

2023-2024  
Safe Routes to School Competitive  
Construction Grants  
**FINAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT**  
MARCH 2023

## Contents

Program Development .....	3
Program Oversight .....	3
Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee.....	5
Program Guidance .....	5
Guidelines .....	6
Project Solicitation Process .....	7
Application Part 1 .....	7
Application Part 2 .....	7
Application Review .....	7
Eligibility review and Empirical score.....	7
Ground Conditions Review .....	8
Advisory Committee Review .....	8
Appendices .....	9
Appendix A: Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee .....	9
Appendix B: Empirical Scoring Matrix.....	10
Appendix C: Program Guidelines 2023-24 .....	19
Appendix D: Safe Routes to School Construction Competitive Grant Program Application.....	19
Appendix E: Eligibility Matrix .....	21
Appendix F: Meeting Packets.....	23
Appendix G: Recommended and Approved Project List.....	23
Appendix H: Memo to the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee, 5/18/23 .....	26

“Safe Routes to School” refers to efforts that improve, educate, or encourage children safely walking (by foot or mobility device) or bicycling to school.

This report summarizes the 2023-2024 Safe Routes to School Construction Competitive Grant project selection process. The Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Section details who and how final recommendations were made to the Oregon Transportation Commission.

## Program Development

The Oregon Department of Transportation has two main types of Safe Routes to School programs: Construction and Education. Construction programs focus on making sure safe walking and biking routes exist through investments in crossings, sidewalks and bike lanes, flashing beacons, and the like. Education programs focus on helping children to bike or walk to school safely through education and encouragement programs. The report focuses on the Construction Program solicitation that took place in 2022.

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), in consultation with stakeholders, developed an organizational structure for administrative rules, application process, and review processes to implement the Safe Routes to School Construction Competitive Program.

## Program Oversight

### Guiding Policies

ODOT created the policy document [Safe Routes to School Construction Funding Program: ODOT Policies and Procedures](#). The document incorporates the guiding policies developed to address the findings in a Secretary of State audit conducted in 2018 and to establish clear principles for the program. The policies are further described in this section and include:

- Develop and manage a fair and impartial process
- Foster equal access to the funds
- Run a transparent program
- Help ensure accountability
- Make program adjustments as needed

### Develop and Manage a Fair and Impartial Process

ODOT has been put in the role of both managing a funding program for cities, counties, and tribes, and also being an eligible applicant. ODOT must assure that all applications are treated fairly and that no bias is introduced when projects are selected. ODOT did not complete in this solicitation because the OTC dedicated additional funding to SRTS project on ODOT right of way in the 24-27 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. Staff anticipates that ODOT will likely compete in the next SRTS solicitation and aims for transparency regardless. To accomplish this transparency, the Agency has initiated several procedures and processes including:

- Separation of duties when submitting, scoring applications to have separation between ODOT submitted applications and external partner applications
- Training scorers to provide consistent scoring for all applications
- Automate some functions of the application to help reduce errors
- Empirical, objective scoring, which is publicly available
- Third party review and recommendations via the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee

### Foster Equal Access to the Funds

Prospective applicants have differing levels of capacity and ability when it comes to applying for funds. It is important that all cities, counties, tribes and ODOT know about the Safe Routes to School Construction Funding Program and how to apply. To help ensure awareness, several communication strategies are used. Communication strategies include:

- Up to date website information
- Informational flyers
- Announcements in Association of Oregon Counties and League of Oregon Cities publications
- Targeted comprehensive tribal correspondence
- Presentations upon request
- Project identification consultant support for small communities through the Project Identification Program
- Online information, tutorials, webinars and responses to individual questions regarding the application process and submission

### Run a Transparent Program

When and how projects are selected within the Safe Routes to School Construction Funding Program should be clear and understandable. To accomplish this, ODOT has sought to:

- Develop a comprehensive website.
- Provide up-to-date guidance through the program guidelines.
- Conduct outreach and host opportunities for public comment prior to each project solicitation cycle.

### Help Ensure Accountability

When and how projects are selected within the Safe Routes to School Construction Funding Program should be clear and understandable. Mechanisms to help ensure accountability include:

- Provide updates to the Oregon Legislature and Oregon Transportation Commission upon request, including the Construction funding program, project identification processes and timelines, project status, budget outlook and performance measures results.
- Develop and monitor programmatic performance measures in consultation with the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee.
- Closely manage project delivery deadlines through performance measures, readiness factors, and funding agreements.
- Establish Active Transportation Liaison roles, job duties and expectations.

### Make Program Adjustments as Needed

Using performance measure data tracked and reported over time, as well as feedback from the public and applicants, ODOT will consult with the Advisory Committee on needed program adjustments. Implement program adjustments, within program limitations (e.g. budget, staffing, etc.) and update guidelines accordingly.

Policies created during the process to document internal ODOT processes are posted on the ODOT's Safe Routes to School website: They are:

- <https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/TDD%20Documents/SRTS-Procedures-and-Process-Policies.pdf>
- <https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/TDD%20Documents/SRTS-Procedures-and-Process-Policies-Appendices.pdf>

### Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee

The formation and use of a Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee was defined in the [Safe Routes to School Rule](#). The Committee is responsible for establishing the Safe Routes to School Construction application process, the review and ranking of applications, and recommendations to the Oregon Transportation Commission regarding awards.

The Committee is charged with two key tasks:

1. Providing ODOT with program guidance and developing recommendations for the Oregon Transportation Safety Committee and Oregon Transportation Commission as appropriate.
2. Setting project selection criteria and making project selection recommendations. The Oregon Transportation Safety Committee and Oregon Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee will provide input and policy direction and guidance to the committee.

The Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee was established in September 2018. The committee approved a charter that details the roles and responsibilities of the participants in the process, including a section on conflict of interest. The charter can be found on the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee website. (<https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS-SRAC.aspx>).

The Committee is comprised of 20 members (Appendix A), with representatives from different areas of expertise and geographic distribution. Members represent Oregon Department of Education, school districts, Safe Routes to School Coordinators, health and equity advocates, League of Oregon Cities, Association of Oregon Counties, tribes, small cities and more.

### Program Guidance

The [Safe Routes to School Rule](#) identifies the major attributes of the program, such as who is eligible, general timing and overall evaluation criteria.

The Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee prioritized project selection criteria identified in the rule, heavily favoring equity, with additional priority to projects addressing safety and readiness. Per the Rule and Statute, school type was also a priority area. Staff then used this general sense of weighting to come out with prioritization scores. The resulting Empirical Scoring Matrix was approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission. It is summarized in the below table:

Empirical Scoring Matrix Summary*		
Priority Area	Categories	Total Possible Score
Addressing Transportation Disparities	Low Income Students	195
	Transportation Disadvantaged Index	
	Other vulnerability assessment data points	
Safety	Crashes	120
	Speed	
	Lanes or Crossing Distance	
School Type	K-8 or any combination	90
Readiness	Elements completed or underway, such as Right of way, utility relocation, environmental, Engineering	80
Proximity to School	1/4 mile or less	15
<b>Total Possible Points</b>		<b>500</b>
*The complete Empirical Scoring Matrix is listed in Appendix B.		

The empirical matrix was published online so that prospective applicants could see how their project may score. Overall guidance was also provided, as described below.

### Guidelines

The guidelines for the Safe Routes to School Construction Grants are included in Appendix C, and describe the roles and responsibilities of the major participants, establish what entities are eligible for projects, what projects are eligible, the match requirements, and the application process.

## Project Solicitation Process

On February 1<sup>st</sup> 2022 the 2023-2024 Safe Routes to School Competitive Construction Grant project solicitation period was announced for March-July 2022. The total amount available was \$32.4 million.

Six online outreach events were held between February and May 2022 to notify cities, counties, tribes and others of the available Safe Routes to School Competitive Construction Grant funding and project selection process. ODOT Headquarters established schedules and workshops in each of the five ODOT regions, with additional webinars to communicate and educate locals about the upcoming SRTS funding opportunity. The purpose was to educate potential applicants on the program and the process for applying for grant funding.

A two-step process was implemented for applying on projects, including Application Part 1 and Application Part 2. Application materials and program guidelines were posted on ODOT's website, [Find money to do Safe Routes to School Programs \(oregonsaferoutes.org\)](https://oregonsaferoutes.org).

### Application Part 1

Eligible applicants submitted Part 1 of the application for projects meeting Safe Routes to School requirements. The purpose of Part 1 of the application is to:

- Provide basic information regarding eligibility of the proposed project.
- Allow the Safe Routes to School Construction applicants to see how many applicants will apply for the current round of funding and how competitive any particular application may be during this round.

Eighty-three applications (Part 1), totaling over \$80 million, were submitted by March 18, 2022. On May 1, 2022, applicants who submitted Application Part 1 were invited to submit Application Part 2 due by July 31, 2022. A sample of the application is provided in Appendix D.

### Application Part 2

Project Applications Part 2 were due on July 31, 2022. ODOT received 56 eligible Application Part 2 totaling \$60 million. Applications were then reviewed using the process described below.

## Application Review

The following five step process was used to review applications and recommend projects:

1. Eligibility review and empirical score
2. Grounds Conditions Review
3. Advisory Committee Review
4. Final recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission

### Eligibility review and Empirical score

Once all 56 full project applications were received, six staff members from ODOT headquarters reviewed all applications for completeness, administrative eligibility, and technical feasibility. Headquarters staff communicated with applicants to clarify specific information contained in the applications.

Staff provided feedback to applicants with projects partially not on public road right of way. The applicants updated their applications to remove the budget line item that were not eligible.

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

All 83 applications were scored using the same Empirical Scoring Matrix using a score automatically calculated from the online application in addition to a small portion around readiness calculated by one of six ODOT headquarters staff trained on the scoring technique. Throughout the process, all 56 applicants remained eligible for funding. The eligibility matrix is included in Appendix E and lists all projects alphabetically in tiers after scoring.

### Ground Conditions Review

The 150% list was provided to region staff (ATLs) in September 2022 for onsite assessments, if necessary. ODOT Staff focused on completing ground conditions review for the top 150% list of applications based on the empirical score.

Staff specifically reviewed project details listed in the application in relation to the actual ground conditions ascertained through on-line or in-person observations. No applicants were removed for consideration during this review.

### Advisory Committee Review

Committee members were given the list of applicants, empirical scores, and all application materials for review prior to their November 17, 2022 meeting. Members were asked to review the materials and suggest additional filters that could be applied to all applications and be used to further reach committee goals, particularly around social equity and geographic balance.

Comments were gathered from members prior to the meeting and staff compiled a presentation of the material (Appendix F). The Committee discussion resulted in a recommended prioritized projects list. Throughout the workshop, committee members used the opportunity to respond to the different scenarios presented and created during the meeting.

On November 17, 2022, the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee met to discuss and recommend \$32.4 M in construction projects to the Oregon Transportation Commission. Through the process identified in this section, the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee unanimously supported the projects on the recommended list that was submitted to the Oregon Transportation Commission and approved on January 12, 2023. The list includes 26 projects from across the state (Appendix G).



## Appendices

### Appendix A: Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee.

Brian Potwin	Bend	Active Transportation Manager, Commute Options
Brock Dittus	Salem	Program Analyst, Oregon Department of Education
Dana Nichols	Bandon	City Planner, City of Bandon
Dani Schulte	CTUIR	Transportation Planner, CTUIR
Eduardo Miranda	Portland	Technical Center Manager, ODOT
Kim Crabtree	Bend	Director of Transportation, Bend-La Pine School District
Lani Radtke	Salem	Engineering Division Manager, Marion Co. PW
Lauren Morris	North Bend	Tribal Representative
Mavis Hartz	La Grande	OBPAC Representative
Noel Mickelberry (Chair)	Portland	Metro Safe Routes to School Program Manager
Rob Inerfeld	Eugene	Transportation Planning Manager, City of Eugene PW
Steve Dickey (Vice Chair)	Salem	Director of Transportation Development, Salem-Keizer Transit
William Anderson	Bend	Oregon Transportation Safety Committee Representative

## Appendix B: Empirical Scoring Matrix

Note: This scoring matrix was approved by the Safe Route to School Advisory Committee on October 18, 2021.

<b>Project Selection Criteria for Safe Routes to School 2023-2024 Competitive Construction Grants</b>		
<p>Projects will be evaluated based on the project selection criteria listed below and consistent with OAR 737-025-0092. The first set of selection criteria listed will be used to determine if the project is eligible for funding. The next set of criteria will be used to create an empirical staff score of the project for consideration in the Safe Routes Advisory Committee (SRAC) recommendations. The last project selection criteria will be used to flag any issues for SRAC consideration.</p>		
<b>Step 1: Eligibility Criteria</b>		<b>Implementation</b>
1	The project description does not appear to address identified problem / hazard (s) and barrier(s) for children walking and rolling to school OAR 737-025-0092(1)(a)(B) and OAR 737-025-0092(1)(a)(c).	Staff will flag an application for further review when there is no nexus drawn between problem and solution. After an application is flagged, staff will reach out to the applicant with an opportunity to update the application.
2	The project scope and project description appear to be significantly out of alignment OAR 737-025-0092(1)(a)(c).	Staff will flag an application for further review when the amount requested is out of alignment with the project OR if the information in the READINESS criteria was not taken into account in the amount requested. After an application is flagged, staff will reach out to the applicant with an opportunity to update the application.
3	The applicants must check all of the additional criteria set by statute and the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee regarding a commitment to outreach, the project alignment with an adopted plan, within one mile of a school, school support, and support of all road authorities involved.	Automation in the application will remove applicants who don't commit to these criteria.

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

Step 2: Scoring							
Focus Area	Priority Area	Categories	Sub-categories	Score for each sub-category	Total score possible in each category	Notes	Implementation
Addressing Transportation	Low Income Students	10-19%		15	175	Title I schools will be prioritized by measuring the rate of low income in addition to	Automatically scored with information from the application.
		20-29%		30			
		30-39%		45			
		40-49%		60			

			50-59%	80		
			60-69%	100		
			70-79%	120		
			80-89%	140		
			90-100%	160		
	Transportation Disadvantaged Index		1.5-1.9	5		
			2-2.4	10		
			2.5 and up	15		
	Other Vulnerability Assessment Data Points		Ever English Learner (students learning English as a second language) rate is above state average (18%)	5	20	
			BIPOC student rate is above state average (40%)	10		
			Students with disability is over the state average (15%)	5		

			Chronic Absenteeism rate is above state average (28.1%)	5			
			Native American students above state average (1%)	5			
		Right of Way (ROW)	The applicant is aware they do not own the ROW and in the process of figuring it out	10	80	Scoring will be assessed based on the risk factors associated with readiness. Partial completion/mitigation will earn a	Automatically scored with information from the application. Reviewed by staff

<b>Heavily Weighted</b>	Readiness		The applicant or the agency delivering the project owns the ROW, have an easement, or has permission to purchase the ROW.	20		
		Public Process	The applicant has done outreach but it was a long time ago (for example 5 years) or if the community was opposed but approaches have been identified to mitigate those concerns	10		Automatically scored with information from the application. Reviewed by staff for accuracy.

			The applicant has completed a public process or has done due diligence, or are currently in the process.	20			
		Environmental	Applicant knows there is an issue but hasn't figured out all the details of how to address it yet.	10			Automatically scored with information from the application. Reviewed by staff for accuracy.
			The applicant doesn't need to address environmental issues or they have figured out an approach to address.	20			

			Applicant knows there is an issue but hasn't figured out an approach to address it yet.	5			
		Storm water	The applicant doesn't need to address storm water or they have figured an approach to address it.	7			Automatically scored with information from the application. Reviewed by staff for accuracy.
		Utilities	Applicant knows there is an issue but hasn't figured out an approach to address it yet.	5			Automatically scored with information from the application. Reviewed by staff for accuracy.
			The applicant doesn't need to move utilities or they have figured out an approach to address it.	7			
		Design	The applicant has started conceptual design.	3			Automatically scored with information from the



		The applicant has attached design or conceptual design documents.	6			
Crash Risk Factors	Bicyclist or Pedestrian crash between 6am and 9pm	Non-serious injury	10	120	Projects that are on an identified Priority Safety Corridor (PSC) will receive 40 points then receive additional points for the aspects of PSC that they have. All projects will receive points for including any aspects of a PSC, in accordance with the scores shown.  OAR 737-025-0092(1)(b)(A)	Automatically scored with information from the application.
		Fatality/serious injury	20			
	Speed (use 50 percentile if available, posted speed if not.)	25 mph	7			
		30 mph	14			
		35 mph +	20			
	Lanes or crossing distance from curb to curb	3 lanes, or greater than 30 feet	10			
		4 lanes + or greater than 40ft crossing	20			
	Average Annual Daily Traffic	3000-5,999	10			
		6000+	20			
	Priority Safety Corridor		40			

<b>Moderately Weighted</b>	Relationship to School	1/2 mile or less			5	15	OAR 737-025-0092(1)(c)(B)	Automatically scored with information from the application.
		1/4 mile or less (not additive to the 5 points from 1/2 mile or less)			15		OAR 737-025-0092(1)(c)(A)	
		Within school attendance boundary			5			
		The project addresses an area that has supplemental bussing (hazard bussing)			5			
<b>Heavily Weighted</b>	School Type	Pre-kindergarten to 8th grade or any combo			90	90	OAR 737-025-0092(1)(c)(A)	

## Appendix C: Program Guidelines 2023-24

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/2023-2024-SRTS-Construction-Program-Guidelines.pdf>

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

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/2022-SRTS-Grant-WORKSHEET.pdf>

This page intentionally left blank.

## Appendix E: Eligibility Matrix

Region	Applicant Name/ Agency	Application #	Grant Award Request	Score Tier
Region 4	City of The Dalles	83	\$1,994,016.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 4	City of Merrill	3	\$1,410,480.35	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 2	City of Independence	23	\$1,004,902.40	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 1	City of Portland, Bureau of Transportation	22	\$1,882,112.80	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 5	City of Irrigon	30	\$393,120.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 3	City of Winston	97	\$1,948,053.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 3	City of Medford	17	\$2,000,000.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 1	Washington County Land Use and Transportation	77	\$959,200.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 2	City of Newport	91	\$1,309,752.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 1	Multnomah County	88	\$1,985,022.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 2	City of Salem Public Works Department	43	\$389,600.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 2	City of McMinnville	19	\$938,636.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 4	City of Chiloquin	46	\$1,597,600.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 2	City of Mill City	31	\$2,000,000.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 2	City of Monmouth	58	\$1,184,543.76	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 2	City of Salem Public Works	40	\$260,000.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 2	City of Warrenton	6	\$2,000,000.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 1	City of Tigard	63	\$2,000,000.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 2	City of Corvallis	93	\$70,924.80	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 1	City of Oregon City	48	\$1,642,782.40	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 2	City of Lyons	92	\$1,520,000.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 3	Douglas County Public Works	15	\$2,000,000.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 4	City of Lincoln City	28	\$755,027.20	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 3	Josephine County Public Works	74	\$547,983.60	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 2	City of Albany	24	\$1,520,000.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 3	City of Grants Pass	35	\$1,974,400.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338

Region 2	City of Salem Public Works Department	44	\$334,400.00	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 2	City of Eugene	59	\$318,879.49	Tier 1: Score 446-338
Region 1	Clackamas County	99	\$484,960.00	Tier 2: Score 337-316
Region 5	City of Wallowa	11	\$1,486,990.40	Tier 2: Score 337-316
Region 2	City of Salem Public Works	38	\$371,200.00	Tier 2: Score 337-316
Region 2	Marion County Public Works	79	\$1,477,600.00	Tier 2: Score 337-316
Region 2	City of Dallas, Oregon	47	\$1,290,696.00	Tier 2: Score 337-316
Region 4	City of Redmond	53	\$87,000.00	Tier 2: Score 337-316
Region 2	City of Salem Public Works	37	\$807,200.00	Tier 2: Score 337-316
Region 2	City of Salem Public Works Department	42	\$1,465,600.00	Tier 2: Score 337-316
Region 1	City of Gresham	104	\$60,203.20	Tier 2: Score 337-316
Region 2	City of Sweet Home	8	\$1,746,240.00	Tier 2: Score 337-316
Region 3	City of Roseburg	16	\$1,999,873.46	Tier 2: Score 337-316
Region 2	Lane County	78	\$1,121,608.52	Tier 2: Score 337-316
Region 3	City of Myrtle Point	10	\$461,580.00	Tier 3: Score 310-227
Region 5	City of Pendleton	80	\$310,800.00	Tier 3: Score 310-227
Region 3	Jackson County	4	\$118,000.00	Tier 3: Score 310-227
Region 2	City of Toledo (OCWCOG)	100	\$1,306,492.00	Tier 3: Score 310-227 <sup>1</sup>
Region 2	City of Corvallis	89	\$70,924.80	Tier 3: Score 310-227
Region 4	City of Condon	12	\$736,000.00	Tier 3: Score 310-227
Region 1	City of Gresham	50	\$371,174.40	Tier 3: Score 310-227
Region 2	City of Harrisburg	49	\$692,963.54	Tier 3: Score 310-227
Region 5	City of La Grande	76	\$259,280.00	Tier 3: Score 310-227
Region 4	City of Madras	102	\$412,000.00	Tier23: Score 310-227 <sup>2</sup>
Region 3	Coquille Indian Tribe	103	\$242,928	Tier 3: Score 310-227
Region 2	City of Banks	13	\$329,600.00	Tier 3: Score 310-227
Region 2	City of St. Paul	57	\$1,540,064.00	Tier 3: Score 310-227
Region 2	City of Salem Public Works	101	\$241,600.00	Tier 3: Score 310-227

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix H

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix H

Region 2	City of Veneta	106	\$1,769,254.80	Tier 3: Score 310-227
Region 2	City of Amity	32	\$1,714,400.00	Tier 3: Score 310-227

### Appendix F: Meeting Packets

11/17/22 Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Meeting

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/RPTD/RPTD%20Committee%20Meeting%20Documents/SRAC-PresentationNov172022.pdf>

9/15/22 Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee Meeting

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/RPTD/RPTD%20Committee%20Meeting%20Documents/SRAC-Presentation-Sept152022.pdf>

1/12/2023 Oregon Transportation Commission Meeting: Approve Recommended 2023 Safe Routes to School Construction Projects

[https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Get-Involved/OTCSupportMaterials/Consent\\_11\\_2023-24\\_SafeRoutesToSchool\\_Project\\_PACKET.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Get-Involved/OTCSupportMaterials/Consent_11_2023-24_SafeRoutesToSchool_Project_PACKET.pdf)

### Appendix G: Recommended and Approved Project List

Region	Applicant Agency	Project Name	Grant Award Request	Request Match Reduction to 20%
--------	------------------	--------------	---------------------	--------------------------------

Region 1	City of Portland	The project constructs sidewalks, crosswalks, and buffered bicycle lanes for students at Powell Butte Elementary School.	\$1,882,113	YES
Region 1	Washington County	The project constructs new sidewalk and lighting along a high speed roadway, extending the walking route to Witch Hazel Elementary School.	\$959,200	YES
Region 1	Multnomah County	The project constructs sidewalks, bike lanes, and an enhanced crossing for students at Fairview Elementary School.	\$1,985,022	YES
Region 1	City of Tigard	The project constructs crossing enhancements, street lighting, sidewalk infill, curb ramps, school flashers, and school signage for students at James Templeton Elementary School.	\$2,000,000	YES
Region 1	City of Oregon City	The project constructs bike lanes, sidewalks, marked and signed crossings, illumination, and two rectangular rapid flashing beacon warning crossings for students at Holcomb Elementary School.	\$1,642,782	YES
Region 1 Subtotal:			\$8,469,117	
Region 2	City of Independence	The project constructs a pedestrian refuge island and establishes a neighborhood greenway for students at Independence Elementary School.	\$1,004,902	YES
Region 2	City of Newport	The project constructs sidewalk for students at Newport Middle School.	\$1,309,752	YES
Region 2	City of Salem	The project constructs a crosswalk, flashing beacons, overhead lighting, and crosswalk visibility enhancements for student at Washington Elementary School.	\$389,600	YES
Region 2	City of McMinnville	The project constructs pedestrian walkways, a rail crossing, signage and lighting for students at Sue Buell Elementary and Patton Middle School.	\$938,636	YES
Region 2	City of Mill City	The project constructs sidewalks, crosswalks, lighting, flashing beacons for students at Santiam Elementary.	\$2,000,000	YES
Region 2	City of Monmouth	The project constructs sidewalks, crosswalks, and flashing beacons for students at Monmouth Elementary School.	\$1,184,544	YES



Region 2	City of Salem	The project constructs a crosswalk, pedestrian refuge island, overhead lighting, and pedestrian signage for students at Swegle Elementary School.	\$260,000	YES
Region 2	City of Warrenton	The project constructs a pedestrian walkway for students at Warrenton Grade School and Warrenton High School.	\$2,000,000	YES
Region 2	City of Corvallis	The project constructs speed feedback signs for students at Lincoln Elementary School.	\$70,925	YES
Region 2	City of Lyons	The project constructs sidewalks and a crossing for students at Mari-Linn Elementary School.	\$1,520,000	YES
Region 2	City of Salem	The project constructs sidewalks, stormwater collection facilities, and ramps for students at Mary Eyre Elementary School.	\$334,400	YES
Region 2	City of Lincoln City	The project constructs sidewalks and enhanced crossings for students at Oceanlake Elementary School.	\$755,027	YES
Region 2	City of Eugene	The project constructs lighting and a walkway for students at Awbrey Park Elementary School.	\$318,879	YES
Region 2 Subtotal:			\$12,086,666	
Region 3	City of Winston	The project constructs sidewalks, ramps, crossings, and flashing beacons for students at McGovern Elementary School.	\$1,948,053	YES
Region 3	City of Medford	The project constructs sidewalks for students at Jackson Elementary School and additional schools.	\$2,000,000	YES
Region 3	Douglas County	The project constructs sidewalks, ramps, separated bike lanes, and enhanced crossings for students at Glendale Jr/Sr High School.	\$2,000,000	YES
Region 3	Josephine County	The project constructs enhanced crossings for students at Williams Elementary School.	\$547,984	YES
Region 3 Subtotal:			\$6,496,037	

Region 4	City of The Dalles	The project constructs sidewalks, curb ramps, curb extensions, streetlights, marked crosswalks, flashing beacons, and bike lanes at Chenowith Elementary School.	\$1,994,016	YES
Region 4	City of Merrill	The project constructs sidewalks and additional signage for students at Merrill Elementary School.	\$1,410,480	YES
Region 4	City of Chiloquin	The project constructs sidewalks and bike lanes for students at Chiloquin Elementary School.	\$1,597,600	YES
Region 4 Subtotal:			\$5,002,096	
Region 5	City of Irrigon	The project constructs sidewalks, crosswalks, and lighting for students at Irrigon Elementary School.	\$393,120	YES
Region 5 Subtotal:			\$393,120	
TOTAL			\$32,447,036	

## Appendix H: Memo to the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee, 5/18/23

In the Safe Routes to School Construction Program application review process in 2022, two applications were scored incorrectly. One of the applications would have been partially funded. Staff is working with the applicant to rectify the situation.

**Background:** Two online forms were used in the application process. One form was used for the application filled out by the applicant. The second form was used for staff to score specific questions in the application. The two forms were linked by a formula to auto-calculate the final score of the application. For two applications, #100 and #102, this formula pulled an incorrect number from the application form to the staff scoring form.

- ❖ Applicant #100, City of Toledo (OCWCOG): The total auto filled as 287 but should have been 327. With the additional points given by the staff scorers- the total should have been 344 (not 304 that was published) and this project should have been partially funded instead of partially funding applications #44 and #59.
- ❖ Applicant #102, City of Madras: The total auto filled as 242 but should have been 293. The final total (including the points from the staff scorers) would have been 327 (not 276 which was published). This project would have remained unfunded.

Staff double checked the final scores but missed the two incorrect numbers likely because they were at the end of the list (#100 and #102 are close to #106 which was the final application number), so staff was not expecting to see any anomalies after every other number was correct. Staff triple checked by doing a spot analysis for 12 applications, manually scoring all 12 and then checking the application auto-score, unfortunately, application s#100 and #102 did not get this attention.

**Solution:** Staff is working with applicant #100, to rectify the situation and have come to a solution. The partial funding would have covered the less expensive location of the two locations listed in the application likely equaling \$44,400. Staff will utilize the SRTS Rapid Response grant program to quickly rectify this situation, with approval from the SRTS Rapid Response subcommittee. Utilizing the SRTS Rapid Response grant program funds will allow staff to fund this project below the \$60,000 program minimum and allow for funds to be allocated quickly to rectify this error. Staff is also working Cognito, the platform for ODOT's online forms, to determine the cause of the error. A preliminary investigation points to a glitch in the timing of the auto-calculation.

**Next Steps:** Staff is still investigating the error in Cognito to address future issues. Staff is also adding an additional staff person to complete the double check and triple check process in addition to the program manager.