Welcome:
Mavis Hart and Kari Schlosshauer welcomed the group as the Chair and Vice Chair of the Safe Routes Advisory Committee.

Meeting Overview:
Chris Watchie reviewed the agenda and highlighted key tasks:
- Understand the scoring matrix and SRAC review process for the Non-Infrastructure (education and encouragement) grants
- Project Identification Program to prepare for our workshop to recommend investments in July

She then asked for a SRAC decision on the draft February notes.
**ACTION: SRAC reached consensus to approve February notes.**

Public Comment: LeeAnne noted that she received input from Hood River about complications and problems for kids with downtown intersections (Attached).

SRAC Update:
LeeAnne shared key meetings since the February SRAC meeting with the Oregon Transportation Safety Commission (OTSC):
Key developments included:

- Project Identification Program can be funded by both Non-Infrastructure and Infrastructure programs.
- The OTSC wants all to have the opportunity to apply for Non-Infrastructure.

Charter Update

LeeAnne reviewed key updates to the SRAC Charter

- SRAC Chair and Vice-Chair terms will be two-years
- Roles and Responsibilities:

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

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

- The Chair will work with the SRTS Program Manager to provide leadership in SRAC meetings and funding recommendation processes.
- The Vice-Chair will serve in a supporting role should the Chair be unable to attend meetings.

**Update on Competitive Grant Program Projects**
- Almost all Inter-Governmental Agreements (IGAs) are signed.
- Alta Planning and Design has begun conducting before studies to evaluate volume of kids walking, biking, rolling prior to project implementation and post-evaluation.

**SRAC Comments/Questions:**
- Is it a 3-year process to build infrastructure?
  - Staff response No, they have 5 years to build that.
- Will we ever see plans?
  - This committee won't review plans; basically the funds go to the community to do work that they already know how to do. Quarterly reports are required. Staff will do site visit at the end to make sure grantees have fulfilled the award and did the things they said they'd do. That is the extent of staff's oversight.
- Who is reviewing the plans for errors?
  - Not SRTS staff.
- Isn't there a requirement to report on encouragement and education?
  - Staff Response: It was recommended by this group, but wasn’t the case.
    - Staff prioritized applications with NON-IN activities. We also did some outreach to all the current IN grant recipients to let them know about the Non-IN grant funding.
    - SRAC set performance measure but we need to set some additional ones that reflect the Guiding Principles.

**Guiding Principles:**
Mavis and Kari reviewed the development process for the Safe Routes to School Program’s Guiding Principles.
They outlined the process to date for proposes revisions to the SRAC Guiding Principles:

- Some SRAC members developed initial principles as part of the Rule Advisory Committee (RAC)
- Oregon Administrative Rules proposed and accepted.
- Safe Routes Advisory Committee used the RAC’s Guiding Principles for the initial Infrastructure 2018 funding cycle.
- Opportunity to review and ask: are these guiding principles still working for us? Do they need tweaking, or leave as is?

With input from the SRAC, suggested some updates:

1. **Social Equity:** (clarified)
   - Pulled ‘social equity’ out of previously called ‘equity,’ comments received from the SRAC was there’s are a lot of pieces of what’s needed for different communities, and needing to spread funds across the state, and urban needs vs. rural. Think of the difference between equality (i.e., everyone gets the same bike) and equity (addressing individuals’ needs). People from different backgrounds have different needs.

2. **Geographic Balance:** *Equity* change to *Balance*

They noted that the SRAC’s Guiding Principle document is a living document. The SRAC will continue to learn as they go through the process and review them once a year.
SRAC Comments/Questions:
- Equity clarification is an important element.
- I agree with social equity; but your challenge is to teach your ODOT engineers what social equity is, they don’t understand it.
  - Staff response:
    - Geographic equity was discussed to clarify to not that ‘balance’ does not mean ‘everyone gets an equal share.’
    - Originally the Rule Advisory Committee wanted to look at geographic balance between rural and urban. In particular for those rural applicants not within a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) area. Those within an MPO have access to more funding opportunities than others.

Chris asked if the SRAC agreed with the proposed Guiding Principle changes.
ACTION: SRAC reached consensus to approve Guiding Principle revisions.

Rapid Response Program (RRP) Guidelines
LeeAnne reviewed the overall program and development to date:

- She noted that 10% of Infrastructure funds are for urgent needs or systemic safety issues equaling $1.8M for the initial RRP.
- The program is rolling and does not have a clear beginning, middle or end as long as there is funding available.
- The RRP Subcommittee members include Anthony Buczek, Laughton Elliot-Deangelis and John Vial
- RRP has the same priorities as the competitive process.

Outlined project eligibility criteria
- Defined ‘urgent’ and ‘safety’ for those applications
- Something has occurred since the last funding cycle e.g., a student was injured on a bike
- Something has changed that wasn’t planned for
- Can’t really wait until next competitive cycle in Jan 2021.
• All applications that score 400 or higher are highly considered. Their score helps inform the decision by the SRAC Rapid Response subcommittee.
• Still considering if a letter of intent should be required
• Subcommittee will strive for consensus. If it cannot be reached, the SRAC will make a recommendation.

SRAC Comments/Questions:
• What is the award max/minimum?
  o Staff Response: 0- to $500K. The OAR indicates ‘up to’ for RRP and for competitive programs so that funds may roll forward into the next fiscal year.

PIP Application and Scoring Review
LeeAnne reviewed the PIP process and the scoring matrix:
• Scoring matrix based on SRAC identified priorities (Safety, Equity, Communication, Coordination, and Collaboration).
• Up to 2.5 % of SRTS Infrastructure funds will be used by ODOT to help communities identify projects.
• Alta Planning and Design lead
• It will take about a 21-week process to develop each plans. Our plan is to have up to 20 Plans completed by the next competitive competition for SRTS Infrastructure grants in 2020.

Process:

Outcomes:
• A SRTS Plan for each school, cluster of schools, or small community that address barriers to students walking and biking to school.
• The necessary information to apply for other ODOT SRTS Program funding opportunities.

SRAC Comments/Questions:
• Where is the revenue for PIP coming from?
Staff Response: The funds come from a combination of state highway funds (from the Safe Routes to School Infrastructure funds) and federal funds (from the Transportation Safety Division’s safety funds).

- Plan is two-fold. 1) Creates an essential planning tool for SRTS IN and Non-IN project applications. 2) Leverages the planning process for inclusion in local transportation system plans. In doing so, other funding opportunities may apply.

- Are we encouraging applicants to include it in other planning processes (e.g., community’s bicycle/pedestrian plan)?
  - Staff Response: That could be a requirement but only for those communities that have a bike/ped plan. It’s a priority not a requirement in the current application. Accessibility gives extra credit.
    - We are setting up communities for success. A great outcome will be the community adoption of these plans.
    - The measure of a successful plan would be a city saying “yes,” this is what we’re looking for be it city council or county level. Have it permeate. It’s in their reference material so when they are working on a road, they know they need to check the SRTS plan and do it.
    - Historically SRTS action plans were documents that local road authorities were not aware of or involved in. That’s changing. This round, road authorities are involved with plan buy-in. The plans will document that they have gone through a rigorous public process, but we don’t really have a ‘stick’ for not doing that. Encouraging communities to take it to the next level, without requiring it.

- We hope to have 20 plans created by summer 2020.

SRAC Comments/Questions:

- Isn’t the PIP intended for small communities (50,000 and under)?
  - Staff Response:
    - Yes. PIPs are open to any eligible entity, any size, but priority is given for the applications from smallest communities. The Association of Oregon Counties and the League of Oregon Counties defines populations up to 50,000 as rural communities.
    - It’s not in the Rule but similar programs, like All Roads Transportation Safety (ARTS), do something like the PIP but is open to all communities.
    - Some small communities don’t have the staff or know-how to do average daily traffic counts, so they rely on ODOT to do that. The application seeks to find out what staff resources and knowledge exists.

- Seems like a lengthy application for a quick need in towns that may only have one person to fill it out. Maybe next time we could provide technical assistance to help them apply or help them with the application.
  - Staff Response: In Step 2, staff identifies any red flags in the applications.
Red Flags for PIP

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

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

2. Once the application is Red Flagged and scored:

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

3. If Red Flag is not mitigated:

   The Red Flag will be noted for the SRAC to review.

If they respond, but the response is not a great response, will the SRAC still get to see the information?
Staff Response: Yes

Non-Infrastructure Application and Scoring Review

Heidi Manlove reviewed the key elements of the Non Infrastructure Grant Program application and process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NI SCORING MATRIX: MAX 440</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCC 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, Collaboration, Coordination is 15%; Translates coordinator’s capacity building, coordinating communication and collaboration; and working with community partners to get buy-in and partnerships toward sustainability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safety is 50%** weight of scoring; this is looked at through their educational programming and how in-depth it is with a 0 -170 points max.

**Equity is 25%**: benefitting schools considered Title I (at least 40% students getting free/reduced lunch); have they ever received SRTS funding before?
Experience has shown that a program with a designated coordinator is much more successful with its SRTS program than those without one.

Other is 10%: Inclusion of the 6 Es (holistic); Plans for long-term sustainability (we want them to think about that now).

SRAC Comments/Questions
- If you have 5 Es (vs. 6), which of those categories do you fall into? 4-5 Es gets 5 points; 5-6 Es gets 20 points?
- Think we should change to: 6 Es gets 20 points;
- It also looks like if you have 1-3 Es only, we don’t care.
  - Staff Response: We know that it is better to address as many E’s as possible in a community and we want to encourage that. The points that are lost by this question could be regained in other areas of the application.
- Scoring matrix is public, correct?
  - Staff Response: Yes, it’s posted on the web site, and we also sent out a press release.
  - The scoring matrices are attached to your packet of materials. It is published publicly. However, we can re-look next time at scoring if there are changes you want made.
- Makes sense that we would want to prioritize the integrated programs.
  - Staff Response: They already see the benefit of the infrastructure; this is encouraging them to work with the other sides, like law enforcement or be considering it.

Red Flags for Non-IN

TSD Program Manager will review the application in regard to scoring along with the following guidance:

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

SRAC Homework
LeeAnne reiterated the things SRAC NOT to consider:
Changing the score of projects
Adding or subtracting content from an application

**SRAC Comments/Questions:**
- We are only considering the project as it’s been presented, yes?
  - Staff Response: Yes, but we may reach out to the applicant at the staff level for clarification, so you don’t have to make those calls.
- The SRAC will get all the information at least two weeks prior to the next meeting on July 9.
- Having the NON-IN grant due in the month of May made lives insane because it is the biggest time of year for SRTS. We have all this funding to support Walk-n-Roll Challenge and have small communities asking us how best to apply. Maybe next time do in April or after June.
  - Staff Response: We didn’t even think about it, but it should have been obvious.
- If you have communities reaching out to you and you feel overwhelmed, definitely shoot them over to Commute Options. It’s part of our current contract to assist.

**SRAC Check-in**
- Mavis and Kari closed with meeting with asking the SRAC to check in on the meeting.
- Is everyone aware of the SRTS Network? It helps to fund the SRTS coordinators regardless of their funding source. It would be good to showcase the work out there and utilize the SRTS Network more.
- Would like to have more people involved and broader diversity.
- For Amanda, LeeAnne, Traci and Heidi, regarding TSAP (page 97-98), it says ‘NON Infrastructure Action Plans’, 220 Action Plans to date. I would like to see a list and a map of where those plans exist.
- Thanks to Kari for sending me to that national meeting in November, Tampa FL—I was shocked that neither LeeAnne nor Heidi could go because of ODOT’s travel restrictions. I would like them to attend next year so anything the SRAC can do to support that, we should.
- I really like that staff wrote out all these things, so I have no questions, thank you.
- Many acronyms used, but I’m getting it now.
- Would be good to have an acronyms list for all partners, etc.

**Next Meeting**
July 9, 2019
10:00 – 4:00 p.m.
Lunch provided
CCBI, 626 High St NE, Salem, OR 97301