Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee (SRAC)
January 21, 2020
10:00 -4:00 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 Hartz, Rob Inerfeld, Dana Nichols, Luis Ornelas, Brian Potwin, Kari Schlosshauer, John Vial, JD Tovey, Lisa Mielke, Carolina Iraheta-Gonzales, Trevor Arnold

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

Facilitator: Chris Watchie, Cogito

Not recommended (better to be in person for this one!): 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 (9:45 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>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Welcome to the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Kari Schlosshauer/Mavis Hartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Overview of the day</td>
<td>Chris Watchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Summary overview and approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>Chris Watchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Program/Department updates:</td>
<td>LeeAnne Fergason, Heidi Manlove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>ACTIVITY 1- Small Group Discussions about first 3 topics!</td>
<td>Chris Watchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description: SRAC members break into small groups to discuss one of three topics. Members will switch to a new topic every 15 minutes until each person had discussed each topic. Three Topics: Equity; Safety; Maximize Resources: Readiness and collaboration with education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In each round ODOT staff will ask the group to consider the below questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. How do you want this topic to be evaluated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How much should it me weighed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch (provided)- round table sharing</td>
<td>LeeAnne Fergason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Walk – SRAC members will go for a walk with 1 or 2 people and share their personal or professional goals for 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>ACTIVITY 2- Small Group Discussions about last 3 topics!</td>
<td>Chris Watchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Topics: Geographic Balance; Maximize Resource: How is the project Cost effective; Maximize Resources: Does the solution match the problem well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Break- individual work assignment</td>
<td>Chris Watchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Group Discussion and Decision</td>
<td>Chris Watchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For each topic we will agree on answers to the following questions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. How do you want this topic to be evaluated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How much should it me weighed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Wrap up</td>
<td>Kari Schlosshauer/Mavis Hartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td>Chris Watchie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next meeting: February 11, 2020; 12:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.
Welcome
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Position</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>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>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>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Iraheta-Gonzales</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Arnold</td>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUR GOAL TODAY

Create today’s SRTS time for meaningful input into SRTS scoring criteria to fund the best projects possible.
Overview

SRAC Business

Public Comment

Program/Department updates

SRAC Priority Input

Discussion and Decision
Meeting Summary

October

We completed a robust debrief of 2018-2019 SRAC decisions. Our 2020 meetings, specifically the deep discussion focus of this meeting, are based on this feedback.
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.
Public Comment
ODOT Leadership Structure – December 2019

- OTC Chief of Staff
- Director
- Audit Services

**Assistant Director for Social Equity**
- Office of Civil Rights

**Assistant Director for Revenue Finance and Compliance**
- Driver and Motor Vehicle Services
- Commerce and Compliance Division (Motor Carrier)
- Office of Innovation
- Finance and Budget Division*

**Assistant Director for Government and External Relations**
- Government Relations
- Communications

**Assistant Director for Operations**
- Delivery and Operations Division (Highway)
- Policy, Data and Analysis Division (TDD)
- Public Transportation Division (Rail)
- Safety Division
- Support Services Division (Central Services)

* New office
- Budget
- Financial Services
- Revenue Forecasting
Transportation Development Division:

NEW: SRTS Construction Program
$10 million/annually increasing $15M 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Program Management</th>
<th>Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Enforcement and Education/Engagement Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ODOT's Safe Routes to School Program!

Transportation Safety Division:

SRTS Education and Engagement
$1 million

Transportation Development Division:

NEW: SRTS Construction Program
$10 million/annually increasing $15M 2023

Equity and Evaluation

2 Programs = 1 Goal
Funded Projects & Communities
2018 - 2020 & 2020 - 2022 Grant Cycles

Funded Projects & Communities
Competitive Construction, Education & Encouragement, and Project Identified Selected Communities

- Funded Entities & Selected Communities

49 Funded Entities
$17.9m Funds Provided

The Need
Not Funded Competitive Construction and Education & Encouragement Grant Applicants

- 1 applicant
- 2 applicants
- 3 applicants
- 4 applicants

105 Applicants Not Funded
$70.6m Requested Funds

Title I Schools
Title I School Density

- 1 - 3 Schools
- 4 - 7 Schools
- 8 - 13 Schools
- 14 - 21 Schools
- 22 - 31 Schools

798 Title I Schools*
1,258 All Public Schools*

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

- MPO Area
  - Funded Inside MPO: 35%
  - Not Funded Inside MPO: 49%
  - Title I Schools Inside MPO: 48%
  - All Public Schools Inside MPO: 51%

- Outside MPO
  - Funded Outside MPO: 65%
  - Not Funded Outside MPO: 51%
  - Title I Schools Outside MPO: 52%
  - All Public Schools Outside MPO: 49%

*2 Mile Analysis Area  **ORE 2018-2019 Free & Reduced Lunch Eligibility List
Non-Infrastructure Program Updates

NI
Competitive Grants

FFY 2020-2022

11 Grantees
## Non-Infrastructure Updates Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Statewide Services</th>
<th>Tech assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for new grantees</td>
<td>Manage consultant work Diversity, Equity &amp; Inclusion Curriculum New SRTS Network Admin position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manage consultant work Diversity, Equity &amp; Inclusion Curriculum New SRTS Network Admin position</td>
<td>Training for SRTS Practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of outreach program In-Person and Webinars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Walk+Roll Program
- **Recognition program-Expansion of outreach**

### Jump Start
- **Roseburg**
- **Applications out for 2020/2021**
- **New bike fleets**
# Infrastructure Competitive Grant Projects

## Update Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Projects</th>
<th>25 Projects</th>
<th>2 projects completed</th>
<th>Deschutes Co La Grande</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 IGA not yet signed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 active projects</td>
<td>1 construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 in design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 in pre-design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Identification Program Communities</th>
<th>14 Communities</th>
<th>1 complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 in draft phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 scheduled site visits in spring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funded Competitive Construction Projects
2018 - 2020

24 Projects Funded
$15.6m Funds Allocated

Competitive Construction Funded Projects*  MPO Area  ODOT Region Boundary

*Rapid Response Applicants and Funded Projects will be included in the 2020 map update
Our Guiding Principles

- Social Equity
- Geographic Balance
- Safety
- Health
- Communication, Coordination, and Collaboration
- Maximize Resources
Equity

Maximize Resources: Readiness*

CCC: Collaboration with Education

Safety

How do you want this topic to be evaluated?

How much should it be weighed?

* Readiness must remain high priority, but how it is evaluated can be updated.
Activity 2
Maximize Resources: solution match the problem

Geographic Balance

Maximize Resource: Cost effective project

How do you want this topic to be evaluated?

How much should it be weighed?
Individual Assignment:
How would you weigh topics in 2020?

*not listed readiness and K-8 priority. These must be high priority.
### 2018 Priorities and Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Title I Schools (equity)</th>
<th>Safety Risk Factors</th>
<th>Elementary/Middle Schools</th>
<th>Readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priorities</td>
<td>Proximity to School</td>
<td>Mutual Benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>Connection to Education and Encouragement Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Score Distribution

- **Equity**: 40%
- **Readiness**: 16%
- **Safety**: 18%
- **School Type**: 18%
- **Proximity**: 3%
- **Multiple School**: 3%
- **Education**: 2%

**Total Possible Score = 500**
Discussion and Decision
Readiness and K-8 must remain high priority, but how readiness is evaluated can be updated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 21</td>
<td>Infrastructure priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>EQUITY TRAINING RESCHEDULED for April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>Review infrastructure draft scoring matrix. Next OTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-June</td>
<td>Optional: Attend a SRTS workshop in your region!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April-August</td>
<td>April 1-May 15: LOI due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 1- August 31: Application due due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 8</td>
<td>Optional: online meeting for analysis of all apps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20</td>
<td>Recommendation for Infrastructure funds. Next OTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2021</td>
<td>Year in review. Nominate new Chair and Vice Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!

Next meeting:

March 18, 12pm-3pm
Sept 8 (optional call), 1pm-3pm
October 20, 12pm-3pm
SRTS Non-Infrastructure Contact:
Heidi Manlove, SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program Manager
ODOT Transportation Safety Division, MS #3
Email: Heidi.manlove@odot.state.or.us
(503) 968-4196

SRTS Infrastructure Program Contact:
LeeAnne Fergason, ODOT Program Manager
Transportation Development Division
Email: LeeAnne.Fergason@odot.state.or.us
(503) 986-5805

Website:
http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.aspx
Member Attendees: Kari Schlosshauer, Kim Crabtree, Sonny Chickering, Rob Inerfeld, Steve Dickey, Scott Bohl, Anthony Buczek, John Vial, Luis Ornelas, J.D. Tovey, Dana Nichols

On the Phone: Laughton Elliot-Deangelis, Brian Potwin, Lisa Mielke

Not in Attendance: Mychal Tetteh

Guest: Carolina Iraheta-Gonzalez from OHA (possible new member)

ODOT Staff: Amanda Pietz, LeeAnne Fergason, Heidi Manlove, Tami Weil, Traci Pearl, Hannah Day-Kapell (Alta consultant);

Facilitator: Chris Watchie

Welcome: Kari Schlosshauer led Introductions and introduced guest, Carolina Iraheta-Gonzales, as the pending new Health committee member previously held by Leticia Valle.

Agenda Item: Meeting Overview: Kari Schlosshauer introduced meeting goals: debrief of 2018-19 SRAC work, successes/challenges of the past year, and prioritization of future projects. She highlighted that the SRAC inherited priorities from SRTS Rule Advisory Committee and will be moving forward with their own priorities this year.

Agenda Item: SRAC Business: Chris Watchie requested approval for May 29 and July 9 SRAC notes. SRAC members noted that in the minutes from May 29, staff needs to correct the spelling of Kari's Schlosshauer's name.

DECISION: SRAC approved May 29 and July 9 minutes with minor revision.

Agenda Item: Public Comment: LeeAnne Fergason introduced two letters submitted as public comment:
• #1: Metro’s expressed concerns about the coordination of programs between two ODOT divisions and their staff capacity. Letter can be found in the SRAC packet on the ODOT SRAC page.
• #2: Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance providers were concerned about ODOT staff capacity.

Both letters are available on the ODOT SRAC page, https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS-SRAC.aspx

SRAC Comments/Questions
Q: Do the letters want more ODOT participation and focus behind essential strategy? What was the intent behind that? What did the letters request? What do the letter writers want to happen?

Response from authors presents (Kari Schlosshauer and Hannah Day-Kapell):
- The SRTS program has a lot going on right now and ODOT should look strategically at how they it and its important relationships to move forward.
- The SRTS Network wanted to express its support that much of the work stay internal to ODOT and not be outsourced.

Comment: In thinking about what the future holds for SRTS and its partners, such as the Oregon Health Authority (OHA) and Oregon Department of Education (ODE), in terms of collaboration is important. This indicates a need for staff time to connect with these departments. Remember the Hood River letter a few months ago that noted a new school being built on a state highway. This letter indicated the need for SRTS infrastructure and school siting policy. These things highlight how the program may need additional staff time because of the changing and growing nature of the program as we learn what is needed.

Program Updates
LeeAnne Fergason reviewed overview maps on the Competitive, Encouragement/Education, and Project Identification programs. She introduced the six maps to review progress to date. Three maps are included below in the notes. The other maps will be posted on the SRAC website in December 2019, https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS-SRAC.aspx. Projects may also be viewed on the SRTS project tracking site, https://geo.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Cascade/index.html?appid=2474dc46e79144b695827682368f60b8
Staff reviewed the ODOT slide showing Transportation Safety Division and the Transportation Development Division graphically to illustrate where the programs are housed.

ODOT’s Safe Routes to School Program!

2 Programs = 1 Goal

Encouragement/Education Program
Heidi Manlove provided the SRAC with updates on the Non-Infrastructure grant projects and technical assistance program including:

- ODOT created an updated Action Plan template: https://www.oregonsaferoutes.org/
- Communities and schools will be able to login on SRTS website www.oregon.gov/ODOT/programs/ for them.
- ODOT's goals for the Action Plans have changed with an increased focus on grantee evaluation.
- ODOT is working with ODE to make sure our health programs are aligned with curriculum to bring bike/ped safety into their school in a sustainable way (PE classes, bike fleets, etc.)
- ODOT is working currently on this curriculum.
- ODOT updated an online SRTS Resources page with lesson plans, videos, ODOT forms, lesson plans, guides, materials, etc. There is a link to the new Action Plan template.
- ODOT is updating the Jump Start Program by potentially adding new bike fleets and to also offer loaner fleets from one school to multiple school districts at once.
- Joint marketing is underway of ODOT's Walk and Roll Program and the Oregon Safe Route to School Recognition Program with additional outreach.

SRAC Comments/Questions
Comment: Program is much improved, looks great.
Q: There is a national event in Tampa in November. Is Staff going?
   Staff response: Heidi is not, but LeeAnne, Brian Potwin, Kari Schlosshauer, and Hannah Day-Kapell are attending.
Q: Are other states doing non-infrastructure grants as well?
   Staff response: Not really like Oregon. It's very diverse how SRTS is set up in each state.
Comment: As long as you bring some information back
   Staff response: ODOT staff will bring some information to the SRAC's next meeting.

Project Identification Program (PIP) Summary
Hannah Day-Kapell from ALTA Planning and Design presented a PIP update.
ALTA is working with 14 communities and 32 schools

- The process involves working with a project management team, organizing a community meeting and walk audit, and incorporating information in a Safe Routes to School Draft Plan.
- The draft plan is reviewed by the Project Management Team comprised of representatives from the school, relevant road authorities, and the public prior to a final Safe Routes to School Plan.
- Most communities are scheduled for their public meeting and walk audit fall 2019 with a few planned for spring 2020.
- Outreach has been difficult. Staff and the consultant encouraged all to attend the community meetings provided in both English and Spanish.
- Each of the communities receives this offer along with fliers and posters.
- Staff works with them on how best to get the info out to their populations (i.e., get message out via water bills, council meetings, etc. In Sandy it has not gone as well as thought due to
low parental engagement and lack of a Parent Teacher Association (PTA).

**Staff comment:** When you focus on Title 1 schools, it’s not unusual because parents are working full time with possibly holding down two jobs.

**SRAC Comments/Question:**

Q: Do the plans cover infrastructure and non-infrastructure recommendations?

**Staff response:** Yes. In May's meeting, we discussed adding Non-infrastructure recommendations to the Safe Routes to School Plan that was originally only infrastructure focused.

Q: Is the Non-Infrastructure Plan the Action Plan?

**Staff response:** No. The new SRTS Plan, created through the Project Identification Program, is a publicly adopted plan created by engineers and planners. The Safe Routes to School Action Plan was required by ODOT for grant applicants. Anyone could create an action plan in a community, as long as it is revieweed by city engineers, etc. SRTS Action Plans usually have been completed by a PTA and have not been very detailed for infrastructure recommendation purposes. When ODOT began the Infrastructure Program, it became evident that the current state of SRTS Action Plans did not adequately identify SRTS infrastructure projects. The Rulemaking Advisory Committee created the Project Identification Program to help communities identify infrastructure projects. The SRAC recognized that this effort should also include non-infrastructure recommendations, hence – current two plans:

\1) Safe Routes to School Plan: Publicly adopted with input from school, road authority, and the public.
\2) Safe Routes to School Action Plan: Not a publicly adopted plan. Developed by the school community. It focuses on a three-year work plan for school volunteers and staff)

Each plan serves a different purpose. Staff is working on streamlining the planning process.

Q: How will the Plans be used in the future? Will it make those communities more competitive or have a higher priority for the next round of Infrastructure funding?

**Staff response:** Our objective is to get communities up to the level to where they include SRTS infrastructure projects in their local Transportation System Plan (TSP) because it’s a community commitment and direction.

**Comment:** We want to make sure we’re on the same page as our schools with respect to Infrastructure plans, but some of those might not rise up to the level of the TSP.

**Staff response:** One way to resolve that would be to reference an infrastructure project or SRTS infrastructure work in a TSP. We’d like to leave it as flexible as possible for right now. By the next funding cycle we hope to have the actual Infrastructure Plans ready (not the Action Plan, but SRTS Plans).

Consultant (ALTA): Communities felt they needed to get the infrastructure side of the project done first before the education piece.

Tami Weil gave a brief update on Infrastructure Competitive Grant projects.

- 24 projects; two projects completed in La Grande (sidewalk) and in Deschutes County.
- Two in construction; 17 in design phase; one in pre-design phase.
- Have spent $393K on reimbursements for four projects to date.

Hannah Day-Kapell from ALTA Planning and Design gave an update on the **Before and After Studies** for the 24 Infrastructure Projects.
• ALTA and ODOT focused on baseline data (student hand tally, as well as, parent surveys to look at mode shifts, safety and perceptions of safety, program lifespan, and equity considerations including whom is perceived benefiting from the Infrastructure and Non-infrastructure interventions.
• ALTA and ODOT developed an advisory group comprised of SRTS Network’s leadership committee and created a parent/caregiver survey similar to national SRTS survey and Portland with slight modifications,
• Data collection gathered for projects completed in 2019 with planned data collection for projects completed by spring 2020 and afterwards.
• After-study measures include:
  o Hand tallies
  o Parent surveys
  o Parent focus group
  o Staff survey
  o Intercept surveys
  o Activity-specific surveys

**Rapid Response Program**
LeeAnne Fergason presented an update for the Rapid Response Program.
• Two Letters of Interest
• Five to ten inquiries
• Two applications received to date
• One approved project for the City of Monroe. ODOT is working on that Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA). The Oregon Transportation Commission approved the project in September 2019.

**Agenda Item: 2019 Debrief: Challenges and Successes**
LeeAnne Fergason and Heidi Manlove presented the Applicant/Grantee Survey results
More than 150 responses from all over the state about challenges and successes.
More detailed survey results are available by request, please email leeanne.fergason@odot.state.or.us.

**Outreach Success and Challenges:**
Application Successes and Challenges:
- **Staff**
  - Online forms worked for infrastructure program but was not available for non-infrastructure program
  - Quick timelines
  - Keep it simple
- **Survey**
  - Application was simple
  - The timing of the application for non-infrastructure was difficult
  - The infrastructure application favored cities with larger staff and more data
  - Difficult to meet the local cash match requirement

SRAC Comments/Question:
Comment: It was harder for smaller cities to even know where to get that data in order to complete the application.
Comment: It remains difficult to meet local cash match requirement.

Scoring of the Grant Apps Successes and Challenges:
- **Staff**
  - SRAC created
  - Quick timeline was a challenge
- **Survey**
  - The prioritization criteria was unclear for the infrastructure grants
  - ROW issue on Tribal Land was discovered late in the process

Staff Comment: The SRAC looked at the OAR priorities and weighed priorities/weight. The SRAC was created to help us prioritize but we didn't have as much time with this committee to review the
criteria as we would have like to. The scoring criteria wasn’t solidified until later in the application cycle. Staff will aim to have the scoring criteria earlier on in the process for 2020.

**SRAC Comments/Question:**

Q: For the City of Monroe, how much money did they end up getting?

   Staff response: The City of Monroe is approved to receive $125,931 with a 29% match.

Q: What did a typical workshop look like?

   Staff response: The workshops were 1.5 hours long with 45 minutes discussion of process and the remaining time answering specific questions.

Q: Did ODOT provide no child care or food?

   Staff response: Childcare was not provided. We provided cookies and water.

Comment: heard from several attendees that the workshops were done well and were absolutely helpful with the application process.

Q: What did you say we’d do better next year in relation to scoring?

   Staff response: We intend to create the scoring criteria from the SRAC’s ideas and bring the scoring matrix back to the SRAC for review. After the OTC approves, we will bring the scoring criteria to the workshops.

**Project Selection Successes and Challenges:**

- **Staff**
  - We got the funding out the door!
  - The melding of 2 programs was a challenge in project selection
- **Survey**
  - Too many applicants and not enough funding.
  - Many applicants put valuable time into the process for no reward

**SRAC Comments/Question:**

Comment: The short time frame, then the scoring process, and the melding of the two programs together sounded like growing pains but it now sounds like a continuing issue.

   Staff response: That may continue as long as we work with two different ODOT divisions and follow different processes for project approval such as going through the OTC for Infrastructure programs and the Oregon Transportation Safety Commission for Non-Infrastructure.

**Staff response:** Here’s what we have accomplished. We have combined our websites and are working with ODE and OHA as one group. We are working hard to make SRTS an accessible program for schools and communities regardless of challenges based delivery of it from two ODOT different divisions. Staff capacity is a challenge seeing as > 60% of grantees want to implement engineering, education, and encouragement and ODOT funded 3 entities out of 47 to do engineering and education programs.
Staff response: Staff recognizes the benefits of combining programs. We're working to understand the constraints of our divisions' work to evaluate the overall program staffing needs. Staff response: We developed a collaborative work program to guide this new division and our relationships with other partners outside of ODOT. We are working on joint evaluation for overall ODOT SRTS Program delivery.

Contract & Delivery Successes and Challenges:

- **Staff**
  - Staff capacity is a challenge
  - Created joint Work Program to guide partnerships

- **Survey**
  - Over 60% of grantees want to implement engineering, education, and encouragement
  - 46% of grantees cannot implement multiple Es due to cost, and 63% can't due to staff capacity

Q: For the 40% who want it, are there ‘did not want’ as well as cannot?
   Staff response: I think that’s part of the outreach that we need to do. We need to educate on the necessity for both the engineering and education/encouragement sides. Communities get excited about the visual expectation of the project but the education/encouragement is not as clear as to how to do it and evaluate.

Q: How was it asked?
   Staff response: A list of checkboxes asking what you would want for your community. Check all that apply.

Q: Last bullet re: 46% of grantees, is that when they receive one type of funding and then they apply for the second?
   Staff response: It was intended to assess when grantees receive funding for one part of SRTS such as infrastructure, do they want to to apply for the other critical element, education but cannot and then understand the reasons.

Q: Only two projects have currently been built on the infrastructure program. Regarding staff capacity, do you anticipate that the problem of local staff capacity will be a continual issue?
   Staff response: We will continue to monitor the situation. Right now all grantees are on track to start building within two years of getting the funds and compete within five years of getting the funds which is what the SRTS Rule and contracts dictate.

Q: Are staff expected to also support infrastructure grantees in their non-infrastructure work as well?
   Staff response: No, if grantees are funded to do the work (infrastructure or non-infrastructure), their staff will do the work. We’re trying to get information about who wants to do all the SRTS Es and why or why not they pursue the remaining parts of the program. Understanding this, we can shape the SRTS program to support communities to do simultaneously.
both infrastructure and non-infrastructure

Q: Construction, Americans with Disabilities Act, requirements get pretty strict. Is there a place to utilize the ODOT regions’ staff to help with capacity?

Staff response: All projects have to be completed within five years and started within two years. Their IGA holds them to that but they do get some extra time if there's a case of staff turnover for example. We hear about those types of situations via the quarterly reports and are able to address that up front. ODOT regional staff like Active Transportation Liaisons and Regional Safety staff often can only provide a small level of support.

**Agenda Item: SRAC Debrief**

LeeAnne Fergason presented a review of the past SRAC meeting schedule and logistics. Chris Watchie led the SRAC member debrief.

LeeAnne Fergason presented on 2018-19 meeting topics and schedule. She noted most meetings were 3-hours in duration with one scheduled for 6-hrs for the recommendation process discussion. Staff found out the full 6 hours were not necessary because the scoring already had been done based on SRAC's priorities.

**SRAC Overview for 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Prioritization criteria for NI Program, IN Rapid Response Program, and IN Project Identification Program (Decision), and Chair/Co-chair (Decision)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Prepare for decision making workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Staff scoring presentation for NI and IN Project Identification grants, Discussion, (Decision)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Prioritization Criteria for 2020 Competitive Infrastructure Program (Decision)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She shared the below chart to illustrate how the SRAC’s spent its time in coordination with the earlier work completed by the Safe Routes to School Rulemaking Advisory Committee.
Staff understands that the SRAC members want their time to be valuable in the process. Staff’s proposal is to spend more time in the future on the criteria prioritization. This would happen during SRAC’s January 2020 meeting, up to a 6-hour meeting. Subsequent recommendation meetings could then be shortened. In doing so, the SRAC will have more influence on the prioritization of criteria reflected in the application.
Comment: There are a lot of projects in process today. If the SRAC looked at the differential of merit from top to bottom, we’d see that they were all projects and had merit. As the SRAC goes further into this process, the prioritization criteria becomes more critical because they determine the distinguishing characteristics for what we want to spend the money on. It makes sense to put the prioritization criteria up front.

**ACTION:** Staff will schedule 2020 SRAC meetings, focusing more time on the prioritization criteria.

Comment: From a personal standpoint, I appreciate later start times for meetings as I travel far for meetings.

Q: Has the committee thought about changing the location? Does it always have to be Salem-centered?

Staff response: Since the SRAC is not a Governor-appointed committee and therefore not able to fund travel of SRAC members, staff recommends making meetings as easy to attend as possible. Staff worked to select SRAC members who can get reimbursed for their travel through their current employers. If we start to move the SRAC meeting to different locations around the state, would that make it harder for other SRAC members to attend?

Comment: People are going to be calling in regardless.

Comment: I’ve found when you start moving around the meetings, fewer people show up.

Comment: When SRAC members made the commitment to be on this committee, we all knew we’d be traveling.

Comment: Logistics of getting to Salem for the meetings and/or being on the phone for the meetings works fine.

Comment: In meetings I’d like to see what’s completed and the finished product. For example, would like to see a sample of a Safe Routes to School Action Plan and a Safe Routes to School Plan.

Staff response: Access to the online Action Plans will be available to the SRAC.

Comment: It would be good to see things well in advance. In relation to the scoring process, it felt like it was pre-determined and we were spending this block of time on recommendations on items that had already been decided. Felt like soothe SRAC didn’t own the process.

Comment: I would like the SRAC to be of help to staff. That’s what I’m used to doing, but I feel right now staff has to come up with a big presentation. Share much of the work in advance, so that the SRAC doesn’t come into meetings blind.

**ACTION:** Staff will schedule 2020 meetings in Salem and work to utilize surveys. The SRAC will receive materials well in advance of meetings to focus a greater percentage of meeting time on discussion and recommendations.
SRAC Comments/Questions:
Comment: In January there may be snow. Request a summary of the Tampa SRTS Conference.
   Staff response: Staff can send out lessons learned from the Safe Routes to School National Conference.
Comment: For the Infrastructure Program, the SRAC works on criteria and then we recommend final selection list for OTC. For the Non-infrastructure Program, the SRAC makes recommendation to a staff person (TSD Director, Troy Costales), who then makes a recommendation to the OTSC. Is it legislatively required that if the TSD Director doesn't like the recommendation, he or she can NOT recommend it to OTSC?
   Staff response: Staff can look at the legislation/rule and to get back to the SRAC. Currently the TSD Director can change the recommendation to OTSC if he/she wants to.

   Staff response: The TSD Director has a responsibility to make sure that projects recommended by staff are ones that he/she can sign off on. If there is an issue, he/she would let staff and the SRAC know ahead of time and not at a public meeting.

Comment: There is great faith in the TSD Director. The current Director is very knowledgeable and a good manager. If he disagrees with recommendations, it would reflect on a poor process. However, it sounds like the old days when ODOT region managers chose all the projects with a lot of politics. This is the reason why the Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) were created. The way the decision-making process is for non-infrastructure feels like it devalues the SRAC.

**ACTION:** Staff will review the Safe Routes to School Rules and statutes and bring an update back to the SRAC in January.
**Agenda Item: Preparing for January SRAC meeting Activity**

Chris Watchie led a discussion about priorities for the next infrastructure program grant competitive process.

**SRAC Member Comments/Questions:**

Comment: For the last competitive infrastructure cycle the SRAC decided to limit one grant per agency even if they had two viable projects. This ended up allowing us to fund more entities more spread out across the state.

Comment: The SRAC also discussed how this created disadvantages to communities that put in several small applications instead of one big one. If an agency has a $150K and a 300K project but can only receive funding for one, it’s unfair if another agency applies for one project that is $2 million.

Comment: Advocate for the best project, wherever located. The SRAC needs to be up front in the application process if we are only going to fund one project per entity. If we are setting aside $X for Region 1 and this much for R2, etc. then for R1, there will be way more applications than we have money for and people fill out a lot of time filling out applications. Applicants need to know realistically going in what they a shot at receiving.

Staff response: The SRAC initially defined Geographic Equity as urban vs rural and used the analysis of inside of a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) as urban and outside of an MPO as rural.

Comment: Please bring to the January meeting an analysis of what got funded and a score breakdown for each one.

Staff response: Staff will send out application, scoring matrix, and all applicants for the SRAC’s review.

Comment: Need to think about benefits vs. cost. City of Salem had two very low cost projects that just missed the funding cut line. Salem could apply for 10 separate small projects vs. one big one. If we use the same way to prioritize applications as the last time, it would incentivize combining all small projects into one large project if each entity could only be awarded one grant.

Staff response: The SRAC can change how we do it next time to not incentivize this.

Comment: Also, we had one agency submitting multiple projects and only one project could be funded. It concerned me that we allowed entities to choose which project of theirs was funded instead of only relying on our ranking.

Staff response: All of the projects that moved up were in the 150% list regardless of how the local ranked their projects. If the two projects were really close in score, we allowed the applicant to “choose” which one would get funded by using their rank but only for projects that had scored high enough to be funded regardless.

Comment: In reference to setting amounts per Region: Regional balance could be set as a target but would need to remain flexible in case the project doesn’t have merit.

Staff Response: Setting targets isn’t allowed in the Rule. The SRTS Rule Advisory Committee talked about MPO vs. non-MPO lens, because MPO areas have more access to funding.

Staff Response: We did an analysis of where the applications were geographically and in relation to the Title I schools. We found that the SRAC mostly recommended projects outside of an MPO
Staff only really received negative feedback from entities in Region 4 because the smallest percent of funding was awarded to that region.

**Staff Response:** Does geographic balance matter? If it does, then we need to figure that out. I’d be careful on setting targets, in general, as well. If anything, you need to look at if we are not disadvantaging geographic areas of the state.

**Comment:** We made a decision in last round to essentially make a Title I schools a screening criteria. Do we want to continue with that or open it up or set a weight to it, or what?

**Staff Response:** We got dinged on that because we can’t say ‘only Title I schools can apply;’ but it is kind of how we weighed equity (Free and Reduced Lunch). For safety we asked how many lanes, Average Daily Traffic, crash statistics, etc. In regards to the project description, our philosophy was that the local agency would know what they need the most. We were looking for big red flags.

**Comment:** It would be helpful to me at the January meeting to understand what the current matrix looks like now, what was decided last time, what are the limitations to having that specific criteria, and what are alternative options for that specific criteria within the state and also nationally.

Chris Watchie placed the below list of discussion topics for January meeting on a wall and asked what else needs to be added.

1. How do you weight geographic balance?
2. Are you weighing equity well?
3. What about safety, is that weighted well?
4. Does the project (solution) match the problem?
5. Is it cost-effective?

**SRAC Member Questions/Comments:**

**Comment:** For cost-effectiveness, let’s use John Day as an example. The street had no sidewalks and was like an urban standards project because you need to put in a curb (required to put in storm water services for entire street). It then costs a lot more than other sidewalk project. I think we should consider cost per linear foot.

Chris Watchie had each SRAC member vote for the topics they are most interested in to discuss in January. Each SRAC member was given three stickers to note their top priorities.
LeeAnne Fergason closed the meeting reminder SRAC members about a volunteer form in their packet. ODOT provides volunteer injury coverage, so if you want it please fill that out and return to LeeAnne.

**2020 meetings**

January 21, 2020
February 11 or March 17, 2020
September 8, 2020
October 20, 2020

**Next Meeting**
January 21, 2020
10am-4pm
CCBI, 626 High St NE, Salem, OR 97301
Lunch refreshments provided
**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.
SRAC Worksheet: SRAC input included January 9, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEOGRAPHIC BALANCE</td>
<td>Would you call this a high priority? Laughton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Geographic Balance questions scored from the previous application: None- the SRAC decided to use an additional lens on the recommendation process to award only one project per entity. The result funded more communities and dispersed more projects around the state.*

**SRAC INPUT:**

- Should the scoring be changed for this guiding principle and why?
  - Kari: No, this should continue to be assessed after a score on the project has been recorded based on project merit.
  - Laughton: The system used in the last grant cycle seemed to have the desired effect of spreading the projects throughout the state geographically.
  - Dana: I’m totally open to hearing how others think this priority should be scored, as I’m not strongly tied to any particular outcome. That being said, I think the lens used last time, that only one project per entity was awarded was a good way to ensure no one region or jurisdiction got all the funding. I don’t know enough about how ODOT projects are delivered, but I am wondering if there needs to be any sort of exception in areas where the projects can’t be delivered locally – if ODOT is going to deliver a project for more than one jurisdiction in the same region, does that could as an entity applying for more than one project?
  - Anthony: I suggest a maximum total dollar amount per agency rather than a limit of one project. This would allow agencies to submit several smaller projects rather than a single larger one, without penalty.

- If yes, what additional/replacement questions should we ask in the application to assess this new idea?
  - Dana: If questions were added, you might get additional points if it was your first time applying for/receiving the infrastructure funding. The likelihood of bigger cities applying every round (with multiple schools and projects) is pretty high, whereas a smaller community might only have one school/project to apply for. Also, you could have a question that asked whether you were part of an MPO or not, since additional funding exists within the MPO boundary for similar projects.
Will the additional questions make the application too complicated for small communities to fill out or is the data not available statewide?
Dana: This data should be available locally.

If yes, revise your answer to question above. If no or unsure, please note.

How would you like to see each piece of new information scored?
Dana: I’m open to how many points are allocated, only that first time applicants (who were not previously awarded) are scored higher than those who already received funding, and those outside an MPO receive additional points.

Is the scoring of that question qualitative or quantitative (preferred)?
Dana: Quantitative

If qualitative, what suggestions do you have to ensure transparency and trust with the public?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL EQUITY</th>
<th>Would you call this a high priority?</th>
<th>Would you call this a medium priority?</th>
<th>Would you call this a low priority?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kari, Laughton, Dana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant could receive up to 200 points out of 500 for this category. Equity questions scored from the previous application:
- What percentage of children who attend the primarily affected school are eligible to receive free and reduced price meals?

SRAC INPUT:

Should the scoring be changed for this guiding principle and why?
Kari: It should not be any lower than 200 points, and could be higher

Laughton: I like that equity is weighted so heavily. I think it will ensure that most of these funds are going to places with a historical lack of investment in bike/ped projects. I higher income schools have a crash occur, they can apply for Rapid Response Funds to try to correct the problem.

Dana: No. I think it was brought up at a previous meeting that a better/different metric might show the impact – number of students affected – but this would weigh heavily towards the bigger cities. Percentage evens the playing field a bit.

If yes, what additional/replacement questions should we ask in the application to assess this new idea?
**SAFETY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you call this a high priority?</th>
<th>Would you call this a medium priority?</th>
<th>Would you call this a low priority?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kari, Laughton, Dana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant could receive up to **90 points out of 500 for this category**. Safety questions scored from the previous application:

- Is there a history of school-related crashes at this location that this project would address?
  - If yes, describe and include number of crashes and if crashes were non-serious, serious injury, or fatal.
  - Posted travel speed (mph)?
- Optional: Operating speed (85th percentile) (mph)?
- What are the number of travel lanes and the crossing width of the road?
- At the project location(s) what is the average annual daily traffic (AADT)?
- Does your project qualify as a Priority Safety Corridor? If you have multiple projects, does at least one of your projects qualify as a Priority Safety Corridor?

**SRAC INPUT:**

- Should the scoring be changed for this guiding principle and why?
  - Kari: This should receive more possible points
  - Laughton: The scoring for safety seems appropriate.
  - Dana: This one is a bit tough, because I see this factor as a pretty high priority personally, but the number of points awarded in this category is relatively low compared to social equity, which is another one of my high priorities. I understand the need for the data asked in this question, but I do think this may be beyond what some smaller communities are able to offer. I don’t know if there’s someone at ODOT who could help them figure out this information, but it would be nice if...
there was some assistance put forward to help people answer these more technical questions.

Anthony: Safety: I think this needs some work so that it’s fairly applied across the state, and can be readily (and accurately) accomplished by small agencies. I suggest:
  o For the crash data, can you link to an ODOT crash data resource, so they can quickly look up local crash data themselves? Alternatively, perhaps they could request this data from ODOT’s crash unit.
  o Crash info they provide in their application should specify what mode the injury victim was, in addition to severity. Only injury crashes should be listed.
  o The Priority Safety Corridor criterion needs an objective review for each application, not reliant on the applicant to determine. I think different applicants will interpret elements differently. Is the project ON a PSC? Some applicants might say yes if on a parallel corridor, some say no. I suggest that the 30’ crossing width should be defined as paved width or auto travel lane width only. For example, gravel/soft shoulders should not be counted. I’m not sure on-street parking or bike lanes should count toward the 30’ width either, since these typically don’t make crossing meaningfully more difficult, but I feel less strongly about this.

☐ If yes, what additional/replacement questions should we ask in the application to assess this new idea?
☐ Will the additional questions make the application too complicated for small communities to fill out or is the data not available statewide?
☐ If yes, revise your answer to question above. If no or unsure, please note.
☐ How would you like to see each piece of new information scored?
☐ Is the scoring of that question qualitative or quantitative (preferred)?
☐ If qualitative, what suggestions do you have to ensure transparency and trust with the public?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAXIMIZE RESOURCES: READINESS</th>
<th>Would you call this a high priority?</th>
<th>Would you call this a medium priority?</th>
<th>Would you call this a low priority?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laughton</td>
<td>Kari, Dana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant could receive up to 80 points out of 500 for this category. Readiness questions scored from the previous application:

- Does the applicant own sufficient right of way (ROW)?
- Does the ROW need to be acquired?
- Who owns the right of way?
- Does the ROW owner concur with your project request?
- Will any utilities need to be relocated?
- If yes, please list and explain how you plan to mitigate:
- Describe how your project impacts storm water drainage.
- Are there any environmental resources within or adjacent to the project area?
- Are there any environmental hazards within or adjacent to the project area?
- If yes, please list and explain how you plan to mitigate:
- Briefly describe public outreach process around this project to date.
- Describe any design work started or completed on the project.

### SRAC INPUT:

- Should the scoring be changed for this guiding principle and why?
  - Kari: This should be more of a red flag question for eligibility, as with cost effectiveness below – these two “maximize resources” categories could be combined.
  
  Laughton: The Current Scoring seems appropriate.

  Dana: My response to the last question holds true for this one as well. It may be more challenging for smaller communities to find this information and assistance would likely be useful in encouraging more to apply.

- If yes, what additional/replacement questions should we ask in the application to assess this new idea?
- Will the additional questions make the application too complicated for small communities to fill out or is the data not available statewide?
- If yes, revise your answer to question above. If no or unsure, please note.
- How would you like to see each piece of new information scored?
- Is the scoring of that question qualitative or quantitative (preferred)?
- If qualitative, what suggestions do you have to ensure transparency and trust with the public?

### MAXIMIZE RESOURCES: COST EFFECTIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Would you call this a high priority?</th>
<th>Would you call this a medium priority?</th>
<th>Would you call this a low priority?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laughton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost Effectiveness questions scored from the previous application: None- this aspect of the project was not scored but reviewed for any major red flags by staff. Staff asked for a problem description, a solution description, a project description, and a budget.

### SRAC INPUT:

- Should the scoring be changed for this guiding principle and why?
  - Kari: This should remain as a red flag and not scored
Laughton: I am not sure how this could be scored efficiently and accurately.

Anthony: I’ll defer to you how to manage, but agree there needs to be an ODOT SRTS staff check that the improvements are specifically SRTS-focused and not just a CIP need that happens to be near a school route.

☐ If yes, what additional/replacement questions should we ask in the application to assess this new idea?

☐ Will the additional questions make the application too complicated for small communities to fill out or is the data not available statewide?

☐ If yes, revise your answer to question above. If no or unsure, please note.

☐ How would you like to see each piece of new information scored?

☐ Is the scoring of that question qualitative or quantitative (preferred)?

☐ If qualitative, what suggestions do you have to ensure transparency and trust with the public?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAXIMIZE RESOURCES &amp; C/C/C: Coordinate with Education and Encouragement Programs</th>
<th>Would you call this a high priority? Laughton, Kari</th>
<th>Would you call this a medium priority?</th>
<th>Would you call this a low priority?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The applicant could receive up to 10 points out of 500 for this category. Questions scored from the previous application:

- Describe past, present, or upcoming Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure programs at the school or school district. Safe Routes to School programs includes education, encouragement, and evaluation activities that reduce barriers to children walking and bicycling to school.

SRAC INPUT:

☐ Should the scoring be changed for these questions and why?

Kari: More points should be given here for this priority, to demonstrate the importance of education/encouragement programs, to build on those who have committed to these programs, and to encourage applicants to take up these programmatic elements

Laughton: I would like to see a greater emphasis put on coordination with non-infrastructure. 10 points feels like too few. This is 1/5 of 1%. I think it should be worth at least 5%. Otherwise, you might as well just pull the question all together. The lack of scoring weight on this question is almost insulting. It seems to say, we
find it important enough to ask, but it will make no difference in whether you are funded.

Dana: I feel like the points received for this should be greater – if it’s a priority of SRTS/OTSC that we look to more than just infrastructure to make it safe for people to walk and bike places. It seems like it would weed out people who are just trying to get a sidewalk built, rather than actually create spaces that help youth travel to and from school without using a vehicle. I’m biased because I’ve seen how important non-infrastructure work can be, but if kids don’t know how to ride their bikes, or navigate crosswalks, bike lanes and sidewalks are only moderately useful to making changes local culture.

☐ If yes, what additional/replacement questions should we ask in the application to assess this new idea?
☐ Will the additional questions make the application too complicated for small communities to fill out or is the data not available statewide?
☐ If yes, revise your answer to question above. If no or unsure, please note.
☐ How would you like to see each piece of new information scored?
☐ Is the scoring of that question qualitative or quantitative (preferred)?
☐ If qualitative, what suggestions do you have to ensure transparency and trust with the public?

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS**

*The applicant could receive up to 120 points out of 500 for this category. Additional questions scored from the previous application:*  
- How far from the school is the project? 15 points  
- What grades are taught at the school? *(REQUIRED IN STATUTE TO PRIORITIZE)* 90 points  
- How many schools are affected? 15 points

**SRAC INPUT:**  
☐ Should the scoring be changed for these questions and why?  
Kari: If points are needed elsewhere it should be taken from this category

Laughton: This seems like it is being scored properly.

☐ If yes, what additional/replacement questions should we ask in the application to assess this new idea?
☐ Will the additional questions make the application too complicated for small communities to fill out or is the data not available statewide?
☐ If yes, revise your answer to question above. If no or unsure, please note.
☐ How would you like to see each piece of new information scored?
☐ Is the scoring of that question qualitative or quantitative (preferred)?
Please add here any additional comments you may have:

Kari: What about the other SRAC guiding principles of Health, and Communication/Coordination/Collaboration? Will those be added in for scoring criteria?

Mavis: We don’t get too much into the project level during the selection process. It would be nice to see more of the projects, but it was a good thing in some instances but was also not good because the individuals didn't know much about the projects. The scoring was really cut and dry, but there wasn't much of "of this is such a great project, it needs to move up." Probably a positive for ODOT because it needs to be easily understood from the outside. Want to enforce the positives of what we are doing. Want to be able to feel the accomplishment and see the projects.

Luis: 1) outreach could be more like the ARTS programs. We want to help the folks fill out the application. The next update to OTSC, talk about the application assistance through the Project Identification Program. 2) Wants people to have access to a map of where the crashes are.

Sonny: My only question is whether the Ground Conditions Review was too much of a burden. I think the exercise serves to discourage poor applications, and keeps the applicants honest, but perhaps reviewing a 150% list would be sufficient?

Kim: The only question I have is -Should Applicants be aware that a "I don't know" answer is going to affect their score in a negative manner. If they knew this they might be inclined to do some more digging prior to submitting.