Welcome:
Mavis Hart welcomed the SRAC and highlighted the meeting’s goal to agree upon a recommended project list for the Transportation Safety Division (TSD) and the Oregon Transportation Safety Commission (OTSC) through review of staff scores and discussion by the SRAC. She encouraged all to listen, learn and share ideas. She called for introductions and welcomed JD Tovey to his first in person meeting.

Meeting Overview:
LeeAnne Fergason reviewed the SRAC Composition and noted two member positions required replacing (Tom Venables (Enforcement) and Leticia Valle (Health and Equity).

ACTION: Staff will reach out to SRAC members by mid-September for suggestions to forward to the ODOT Director.

LeeAnne reiterated the meeting goal and added the work today is to deliver programs that support kids walking and rolling to school. She reminded the SRAC that the Non-Infrastructure (Non-IN) applications’ staff scores are set and not to be adjusted by the SRAC.

Chris Watchie provided agenda overview, reviewed the SRAC consensus decision-making model, and highlighted what constitutes a conflict of interest for the SRAC. Brain Potwin recused himself due to his role as a current technical assistance provider and a Non-IN applicant on the 100% list.

LeeAnne next reviewed revisions to the SRAC Charter including:
New member process
Rapid Response Program sub-committee roles and responsibilities
Rapid Response decision-making process
Chris called for a SRAC decision to updates to SRAC Charter.

**ACTION:** SRAC reached unanimous consensus on the updated SRAC Charter.

**Public Comment:**
No public comment

**Background:**
LeeAnne reviewed the two SRTS programs housed in two ODOT divisions for infrastructure and non-infrastructure but with one goal to deliver programs that support kids walking and rolling to school. She noted that the work between Transportation Development Division and Transportation Safety Division is a prime example of how Safe Routes to School delivery represents the One ODOT service model.

She then provided an update on the Competitive Grant Projects and reviewed the timeline for Non-IN and the Project Identification Program (PIP).

Key Competitive Grant Program points included:
- Two projects are waiting for their Intergovernmental Agreement approval, Josephine County and City of North Bend.
o A Region 3 project in North Bend will have City of North Bend deliver it instead of ODOT Region 3.
o Josephine County had staff changes between application submission and award. New staff wants to adjust scope. If they can't do the project with the new scope, they will not receive the award.

Project Identification Program points included:
All requests can be covered with available funds. Rural communities represent majority of requests.

Analysis in Regards to Infrastructure Program and PIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure:</th>
<th>Project Identification Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 projects, 24 entities</td>
<td>32 schools, 14 entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 entities applied for Non-IN</td>
<td>2 entities applied for Non-In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School alignment:
Infrastructure projects: There are 10 SRTS infrastructure project schools that are represented by non-infrastructure applicants, of those 7 are on the 100% list.
Included in 100% list: 7
- Madras Elementary School- Commute Options application
- Reynolds Elementary- Multnomah County application
- Green Elementary- Douglas Education School District
- McLoughlin, Wilson, and Howard- Medford School District
- Liberty Elementary- Salem Keizer School District
Not 100% list: 3
- Lincoln, South Shore, Central Linn – Oregon Cascades West Council of Governments
PIP projects: There are 4 PIP schools that are represented in non-infrastructure applications, all 4 are on the 100% list

Included in the 100% list: 4
- La Grande Middle school and Central Elementary- City of La Grande
- Sweet Home Junior High- Sweet Home School District
- Days Creek Charter School- Douglas Education School District

2019 Timeline
March-June: SRTS Workshops throughout Oregon
March 15: Solicitation begins
May 31: Applications due
June: Staff review and scoring
July: SRTS Advisory Committee review, deliberations, and recommendation process
August: Non-IN Project list presented to TSD Administrator and then presented to OTSC
Fall: Non-IN grants begin and PIPs begin

Selection Process Overview
Heidi Manlove reiterated the 5 Es of SRTS Non-Infrastructure: Education, encouragement, enforcement, evaluation, and equity and presented a map of applications from ODOT regions.

Key points:
- 28 applicants with a total request of $4.4 million
- Combination of large and small projects
- 100% list represents 11 applicants with a total request of $2.3 million
Selection Process Review for Non-Infrastructure Applications
Heidi noted that the scoring process mirrored the SRTS Infrastructure program.

Scoring Process highlights:
- Staff took a holistic approach and looked to see if applicant had applied for a project or recently completed an infrastructure project.
- Staff scorers represent Transportation Development Division and Transportation Safety Division
- Score based on SRAC guiding principle prioritization
  - **Safety** (50%)
  - **Social Equity** (25%)
  - **Communication/Coordination/Collaboration** (CCC) (15%)
- Max of 440 points possible (and 10% given if applicant discussed the SRTS 6 Es and long-term sustainability.
- Additional points assigned if not recently funded by SRTS to allow for equity.
- No red flags were found in terms of needing to follow up with any of the applicants for clarification. One applicant was ineligible because of an incomplete application (no required letters of support).

SRAC Comments/Questions:
Q: What is the number of Title 1 schools inside vs. outside Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and the number of students with free/reduced lunch?
Staff response: We don’t have that broken down by that lens but can. The majority of schools were Title 1. Statewide there are approximately 1,000 Title 1 public schools with about 75% of them qualifying for free or reduced lunch. Outside of MPOs there are 504 public schools and 87% of them qualifying for free and reduced lunch.

Comment: Would also like to see the number of students.
   Staff response: If we looked at numbers, it would really skew the relation and numbers of who gets funding.

Comment: Very pleased with number of applicants coming from Regions 3 & 5. Historically this has not been the case.
Q: Did we get any complaints about the process?
   Staff response: Only about the application form. Next time will be an online application option.
Q: Was there a problem with applicants being able to provide match?
   Staff response: Once they are selected, we will go through their budgets to confirm match. There are a lot of eligible in-kind match opportunities.
Q: What role did Active Transportation Liaisons play in assisting the communities with their application process?
   Staff response: They could assist in the outreach process. It’s under discussion with TDD now. Staff response: We need to be thoughtful of the workloads of the ATLs. Don’t know if they have capacity to proactively go out and recruit projects. May be better fit for the Transportation Options program and related funded providers.
Comment: We would like the TAP be offered more as Regional assistance. Technical assistance can be more of a resource for outreach in future years. TSD RTCs are also out in each Region who works with most if not all of the applicants.

Review of SRAC Comments Previously Received
Heidi reviewed the few comments received by the SRAC prior the July 9 workshop.
Q: What role does SRAC have in this process?
   A few members questioned not having a bigger part to play in the scoring process, but rather to review what staff came up with (60+ hours review/scoring). There are a few applicants that came close to the cut line (between 100% and 150% list is a 10-point difference). Nobody commented on this.
Q: What does 100% vs 150% list mean? Gets confusing.
   Staff response: The green list is 100%, yellow list is 150% (See Attachment A). The 150% list is used in event of one of the 100% list falls out or can’t do the project (the next group in line to be funded if there was a re-evaluation of scoring, applicant can’t perform, etc.).
Q: How does that factor into scoring?
   Staff response: It doesn’t. It isn’t based on quantity, but on priority and projects. Also larger Educational Service District with 20 schools has much more opportunity for volunteers and funding than a smaller region.
Q: Can remaining funds be used for smaller scale projects?
   Staff response: About $27K is left after funding the 100% Non-IN list. It is not enough to fund the next eligible score on the list. Technically we’d like at least $100K to offer any new
applicant/award/project. In the past about 5% has been a good buffer to have, in case of any budgeting error or problem such a time lapse, attrition, etc.

Comment: With 27K remaining and looking at 150% list, there are a couple that fit. Is there value in using the funding for one of those lower scoring and less expensive applications and broader statewide application such as the video proposal?

Staff response: The staff recommendation is that the video series proposal does not fit as a local competitive grant project, rather this proposal would be a better fit using the SRTS statewide funds.

Comment: Agree with that as far as statewide video work.

Staff response: Rather not use open-competitive dollars for statewide video series because video production will likely be included as a deliverable for statewide services.

Q: Was there a cap on requests?

Staff response: $100K/year. Medford is over that amount, $328K over a 3-year period. In original spreadsheet we accounted for that and will make sure it’s $300K max for 3 years.

Comment: The Metro MPO does have funds and we have two Metro applications on the 100% award list. If we’re trying to do balance inside and outside of MPOs, should we take that into consideration?

Q: Could we fund some more communities with leftover money and add in 1 or 2 more applicants?

Staff response: Without going into too much detail, I know that not all applicants were funded by the Metro SRTS grants and the ones that were, were not fully funded. The scoring did not take into account ‘what other sources of funds are you getting?’

Comment: Proposal to have a discussion whether the committee wants to reduce awards to those getting funds from other entities. Could apply to anyone. Question for the committee if we want to take that approach.

Staff response: Is that something to consider this round? That’s probably something we could ask in the future that could give you the information for the future.

Comment: Don’t think we need to consider additional funding from other entities in this round. Bottom line is they applied and if they scored high, they should be funded. Concerned if we get too far into that type of detail, we’ll miss out on opportunities such as non-profits that may contribute to the project.

Comment: Both of the [Metro] applications were around the same time frame, so we don’t know if they got one award or another when they applied for Non-IN.

Staff response: Bottom line is the SRTS program in one area is going to be disjointed based on the 6 E’s and disciplines, so the goal is to have them go for other funding sources (a goal of the program). Additional funding is something we should know about but iffy on if that’s the best way to support communities in regard to a holistic SRTS program. SRTS projects will have multiple funding sources and this is the goal so they can be fully funded and we should not penalize those who do have multiple sources.

Staff response: It could also be a verification step to ask but not necessarily involved in scoring plus or minus, but we need to know.

Comment: It’s a reimbursement grant, so if they don’t do the work they don’t get the grant funds.

Comment: Are there same grant applicants for the same project (IN and Non-IN)?

Staff response: There are 10 SRTS infrastructure project schools that are represented by non-infrastructure applicants, of those 7 are on the 100% list.

Q: Is there a way to go back to the 100% list later?
Staff response: There might be a step after this meeting and go back to applicants to ask if they applied elsewhere and received funding. The question then becomes, do you still need the funding? During this meeting, we will get into the 150% list now to name back-ups to avoid another meeting.

Q: Between the four scorers, if one of the four scored significantly different was there a discussion about that particular application?
   Staff response: We knew that it was likely we may score differently and some of the items had a range of points (not a yes/no). If there were any way-off numbers, we discussed it. Sometimes it was only an issue of the math.

Comment: The engineer in me says just fund those projects that have the “bang for the buck.” For instance, describe the number of schools, some have 20, some have fewer.

Q: Does # of schools factor into scoring?
   Staff response: No it was not factored into the scoring process.

Q: What is the time frame of non-infrastructure grants?
   Staff response:
   Federal fiscal years
   Oct 1, 2019 – Sept 30, 2020
   Oct 1, 2020 to Sept 30, 2021
   Oct. 1 2021—Sept. 30, 2022

Comment: Pleased with distribution and equity. See 11% coming from R3 and R5 is pretty significant. I've been involved in 11 years and have never had this surge of interest out there in the rural regions.
   Staff response: There were so many restrictions to SRTS Federal funding such as within one mile of school, etc. Now we can look at rural programming with state highway funds now from HB 2017.

   **ACTION:** Staff will provide SRAC with analysis of Title 1 schools inside vs. outside Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and student numbers.

**LUNCH**

**Selection Process Review for SRTS Non-In**

Prior to the discussion, the SRAC asked about the remaining unallocated funds ($27K, + additional (overage) to Medford of $20K, now have $47K available). Chris Watchie provided a recap of the SRAC conversation to date. When the Non-IN funds not used reaches 100K then there may be a discussion with the SRAC. The $27K remaining will grow as staff will work and negotiate with the grantee. In the next funding cycle, staff will include 'other funds' as consideration in the scoring process.

Heidi suggested that the remaining 48k remain in the pot. Could justify moving down the 150% list and if it's less than what was asked for, see if it's a feasible amount for an applicant to get it done. If not, move down the list.

**SRAC Comments/Questions**

Q. What is this buffer?
   Staff response: In the past, 5% was held back in case of any budget problems or snafus.
Q: Why does TDD need a buffer?
   Staff response: If there is a case where an applicant makes a mistake in their budgeting.
Q: Is that true on the infrastructure side too?
   Staff response: No. On the IN side, whatever they propose is what they get, no overages. This
   would be different for the NON-IN side.
Q: Is that because the program is in two different divisions?
   Staff response: The simple answer is yes.
Comment: Preference is to partially or wholly fund the next person on the list. If there is a $100 cap/year,
   reduce Medford’s grant that is > $300K for three years.
   Staff response: The buffer is kind of an emergency thing and this project may not move forward
   unless we adjust some things.
Comment: The declining balance listed (after the $27K remaining) is not correct (formula went awry).
   Staff response: The formula will be checked and the amount of 48,000 will be revised on the final
   spreadsheet.
Comment: Want to clarify the conversation and the 100% list and what their total budge was and other
   fiscal resources in terms of process. We had talked about confirming with grantees what their total budget
   was (such as Metro awards and other awards that might overlap). Just want to confirm that this is still the
   total funds needed from ODOT of could they get by with less.
Comment: How long would that take and how does that work into current process and timeline? I
   understand the value but logistically the time involved. Would need to be done expeditiously.
Comment: With other grant dollars, what happens if someone gets a big award half way through the
   project?
   Staff response: Entities cobble together money from different sources which is a good thing. We
   don’t want to penalize them for that. It is possible that an entity that applied for ODOT also looked
   for funding elsewhere for the same project. Heidi would contact them and verify that the funding
   amount is still required.
Comment: If we give applicants an opportunity to have the buffer, experience shows most will use it. Prefer
   to allocate all of the funds out and go down the list as we have extra funding.
Comment: Suggest that after verification process if there are leftover funds after the 100% list, look at the
   150% list in order presented, offering partial funding as necessary (going down the list in order).
Q: On the 150% list, how frequently are we going to be looking at this list? For instance, Point2Point is
   asking much more than Healthy Families, so we can’t fund the big one, but can fund next one on the list?
   There may be more funds to award after final budgets are determined by current NON-IN awardees.
   Staff response: I think it would be more fair to award partially to the next agency on the list (150%),
   because they DID score higher than the next one.
Comment: Staff will need to make phone calls, make the contacts, get their final budget figures; now you
   know total point, then you go to 150% list.
Comment: What happens when Year 2 comes along and they can no longer do the project, do the funds go
   back into the pot? What happens then?
   Staff response: We had a project that couldn’t finish this current cycle, year 2. That money left over
   got used for this cycle.
   Staff response: For IN funds which are state funds, they can rollover from year to year to year.
For Non-IN funds which are federal funds, they don't roll over year to year. Funds not spent go back into the SRTS Non-Infrastructure pot to be allocated if within the STIP years of funding cycle.

Staff response: This application was not their final application. Once they're awarded, we'll negotiate objectives, evaluation, performance measures, etc. Part of that application is 'what are your other sources of funding and in what amount?' TSD already does that with no punitive action (budgeting only, no fed money being used as match, etc.).

Chris Watchie asked the SRAC if they were ready to make a recommendation on the proposed 100% list.

**ACTION:** The SRAC reached unanimous consensus (Brian Potwin recused and Lisa Melke no longer on phone) to recommend the 100% list to the TSD Administrator.

Chris then asked if the SRAC was ready to discuss how to allocate any leftover funding. She recapped the conversation. If there are leftover funds, or any of the 100% list reduces their award amounts that the SRAC would work our way down the 150% list based on ranking. If the SRAC does not have 100% of applicant's funding requested, partial funding would be offered.

**SRAC Comments/Questions**

Q: What is SUN?

Staff response: Schools Uniting Neighborhoods, an after school program.

Staff response: This is funding the SRTS Coordinator to then train the trainer SUN volunteers re: education and encouragement. To make it sustainable within the SUN Coordinator because they have a lot of impact in the community.

Comment: Projects 13 and 14 are tied. This needs to be dealt with.

Staff: Response: Staff ranked the scores for the event of a tie. Ranks are to be sued as secondary measure to break ties, taking each individual scorers’ scores; putting in ascending orders, rank, then adding those ranks. An agency can have same scores but different ranks. For instance, P2Point for Eugene says we can't use that money; so we would go to the next one that ranked the highest.

Comment: Sounds great, support that. Also vote for Building Healthy Families over P2Point because of the geographical equity need.

Chris Watchie asked if the SRAC was ready to provide a revised recommendation to go down the 150% list using the ranked score as the secondary measure, in the event of a tie of scores or ranks keep with geographic balance in mind.

**ACTION:** The SRAC reached unanimous consensus (Brian Potwin recused and Lisa Melke no longer on phone) to recommend to the TSD Administration the moving down the 150% list with any remaining funds according to the score but in the event of tie using the ranked score as a secondary measure with geographic balance in mind.

**Next Steps for SRAC**
October 2019: A SRAC Year in Review: What we learned, how it went, what could be improved. Staff will send the SRAC a Doodle poll for 2020 meeting schedule.

**SRAC Meeting Check In**
- Went well, and I just want to request fresh fruit for next time.
- I would love a list of what all the acronyms mean.
- Went well.
- Went well. One thought on Charter or someplace, this process that we use staff to score the applications and we have no input on the scoring; but this Committee does authority to change the rank. Is that in the Charter or someplace that we’re not bound by scorers 1, 2, 3, and 4.
- We might need to change the scoring for the future. Were the weights too much and we missed projects that should have been funded?
- Appreciate getting the materials ahead of time, and the process of going over the scoring process.
- Good job in recruiting applications. The one thing is unclear what our charge was at this meeting—we were providing a lens, but not clear on how we could provide constructive feedback. So, what is our role in the discussion, how we can influence the outcomes?
- Celebrate the staff and their hard work; and invite everyone to the OTSC August meeting, please.

**Mavis Hart closed the meeting and noted she is** looking forward to next meeting and discussing improvements to the overall SRTS process.

Adjourn: 12:40 PM

**Next Meeting**
**Date:** October 21, 2019
12pm-3pm
CCBI, 626 High St NE, Salem, OR 97301