	Proi	ect Selection Criteria for	Safe Routes to School	2024-2025 Com	petitive Construction Grants]
Projects will be						he project is eligible for funding	The next set of criteria will be used to
Step 1: E	cts will be evaluated based on the project selection criteria listed below and consistent with DAR 737:025-0092. The first set of selection criteria listed will be used to determine if the project is eligible for fundin 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 p 1: Eligibility Criteria						AC consideration. Implementation
1	1 The project description does not appear to address identified problem / hazard (s) and barrier(s) for children walking and rolling to school OAR 737-025-0052(1)(a)(B) and OAR 737-025-0052(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 application with an opportunity to update the application
2	2 The project scope and project description appear to be significantly out of alignment OAR 737-025-0022(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 application is flagged, staff will reach out to the application.
3	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 adopta 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)(8). An issue was identified at some point during the application review that warrants further discussion.						Saff will perform ground conditions to assess whether the information provided in the RADNESS and CRASH RISK ATC TORS portions of the application seem accurate. The use of faceral faulting as match automatically ringges an in person ground conditions review. Staff completing ground conditions review. Staff completing ground conditions review. Staff and the staff of the staff of the staff of the there is an applications in flagged at fault reach out to the application. Staff will only use this category if there is an Staff will only use this category.
							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: S	coring						
	Priority Area	Categories	Sub-categories	Score for each sub- category	Total score possible in each category	Notes	Implementation
Focus Area	Addressing Transportation Disparities	Low income Students	10-19% 20-29%	15 30	175	demographics, students with disabilities, and chronic	a Automatically scored with
			30-39% 40-49%	45 60			
			50-59% 60-69%	80 100			
			70-79% 80-89%	120 140			
			90-100% Low/Medium	160			
		Social Equity Index	Medium/High High	10			
			Ever English Learner (students	15			information from the application.
		Other Vulnerability Assessment Data Points	learning English as a second language) rate is above state average		25	absenteeism.	9
			BIPOC student rate is above			OAR 737-025-0095(1)(b)(C)	
			state average Students with disability is over	5			
			the state average Chronic Absenteesim rate is	5			
			above state average Native American students	5			
			above state average The applicant previously	5			
Heavily Weighted	Readiness	Former SRTS PIP Participant	completed a PIP grant with ODOT SRTS	5	85	ir R Scoring will be assessed based on the risk factors associated with readiness. Partial completion/milgation will earn- a project half a credit for addressing the risk). The total	Automatically scored with information from the application. Reviewed by staff for accuracy.
		Right of Way (ROW)	The applicant is aware they do not own the ROW and in the				
			process of figuring out potential options The applicant or the agency delivering the project owns the ROW, have an easement, or has	10			
		Public Process	permission to purchase the ROW. The applicant has done outreach but it was a long time ago (for example 5 years) or if the community was opposed	20			Automatically scored with information from the application. Reviewed by staff for accuracy.
			the project but the applicant has identified measures to mitigate those concerns The applicant has completed a public process or has done due diligence, or is currently in the	10			
			process. Applicant knows there is an	20			
		Environmental	issue but hasn't figured out all the details on how to address it yet. The applicant doesn't need to	10			Automatically scored with information from the application. Reviewed by staff for accuracy.
			address environmental issues or they have figured out an approach to address them.	20			
		Stormwater	Applicant knows there is an issue but hasn't figured out an	10			
			approach to address it yet. The applicant doesn't need to	5			Automatically scored with information from the application. Reviewed by staff for accuracy.
			address stormwater or they have figured an approach to				
		Utilities	address it. Applicant knows there is an issue but hasn't figured out an	7			Automatically scored with information from the application. Reviewed by staff for accuracy.
			approach to address it yet. The applicant doesn't need to	5			
			move utilities or they have figured out an approach to				
			address it. The applicant has started	7			
		Design	conceptual design. The applicant has attached	3			Automatically scored with information from the application.
			design or conceptual design documents.	6			Reviewed by staff for accuracy.
	Crash Risk Factors	Bicyclist or Pedestrian crash between 6am and 9pm	Non-serious injury Fatality/serious injury	20 40	195	Projects that are on an identified Priority Safety Corrider (RSC) will provide the	fety the 40 litional of PSC Automatically scored with cts will information from the application. rdfance wn.
		Speed (use 50 percentile if available, posted speed if not.)	25 mph + 35 mph +	30 35			
		Lanes or crossing distance from	3 lanes, or greater than 30 feet 4 lanes + or greater than 40ft	30		Corridor (PSC) will receive 40 points then receive additional	
		curb to curb	crossing 3000-5,999	40 30		points for the aspects of PSC that they have. All projects will project and the point for including any	
		Average Annual Daily Traffic	6000+	40		receive points for including any aspects of a PSC, in accordance with the scores shown.	
		Priority Safety Corridor	Posted speed/85th percentile is 40mph+ OR (two or more of the following): 30mph, 2 lanes +, 12,000 ADT+, history of crashes	40		with the scores shown. OAR 737-025-0092(1)(b)(A)	
Moderately Weighted	Relationship to School	1 mile or less 1/2 mile or less	and the second s	40 5 10	20	OAR 737-025-0092(1)(c)(B) OAR 737-025-0092(1)(c)(B)	
		1/2 mile or less 1/4 mile or less (not additive to		10		uws /3/-025-0092(1)(c)(B)	
		1/4 mile or less (not additive to the 5 points from 1/2 mile or less) Within school attendance boundary The project addresses an area		15			
		that has supplemental bussing (hazard bussing)		5			
		TOTAL SCORE			500		