementary.	\$117,812	yes
Region 2	City of Waldport	The project constructs a walkway and a crossing for students at Crestview Heights Schools.	\$1,670,920	yes
Region 2	City of Warrenton	The project constructs walkways for students at Warrenton Grade School.	\$400,000	yes
Region 2	Lane County	The project constructs sidewalks and a pedestrian refuge island for students at Lundy Elementary School.	\$931,616	yes
Region 2	Marion County	The project constructs a crosswalk, flashing beacons, walkways, sidewalk infill, and enhanced safety measures for students at Four Corners Elementary.	\$380,000	yes
Region 2	Marion County	The project constructs a pedestrian crossing with enhanced safety measures including a rectangular rapid flashing beacon, pedestrian refuge island, street lighting, and high visibility signing for students at Auburn Elementary.	\$160,000	yes
Region 2	Marion County	The project constructs crosswalks, school zone flashers, and ramps for students at Eyre Elementary School.	\$300,000	no
Region 2	Marion County	This project constructs pedestrian hybrid beacons, signage and surface markings to enhance the crossing visibility, sidewalk infill, and ramps for students at Stayton Middle School.	\$460,000	yes
		Region Sub-Total	\$10,740,107	
Region 1	City of Forest Grove	The project constructs sidewalk and an upgrade to the railroad crossing to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists with a dedicated facility for students at Fern Hill Elementary.	\$80,000	yes

Region 1	City of Gresham	The project constructs flashers to school zones that will flash during school arrival and dismissal times for students at Hogan Cedars Elementary School.	\$197,047	yes
Region 1	City of Gresham	The project constructs curb extensions, flashing lights added to the existing school zone, ramps, and a walkway for students at Davis Elementary School.	\$398,101	yes
Region 1	City of Hillsboro	The project constructs an enhanced crossing with a refuge island and a school crossing for students at Rosedale Elementary School.	\$112,000	yes
Region 1	City of Hillsboro	The project constructs sidewalks, intersection improvements, and lighting for students at Eastwood Elementary School.	\$412,000	yes
Region 1	City of Hillsboro	The project constructs sidewalks, ramps, and lighting improvements for students at McKinney Elementary School.	\$216,000	yes
Region 1	City of Portland	The project constructs sidewalk infill and crossing improvements for students at Parkrose Middle School.	\$2,000,000	yes
Region 1	City of Tigard	The project constructs an enhanced pedestrian crossing (marked crosswalk, landings and ramps, and pedestrian-actuated rapid flashing beacon), and a complete sidewalk for students at Metzger Elementary School.	\$792,000	yes
Region 1	Clackamas County	The project constructs sidewalks, buffered bike lanes, lighting, ramps, and center pedestrian refuge island for students at Bilquist Elementary School.	\$1,977,975	yes
		Region Sub-Total	\$6,185,123	
		Total	\$28,322,447	