The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is required by the Legislature, as are most state agencies and boards, to report on Key Performance Measures (KPMs) annually. These KPMs are approved by the Legislature as part of the biennial budget process.

At ODOT, performance management and Key Performance Measures provide for (1) transparency and accountability to the public and decision makers, (2) drive desired behavior and outcomes based on strategic goals, supports and (3) inform performance-based decision making and effective resource allocation.

Specifically, ODOT’s performance measures exist to fulfill the following aims:

(1) Transparency and accountability to the public and decision makers
   - Meet federal and legislative requirements
   - Provide transparency and accountability to public
   - Communicate successes
   - Simplify complex stories
   - Build support among stakeholders

(2) Drive solutions and outcomes to meet mission, vision and goals
   - Make sure we achieve agency mission, vision and goals
   - Drive desired behavior by ODOT staff, because what you measure gets done
   - Identify gaps that aren’t being addressed

(3) Support and inform performance-based decision making and effective resource allocation
   - Evaluate performance
   - Identify opportunities for improvement
   - Improve business processes
   - Identify future problems and opportunities
   - Identify what doesn’t work and performance deficits
   - Use resources more efficiently and move resources where needed
   - Justify additional resources

ODOT uses the Performance Management Leadership Team (PMLT), a cross functional and inter-divisional group of subject matter experts, to review, evaluate, develop, and propose strategic-level Key Performance Measures (KPMs) that will help ODOT steer the ship of state, and inform decision making and investment decisions.

The PMLT is the Agency’s performance management body. The PMLT provides the Oregon Department of Transportation expertise and resources to support and create a results-driven environment committed to continuously improving the performance of ODOT and Oregon’s transportation system and organization.

At the conclusion of a year-long review process, a list of proposed KPMs are agreed to by the PMLT after extensive coordination with internal ODOT staff. They are then reviewed and accepted by the
appropriate division administrator and then ODOT Director. Once reviewed, the final versions of the proposed KPMs are presented to the entire ODOT Executive Staff for acceptance. At this point the KPMs are introduced to and reviewed by the CIAC and then Oregon Transportation Commission. Following this the KPMs are submitted to the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) and Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO). Following this the KPMs are finally approved during the next “long” session of the Oregon Legislature as part of the budget process.

**Process Summary**

**KPM Timeline**

The following timelines for review, approval, and reporting of KPMs are set by LFO and DAS.

**March 2018** - 2019-21 Budget Instructions are released by DAS

**April 30th 2018** - Agencies input KPM change request information; advise DAS/LFO Analysts

**June 30th 2018** – DAS and LFO Analyst provide feedback to agency

**September 30th 2018** – Agency Annual Performance Progress Report (APPR) is due

**October 2018** – Include APPR for FYE June 30th in Governor’s Recommended Budget

**February – June 2019 Legislative Session** – Budget Approval - Agency’s presentation of KPM results and Legislative review of proposed changes and LFO Analysis.

**June 2019** – Legislatively Approved KPMs released by LFO and included in the final agency budget report.
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KPM Guidance
A number of pieces of guidance and direction inform ODOT’s approach to its KPM modification proposal.

LFO/DAS KPM Requirements
According to guidance from the Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO) and the Chief Financial Office of the Department of Administrative Services (DAS), KPMs should:

1. Gauge progress toward agency’s goals and mission
2. Use standard terminology and definitions
3. Be few in number
4. Identify performance targets to be achieved during the two year budget cycle
5. Use accurate and reliable data sources
6. Measure customer satisfaction
7. Assign an organizational unit responsible for achieving the target
8. Address comparable information, where possible

McKinsey Report recommendation on performance measures
The ODOT management review completed by McKinsey & Co. provided the following recommendation to the agency on the agency’s key performance measures.

Quote from page 9 of McKinsey Study:
“Consolidate KPMs most critical and relevant to ODOT’s near-term challenges – Use the operating planning process to identify the most critical and relevant KPMs to its success, as well as to set a clear timeline to achieving targets. In addition:
- Ensure OTC champions remove KPMs that are not aligned with strategic goals
- Ensure the number of metrics is limited, actionable, and focused on areas truly within the ability of ODOT to influence and achieve. Develop a structured performance management cadence between OTC and ODOT to evaluate performance and shifts to operations based on metrics
- Assure data integrity for selected KPMs to focus debate on performance rather than the technicalities of individual values
Potential benefit: Consolidating KPMs could refocus ODOT and governing bodies on what matters and ensure managers throughout all levels of the organization have organizational clarity as they set their own priorities.”

DAS recommendation on performance measures
Following release of the McKinsey management review, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) gave the following direction to the Oregon Transportation Commission and ODOT.

“Following approval of agency success metrics, ODOT should work with the Legislature to align key performance measures (KPMs) with agency, division, department and individual goals.
• Current KPMs should be reconciled to align with the agency goals and management plan developed in recommendation 2.
• ODOT should work with the OTC in the development and tracking of KPMs. The order and manner of OTC involvement may vary depending on the outcome of recommendation 1, however their involvement in the development and monitoring of KPMs is recommended.
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• ODOT should work with the Legislative Fiscal Office to propose reconciling KPMs with agency success metrics during the summer of 2018.

**Desired outcome:** A set of key performance measures that help ODOT management better monitor their progress towards agency goals, and work to tie the individual efforts of staff to broader agency goals.”

**Budget note**
The Legislature provided this direction in the form of a budget note in ODOT’s 2017-2019 biennial budget.

“LFO recommends approval of proposed 2017-19 Key Performance Measures with direction that the Oregon Department of Transportation work with the Legislative Fiscal Office during the interim to develop a KPM proposal to be evaluated in conjunction with the 2019-21 Governor’s Budget. The proposal should reflect the recommendation coming out of the management review conducted in 2016 by McKinsey and Company: that ODOT consolidate its KPMs with a focus on developing and tracking performance measures that align with the near-term strategic goals of the agency, and on areas within the ability of the Department to influence and achieve.”
**Reported Key Performance Measures**
The following are lists of the Key Performance Measures that we are recommending.

No recommended changes at this time:

- Traffic Fatalities Rate
- Traffic Serious Injuries
- Large Truck Crashes
- Derailments
- Bridge Condition
- Pavement Condition
- Public Transit Vehicle Condition
- Passenger Rail Ridership
- Bikeways and Walkways
- Certified Firms (DBE)
- DMV Field Office Wait Times
- ODOT Customer Service

Recommended Modifications: These modifications use measure definitions that are more in line with the other DOTs mentioned in the McKinsey Report:

- **Construction Projects on Budget**: The percentage of projects for which total construction expenditures are within 10% of its baselined construction authorization. This will replace ODOT’s current measure, which gauges overall performance in bringing the construction program in within budget but allows for significant variance among individual projects.
  
  **Justification** – This modified measure more closely aligns with peers states and accounts for the appropriate re-baselining of contract authorizations of on budget measurement. Additionally the old measure is an aggregate on budget measure and did not address project to project variation or the components of the final construction costs.

- **Construction Projects On Time**: The percentage of state administered projects that have satisfactorily completed all on-site work within 90 days of the baselined last contract completion date.
  
  **Justification** – This modified measure more closely aligns with peers states and accounts for the appropriate re-baselining of contract completion dates of on-time measurements. Additionally the old measurement methodology did not highlight the variability on smaller to medium sized projects.

Recommended Additions:

- **Total Lane Miles rated as Moderately Congested or Worse**: ODOT does not currently have a mobility measure that measures congestion on the state highway system. This proposed measure gauges compares traffic volumes to capacity. It is measured by Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)/Capacity (C) = 9 or higher on Oregon State Highway System (AADT = Total volume of vehicle traffic of a highway or road for a year divided by 365 days). This addresses both passenger vehicles and freight and both severity and duration of congestion, and captures reliability reasonably well. It is easy to understand and (somewhat) reflects performance of investment strategies. It is responsive to both road supply (widening) and reducing demand (traffic volumes) through transportation options—so it’s not inherently about widening highways.

- **Transit Rides per Capita**: The current ODOT measure focuses on senior and disabled transit service. ODOT recommends deleting the existing measure and replacing it with a more inclusive measure supported by stakeholders, similar to one of the Oregon Public Transit Plan Performance Measures. This measure reflects demand/usage and aligns with ODOT’s expanded role in public transportation under HB 2017, which used to be focused on senior/disabled service but now includes broader investments in public transportation.
Recommended Deletions:

- **Special Transit Ridership**: This will be rolled up into the new transit ridership per capita.
- **Rail Crossing Incidents**: Federal Rail Administration reports that, during recent years, Oregon has been in or near the top twenty states for least number of motor vehicle incidents at public rail crossings. Rail crossings are a minor contributor to transportation system fatalities (28 fatalities in 10 years) so it makes little sense to report on this topic at the Department level.
- **Jobs from Construction Spending** – This is an indicator, a mathematical calculation based on construction funding from the Legislature.
- **Incident Response** – Performance is consistent, and somewhat of a proxy. It will continue to be reported in the OTC quarterly performance report.
- **Fish Passage** – Good work is being done but this does not rise to the level of a strategic or agency wide performance measure.
Oregon’s strategy
ODOT’s strategy to reduce traffic fatalities is to continue to implement traffic safety programs based on the causes of fatal crashes in Oregon. For example, the Oregon Transportation Safety Performance Plan and the ODOT Transportation Safety Action Plan outline safety activities directed at safe driving, DUII, safety belt use, speeding, motorcycle safety, child safety seats, equipment standards, and other areas. ODOT also seeks to combat traffic fatalities through strategic highway safety improvements, such as median cable barriers, rumble strips, and pedestrian crossings as well as the DMV medically at-risk program.

About the target
Oregon’s goal is zero fatalities, but realistic targets are set based on the desire to reduce fatality rates gradually over time to achieve the longer-term goal of zero. Oregon’s 2015 rate was 1.24 fatalities per vehicle miles traveled.

How Oregon is doing and how it compares
The rate of 1.24 for 2015 is above the target at 0.86 per 100 million VMT. There was a dramatic increase in the number of fatalities, in line with the rest of the nation, in Oregon starting in October 2014 which increased the rate per 100 million VMT. When comparing Oregon traffic fatality data with national data, provided by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, in 2015 Oregon’s rate was higher than the U.S. national fatality rate of 1.12. ODOT set an aggressive long-term goal of reducing the traffic fatality rate to 0.86 per 100 million VMT by 2015. The targets are increasingly more challenging to meet, however the goal is important and should not change. Oregon's fatality rates have been consistently below the national average since 1999, until recently.
Factors affecting results and what needs to be done

Several factors affected the traffic fatality rate in 2015. Among those factors were continuing increases in crashes involving impairment, the number of available traffic law enforcement officers, and the response times of emergency medical services. Another factor is that it is harder to make changes when the fatality rate is already at such a low rate. Fatal crashes involving alcohol; speed; or not wearing a safety belt are the most common causes of a fatality on Oregon roadways. Over the last 15 years, Oregon experienced the lowest fatality count since the late 1940s. ODOT and its safety partners must continue efforts to reduce fatalities by reviewing the causes of fatalities, targeting safety activities accordingly, and allocating safety resources to the programs most effective at reducing fatal crashes.

About the data

Traffic fatality rates are reported on a calendar year basis. The data that ODOT uses to measure traffic fatality rates has several strengths. It is coded to national standards, which allows for state to state comparisons, and it is a comprehensive data set that includes medical information. Some weaknesses of the data are that it is sometimes difficult to get blood alcohol content reports and death certificates for coding purposes, and emphasis is placed on coding the data and not on creating localized reports for state, city, and county agencies and organizations.

Contact information

Traci Pearl
ODOT Transportation Safety Division
503-986-6718

Data source

Crash Analysis and Reporting, ODOT; Fatality Analysis Reporting System, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, US DOT
Oregon’s strategy
Reducing the number of traffic crashes is the primary strategy to reduce serious traffic injuries, but when a crash does happen, reducing the injury severity becomes the secondary strategy. This is influenced in three primary ways: first, with safe infrastructure use of safety equipment for infrastructure work and implementing design practices that mitigate structural safety risks on Oregon’s transportation system. Second, deploying safety information and education programs, and implementing the DMV driver improvement program in order to reduce crashes caused by driver behavior (poor choices). The final way is through timely emergency medical services at the scene and transport to trauma centers.

About the target
ODOT wants to eliminate serious injuries due to roadway crashes. Although trends for serious injuries and fatal crashes fluctuate up and down year to year, realistic targets are set with future reductions in mind. ODOT reset the targets for traffic injury rates in 2016 due to an increase in reported injuries in 2014 and 2015. The increased use of electronic crash reporting by law enforcement also has also added crash data to the state’s crash file and in a timelier manner. More than 6,000 e-crash reports are now filed by law enforcement each year.

How Oregon is doing and how Oregon compares
The Oregon rate in 2015 was just under 5 serious injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled. Traffic injury rates are reported on a calendar year basis just like fatalities. However, unlike fatality data that allows state to state comparisons, injury data is not yet comparable. This is because the

Fact
In 2011, the increased use of e-crash reporting by law enforcement also has added crash data to the state’s crash file. More than 6,000 e-crash reports are now filed by law enforcement each year.
definitions of injury are not consistent across the country; any comparisons made to California, Washington or Idaho, for example, are not valid. However, some state-to-state data comparisons can be made against the national data which is useful for understanding state trends versus national trends.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done
Several factors affected the serious injury rate in 2015. Significant positive factors affecting serious injury rates were high rates for the use of safety belts, child safety seats and booster seats. Drivers age 15 to 20 continued to be overrepresented in serious injury crashes however; representing approximately 14 percent of all serious injury crashes but, only 6.9% of licensed drivers in Oregon.

About the data
The Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit (CARS) collect data and publish statistics for reported motor vehicle traffic crashes. A system change in 2011 resulted in an increase of over 15 percent for injury and property damage data available in the crash data file. Legally reportable motor vehicle traffic crashes are those involving death, bodily injury, or damage to personal property in excess of $1,500. Additional data comes from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System.

Contact information
Traci Pearl
ODOT Transportation Safety Division
503-986-6718

Data source
ODOT Crash Analysis and Reporting; Fatality Analysis Reporting System, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, US DOT
Our strategy
A minority of large truck crashes are attributed to a mechanical problem, leading us to focus our efforts on the truck driver. These other crashes are usually linked to speeding, tailgating, changing lanes unsafely, failure to yield right of way and driver fatigue. Our Motor Carrier Transportation Division staff conducts inspections at weigh stations and performs safety compliance reviews at trucking company terminals. Many Oregon State Police troopers, county sheriff deputies and city police conduct roadside inspections after probable cause stops for traffic violations. They also join MCTD staff in enforcement operations and logbook checks along major freight routes where most truck-at-fault crashes occur. A key part of our Commercial Vehicle Safety Plan is to conduct multi-day inspection exercises to find problem drivers. In 2016, enforcement exercises checked thousands of drivers and placed over hundreds out of service for critical safety violations. Oregon ranks well above all states in this area because inspectors use real-time data to identify trucking companies with suspect safety records and then apply training, experience and other tools to find safety problems.

About the target
The truck-at-fault crash rate target is set to a fixed baseline and adjusted when the program has met or exceeded it for a number of years. In 2013, the target was readjusted upward (one standard deviation higher) at a constant level through 2016.

How we are doing and how we compare
The truck at fault crash rate in Oregon increased in 2016 compared to 2015, moving up from 0.39 to 0.41 crashes per million miles traveled by trucks. Oregon’s truck-at-fault crashes continue to be below the national average.

Fact
In 2016, Oregon ranked #1 in the nation, as inspectors placed 14.7 percent of drivers out of service for critical safety violations. The national rate is 5.5 percent.
Trucks were involved in 172 more crashes in 2016 (1,508) as compared to 2015 (1,336). Oregon safety inspectors checked 32,850 trucks and/or drivers in 2016; inspectors placed 32.9 percent of trucks out of service for critical safety violations and 14.7 percent of drivers inspected were placed out-of-service. Oregon inspectors also conducted over 120 bus inspections in 2016.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done
Despite the increased number of truck-at-fault crashes, the number of deaths associated with truck crashes decreased from 55 in 2015, to 50 in 2016. It should also be noted that a single incident can skew these numbers. Factors directly affecting this measure largely involve commercial vehicle driver fitness, qualifications and judgment. The rate of crashes is also affected by the volume of all vehicle miles traveled, not just commercial vehicle miles. It’s affected by traffic congestion, the level of road and bridge construction and maintenance work, and inclement weather. Further contributing to crash rates is the presence of law enforcement officers on the road. We are engaging many more law enforcement agencies in truck safety-related exercises to focus on making probable cause stops for speeding and other traffic violations along major freight routes where most truck-at-fault crashes happen. Because so few crashes are attributed to mechanical problems, checking the behavior and fitness of truck drivers continues to be the most effective way to reduce crashes. We continue to conduct frequent multi-day inspection exercises focusing on truck driver inspections and partner with police in exercises to stop unsafe car and truck drivers. We will continue our aggressive safety inspection efforts.

About the data
Crash data for this measure is based on the federal definition of a recordable incident – those which involve a fatality, injury or disabling damage. The ODOT Transportation Development Division’s Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit analyzes crash reports to determine which are truck-at-fault. States are rated on a quarterly basis — Good, Fair, or Poor — on completeness, timeliness, accuracy and consistency of both crash and roadside inspection data submitted to the Motor Carrier Management Information System. The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration rates Oregon “Good.”

Mileage data for this measure is based on miles traveled in Oregon by trucks over 26,001 pounds, as determined by motor carriers’ highway-use tax reports and temporary passes purchased by short-term operators, following the national model. The truck-at-fault crash rate would be lower if it were based on miles traveled in Oregon by all trucks over 10,000 pounds and buses carrying more than 15 passengers, including the driver. Mileage figures used here are verified by MCTD auditors. The figures are also verified by financial analysts for use in Oregon’s periodic Highway Cost Allocation Study.

Contact information
David McKane
ODOT Motor Carrier Division
503-373-0884

Data source
ODOT Motor Carrier Division and ODOT Transportation Development Division, Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit
Our strategy
We want to have the safest infrastructure possible. Safe infrastructure mitigates structural safety risks on Oregon’s transportation system. Working with the Federal Railroad Administration, we use a combination of inspections, enforcement actions and industry education to improve railroad safety and reduce the incidence of derailments and the potential for release of hazardous materials.

About the target
The number of derailments has steadily decreased to a level below the target. For 2014 through 2019, we’ve lowered the target to 25. Even as rail traffic decreases, this trend indicates significant improvement.

Fact
From 2007 to 2016, derailments have decreased 61 percent from 36 to 14.

How we are doing and how we compare
In 2016, there were 14 derailment incidents, a decrease from the 16 derailments in 2015. From 2007 to 2016, derailments have decreased 61 percent from 36 to 14. According to FRA’s 2016 data for Oregon and its neighboring states, derailments increased in Washington and decreased in Oregon, Idaho, California and Nevada. The rail systems differ among the states in terms of track miles and the number of carloads, e.g., California and Washington have larger systems than Oregon while Idaho and Nevada have smaller systems. A comparison of derailments per track mile (miles of track in each state) for 12 months ending December 31, 2016, shows Oregon with .0058 incidents per track mile, Washington with .0088, Nevada with .0008, Idaho with .0055 and California with .0110.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done
From 2015 to 2016, Oregon showed a 12.5% decrease in derailment incidents.
percent decrease in derailments even though rail traffic increased slightly. A decrease in derailments caused by human error and a decrease in track caused yard derailments are more significant reasons. The latter two of three decreases are a direct result of an increase in the number of inspections.

Operating Practices inspections, which directly affect human error caused derailments, went from 218 in 2015 to 338 in 2016. Track inspections, which directly affect yard derailments, stayed approximately the same with 218 in 2015 and 219 in 2016. In 2015, we hired four additional inspectors and replaced staff that had retired. It took almost a year to have new staff federally certified. We expect the previously demonstrated decline in derailments to continue into future years due to an increase in inspections and a full staff of certified inspectors. Except for the 2010, 2013 and 2014 spikes, the decline has steadily continued since 2007, with the hiring, training and certification of new inspectors to replace the turnover in staff. This supports the need for certified inspectors performing regular inspections. Recruitment and retention of qualified compliance (inspector) personnel is vital. Analysis of data from previous inspections (track conditions, operating issues, etc.) helps us identify areas on which to focus resources and inspections.

About the data
The reporting cycle is calendar year. The data is based upon reports submitted by the railroads to the FRA. Under federal regulations, railroads are required to report all derailments meeting federally mandated thresholds to the FRA.

Contact information
Joe Denhof
ODOT Rail and Public Transit Division
503-986-4169

Data source
ODOT Rail and Public Transit Division
Our strategy
The current ODOT bridge preservation strategy was developed when the Bridge Program began repaying OTIA III bonds in response to reduced funding, but also in recognition of the significant number of bridges reaching the end of their service life over the next several decades. ODOT developed a unique measure only used in Oregon to reflect our aging bridge population and the specific types of bridges constructed here over time. Bridges “not distressed” means the bridges have not been identified by the Oregon Bridge Management System as having freight mobility, deterioration, safety or serviceability needs and have not been rated as Structurally Deficient based on the Federal Highway Administration criteria. The Bridge Program adopted seven strategies which include: protecting high-value coastal, historic, major river crossings and border structures; using practical design and funding only basic bridge rehabilitation projects and rare replacements; giving priority to maintaining the highest priority freight corridors; developing a bridge preventive maintenance program; continuing to raise awareness to the lack of seismic preparation; addressing significant structural problems on all bridges to protect public safety; and monitoring the health of selected bridges.

About the target
The target for “not distressed” bridges is established by assessing the impact of program funding targets approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission, deterioration rates of our aging structures and considering the historic performance of the Bridge Program in addressing needs in twelve categories.

How we are doing and projected conditions
The improvement in the percent “not distressed” measure since 2007 is largely due to the OTIA III State Bridge Delivery Program. While we have been able to meet and maintain the bridge performance measure for the last four years at the State Bridge Program funding level, we expect to

Fact
In the last twenty years, the percentage of good bridges has dropped by more than 40% resulting in a large population of fair bridges. Many of the fair bridges have been in fair condition for several years and are at risk of dropping to poor condition.
see a decline in the near future. Oregon has moved quickly in getting bridge repair and replacement projects under way on high priority freight corridors. As a result of planned work through 2018, fewer distressed bridges are expected through 2020. After a relatively flat period, bridge conditions are expected to decline gradually and then at an increasing rate. New Federal measures have been proposed as required in MAP-21 to be Percentage of NHS bridges in poor condition and percentage of NHS bridges in good condition. ODOT has a low percentage of NHS poor bridges, but also a low percentage of NHS good bridges. In the last twenty years, the percentage of good bridges has dropped by more than 40% resulting in a large population of fair bridges.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done
A sustainable bridge program includes bridges in various conditions with planned maintenance, preservation, and replacements for bridges that have reached the end of their service life. With a disproportionate number of aging bridges in fair condition, available funding will only be able to address the most critical needs.

Although Oregon bridges are considered safe (if load restrictions signs are obeyed), there are a large number of bridges whose service lives have been extended beyond a normal time period because of inadequate funding. Those bridges demand vigilance and dedication by inspectors and maintenance personnel to maintain safe conditions. However, there is a serious concern that those critical and near-critical conditions will grow at an increasing rate until a point in the near future that current staff will not be able to keep on top of these serious issues. At that point unpredictable failures are possible that will result in delays, detours and unplanned high cost emergency repairs.

About the data
Each state reports bridge condition for bridges included in the National Bridge Inventory, using standard criteria which are established by FHWA. The FHWA does not report data based on ownership, but does report deficient bridge data for all National Highway System bridges within states.

Contact information
Ken Franklin, ODOT Highway Division
503-986-3511

Data source
A snapshot of the bridge inventory is taken each April. Data in the snapshot is consistent with the annual NBI submittal required by FHWA. The snapshot provides a convenient and consistent reference point each year.
Our strategy

The goal of the ODOT pavement preservation program is to keep highways in the best condition possible, at the lowest cost, by taking a preventive approach to maintenance. The most cost-effective strategy is to resurface highways while they are still in “fair” or better condition, which extends pavement life at a reduced resurfacing cost.

About the target

A higher percentage of miles in good condition translates to smoother roads and lower pavement and vehicle repair costs.

Prior to 2014, the long term target was set at 78 percent “fair” or better. The legislature increased the target to 87 percent for 2014 and 2015 and subsequently reduced the target to 85 percent for 2016 and 2017. Pavement conditions are measured every two years and the 2018 numbers will be available in early 2019.

How we are doing and how we compare

Thanks to ODOT’s asset management and investment strategies, pavement condition over the last few years has ranged between 85 and 88 percent “fair” or better. Pavement conditions are currently above target. ODOT’s pavement strategy is focused on protecting the interstate first, and a full 96% of Oregon’s interstate highway miles are in fair or better condition.

No standardized system exists for classifying the pavement condition of all highways nationwide. Each state uses a unique procedure for classifying pavement defects and assessing structural and functional pavement conditions. However, pavement smoothness, which is one indicator of pavement condition, is collected by all states.
using standardized procedures. A smoothness comparison between Oregon and our neighboring states of California, Idaho, Washington, and Nevada based on 2015 Highway Statistics data [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/statistics/2015/] shows that Oregon’s pavement is on par with Idaho and Nevada and better than California and Washington and also better than the nationwide average.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done

The increase in overall pavement conditions for 2016 is mostly due to a temporary uptick of pavement funding thanks to federal funding increases from the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act passed by Congress in 2015. At the same time, relatively low oil prices reduced the cost for asphalt materials and allowed these resources to stretch further, resulting in even more paving projects added to the program. Overall, approximately $70 million of paving work was added to the program in 2015-2016 on top of what was previously funded, and another $40 million of additional projects are scheduled for 2017-2018. These investments will hold pavement conditions relatively flat over the next two to four years.

Over the long term, however, our pavement programs are underfunded, which will lead to a decline in conditions. An estimated $200 million per year is needed to repair the backlog of high cost poor and very poor highways, while keeping the remaining state highways in “fair or better” condition. This funding level would support major repairs needed on routes with the worst pavement conditions, while providing for timely preventive preservation and maintenance on roads in fair to good condition. Starting in 2019, pavement preservation funding will drop to about $85 million per year as ODOT shifts scarce resources to repair aging bridges that have reached the end of their design life. This pavement funding level provides less than one-half of the actual need for pavement preservation and major repairs.

Pavement resurfacing treatments typically last 10 to 20 years, but pavement funding will only be able to pave each section of road on average only once about every 35 years—far beyond the optimal timeframe. Over time, pavement conditions will drop well below the target. This will result in diminished safety, as well as higher vehicle repair costs as Oregonians travel on rutted and deteriorated roads. As road conditions deteriorate, thicker paving and/or complete replacement will become necessary at a higher cost than what would be required to simply maintain them in fair or better condition. In the long run, Oregonians will pay more to rehabilitate this failed pavement than it would have cost to keep it in good condition.

About the data

Pavement conditions are measured via a combination of automated equipment and visual assessment. Rigorous checks are made on the data to ensure integrity. Conditions are measured and reported every two years on even numbered years. Our Pavement Condition Report provides detailed pavement condition data and statistical summaries across various parts of the highway system and is available online at [http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/CONSTRUCTION/pages/pms_reports.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/CONSTRUCTION/pages/pms_reports.aspx)

Contact information

Justin Moderie
ODOT Highway Division, Construction Section, Pavement Services Unit
503-986-3115

Data source

ODOT Highway Division, Pavement Services Unit
Our strategy
ODOT’s Rail and Public Transit Division (RPTD) partners with local agencies to provide buses that help communities offer safe, cost-effective public transportation. There are approximately 1,000 active transit buses purchased with ODOT investment currently operating in Oregon communities. An additional 1,000 large buses in Portland, Eugene and Salem are excluded from this inventory, since larger transit districts receive federal funding for large bus purchases directly, and receive relatively little state investment. ODOT’s performance goal is to keep transit buses in a “State of Good Repair” based on federal standards for expected age, mileage and condition. ODOT’s funding priority is for a vehicle replacement schedule that replaces vehicles before increased maintenance costs become a poor investment. Utilizing the most cost-effective investment strategy requires planning replacement purchases while vehicles are still within a year of high maintenance or rebuild costs.

About the target
New federal requirements mandate setting a target for replacing vehicles to keep them in a continuous state of good repair through efficient investment prioritization. RPTD is working with stakeholders to determine the appropriate target for Oregon. Staff has proposed an initial target of no more than 40 percent of vehicles statewide exceeding their useful life standard for each category.

How we are doing and how we compare
ODOT annually spends approximately $6 million in federal revenues to replace vehicles. This is about $5 million short of what is needed to improve the current fleet condition.

The Oregon Transportation Commission has added $5 million, each year, for 2019, 2020 and 2021, which will bring the fleet closer to the desired goal of less than 40 percent of the fleet exceeding useful life through 2020.

Fact
The majority of rural transit vehicles are small transit buses that are expected to last for only 5 years or 150,000 miles.

Public Transit Vehicle Condition

Public Transit Vehicle Condition - Percent of Public Transit Buses that meet replacement standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual/Forecast</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Additional funding will be needed to maintain this level in 2021 and beyond due to an increasing number of vehicles projected to exceed useful life by 2021.

Data is not currently available to compare Oregon with other states. The new federal requirement for state targets and reporting will allow comparisons within the next five years.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done
Local governments and providers own and operate the buses that ODOT holds security interest in. Providers decide when to request vehicle replacements based upon vehicle condition and their ability to meet requirements for local match. Oregon transit providers often have difficulty raising the required local funds to maintain an optimum replacement schedule, and rely on the state Special Transportation Fund (STF) for local match.

The STF has been declining since 2015, making it increasingly difficult for local providers to meet local match requirements. Ongoing STF funding stability will be essential in meeting this goal.

About the data
ODOT RPTD maintains a registry of vehicles and providers are required to report condition and mileage. Transit providers in Oregon report on their federally funded ODOT RPTD assets through the Oregon Public Transit Information System database.

This new key performance measure provides a better understanding of the state’s vehicle assets used in public transit and will help the state to prioritize resources to keep vehicles in a state of good repair.

Contact information
Christine West
ODOT Rail & Public Transit Division
503-986-3410

Data sources
ODOT Rail and Public Transit Division, Policy Unit
Oregon Public Transit Information System
National Transit Database
Our strategy
Promoting transportation options: ODOT seeks to promote the use of transportation modes other than Single Occupant Vehicles by improving existing facilities and creating new transportation options. Alternative modes of transportation help reduce travel delay and stress on the highway system and ensure multimodal options for Oregonians.

About the target
The target projections are based on historical increases in state-supported Cascades trains and affiliated Thruway Buses. An increase in rail ridership is desirable and could be an indication that transportation options in Oregon have expanded. (NOTE: Thruway Bus ridership numbers are actually part of Passenger Rail program ridership and are represented in this graph.) Thruway Buses connect the passenger rail system to communities that lack passenger rail service.

How we are doing and how we compare
Passenger rail ridership reached its highest level in 2013, increasing by 1.9 percent or 4,060 riders, over the 2012 figures. 2014 ridership decreased by 4,195 but exceeded the 2014 target by 2,311. In 2015, ridership decreased further to 193,743 which missed the 2015 target by 16,933. In 2016, ridership increased to 194,453 which missed the 2016 target but is an increase over 2015 Actuals. Oregon’s passenger rail program is modest compared to Washington’s and California’s programs. These states have aggressive investment programs for passenger rail resulting in corresponding benefits for passenger and freight rail.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done
In general, increases in ridership result from reduced travel time, more train/bus options and on-time reliability. These conditions are...
largely dependent upon sufficient capital investment. Washington and California are spending $800 million and $3.5 billion respectively to improve travel time, frequency and on-time reliability. Washington will increase daily round trips between Portland and Seattle in 2017, which would result in an equipment shortage in Oregon. Consequently, Oregon purchased two new train sets using $38.4 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds and $7.6 million in state funds to maintain current levels of service. These train sets began service in January 2014 and they bring the total train sets serving the Amtrak Cascades corridor to seven. Oregon continues to update its schedules to offer better connections for Willamette Valley passenger rail users. This is but one step in supporting the continued growth in passenger rail ridership. ODOT Rail is seeking additional, dedicated funding to continue with current service levels and, more importantly, increase ridership by improving train speed, frequency, range of service and reliability. Dedicated funding will also provide for passenger rail marketing which will increase future ridership.

About the data
The reporting cycle is calendar year. The data is provided by Amtrak, the passenger rail service provider. It represents the total number of rail passengers each year and does not indicate how this number relates to changes in the population of Oregon. As the population of Oregon grows and gas prices increase, the number of rail users is likely to rise, but a large number of users do not necessarily correlate to an increased proportion of the population using rail service.

Contact information
Joe Denhof
ODOT Rail and Public Transit Division
503-986-4169

Data source
ODOT Rail and Public Transit Division
Our strategy
With our local partners, ODOT is working to create safe, walkable and bikeable communities in Oregon. To further that goal, Oregon law requires walkways and bikeways be provided when roads are constructed or rebuilt, and mandates that at least one percent of the state highway fund be used for walking and biking facilities. This performance measure reports our progress in adding walkways and bikeways to the state system.

About the target
This target addresses the percentage of total highway roadside miles in urban areas that have complete walkways and bikeways. Urban areas are defined as those areas with populations over 5,000 where the population density meets federal definitions in the area bordering the highway. Small incorporated cities with populations under 5,000 are also included. Walkways must be present, five feet or more in width, and in fair or better physical condition. Bikeways are defined as a marked and striped bike lane five or more feet in width, a paved shoulder five feet or more in width, a travel lane shared by people biking and people driving where the posted speed is 25 MPH or less, or a multi-use path within the highway right-of-way. As walkways are not needed in undeveloped urban fringe areas, ODOT has set the target of providing walkways on 65% of highway roadside mileage in urban areas. The Oregon Transportation Plan seeks to meet this target by 2030, in order to provide Oregonians with good transportation options that include biking and walking.

Factors affecting results
Between 2015 and 2016, ODOT built 40 new miles of walkways and bikeways on our urban highways. However, our progress in meeting this target isn’t just determined by how many miles we build each year. As the
chart shows, the percent of urban highways with complete walkways and bikeways has trended down in recent years. Why is this happening? Recent adjustments to the federally defined urban areas brought many new roadway miles into Oregon’s expanding urban areas. As former rural roads, these highways are unlikely to have walkways and bikeways. We also see occasional declines due to jurisdictional transfers, where a local government assumes ownership of a state highway. When such transfers take place, they are typically preceded by significant improvements to the highway, including adding walkways and bikeways, because it is less burdensome for a local government to take responsibility for a road if it is already complete and in good repair. So ODOT may build walkways and bikeways on a highway one year, increasing our progress toward our goals, only to transfer the road into local ownership the next year, causing our percent completed to drop.

How we are doing and how we compare nationally

ODOT is making strategic investments in walking and biking improvements where Oregon communities have identified the greatest need. We collaborate with local governments to fund programs and improvements that support biking and walking, and provide them with technical assistance so that they can ensure local systems are bikeable and walkable as well. As a result, the number of people who walk and bike in Oregon continues to increase. On an average weekday, Oregonians make 8% of their trips on foot and 2% by bicycle. One in five households meets a daily travel need by walking and one in twenty does so by biking.1 When it comes to commuting by active modes of travel, Oregon is one of the top-ranked states in the nation. We’re #1 for biking to work (2.3% of commute trips), and #8 for walking to work (3.9%).2

Next steps to reach our goals

ODOT completed the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Mode Plan, which defined new policies and strategies meant to make biking and walking safe, comfortable options that provide good connections for Oregonians and their communities. The plan will identify multiple ways to measure our progress in meeting that goal. ODOT will review this performance measure and may recommend changes based on the direction set by the plan.

About the data

This performance measure was revised in 2006 to better reflect the goals of the program and to establish clear targets. In 2008, ODOT completed a two year effort to physically inventory and assess all walkways and bikeways on highways in urban areas and small cities across the state. Since then, the inventory has been updated each federal fiscal year, based on site visits, construction contract review, and highway video logs.

Contact information
Susan Peithman
ODOT Active Transportation Policy Lead
503-986-3491

Data source
ODOT Highway Division:
Bicycle/Pedestrian Program,
Road Inventory & Class Services Unit

---

Our strategy

ODOT tracks and reports on awards made to firms that are certified by the Certification Office for Business Inclusion and Diversity (COBID); this includes disadvantaged business enterprise, minority- and woman-owned and emerging small business certifications, or collectively reported as “certified firms.” Beginning in 2016, we will also track and report on a business that a service-disabled veteran owns.

Reporting on all certified firms and both prime contracts and subcontractors is a more accurate and complete representation of how ODOT uses these firms. The agency also sets internal targets for payments to these certified firms and implements programs and supportive services to encourage participation.

About the target

The certified firms’ aspirational targets are set on state-funded-only projects over $100,000. The aspirational targets are not a condition of contract award; rather the target represents the level of certified small business participation the agency has determined is reasonably achievable in the type of work and locality of the project.

How we are doing and how we compare

ODOT is committed to programs that encourage the participation of small businesses, including minority- and women-owned firms, in contracting opportunities with the Department across divisions and business lines. To that end, we implement the state Emerging Small Business (ESB) Program, ODOT Small Contracting Program (SCP), and numerous small business supportive services, including providing or sponsoring mentoring, training, and outreach events.

Fact

We provide statewide training for project management and field staff and reach out to certified firms to let them know about opportunities and resources for working on ODOT projects.
These programs and initiatives are intended to ensure ODOT and our contractors comply with state and federal non-discrimination laws; to create a level playing field for small businesses to compete fairly for contracts; to ensure only eligible firms benefit from the programs; to help develop firms to compete successfully in the marketplace outside the programs; and to eliminate or assist small businesses in overcoming barriers to participating in the agency’s procurement and contracting processes.

We provide statewide training for project management and field staff and we reach out to certified firms to let them know about opportunities and resources for working on ODOT projects. Due to the wide variation in metrics, it is not statistically feasible to compare our overall goals and use on a state-to-state basis.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done
ODOT Information Systems completed a project recently to integrate all data systems to provide comprehensive information. This system will provide an enterprise approach to data collection and reporting.

Contact information
Angela Crain
Office of Civil Rights
503-986-4353

Data sources
Trns*port which is downloaded to the Civil Rights Compliance Tracking system, Purchasing & Contract Management System (PCMS), and Local Agencies
DMV Field Office Wait Time

DMV Customer Service: Percentage of DMV Field Office customers served within 20 minutes

Our strategy
DMV strives for high quality service in each of its 60 field offices, and a primary measure of quality is customer wait time. Customer satisfaction surveys include factors such as employee courtesy, efficiency and professionalism as equally important to how long a customer waits.

The primary strategy is to reduce in-person visits by completing transactions in the first visit. DMV encourages use of alternative channels such as online services or the mail. Simple transactions such as vehicle registration renewals, address changes, and notice of vehicle sale can be done online instead of visiting an office. Also, many questions can be answered over the phone or by visiting the DMV website, rather than appearing in person at an office.

Other strategies to reduce wait time include express counters, information kiosks, relief help between offices, alternative work schedules, and other best practices. DMV offers third-party driver skills test services as an option for CDL, teen driver, and regular Class C licensing. Motorcycle drive skills tests are conducted by Team Oregon. This allows time for DMV staff to assist more lobby customers instead of being outside the office conducting driver skills testing.

About the target
The target is to serve at least 70% of field office customers within 20 minutes of entering the facility. Customer surveys indicate that people generally expect to wait 20 minutes or less, and their level of satisfaction decreases with longer delays in receiving service. The new Key Performance Measure approved by the Oregon Legislature in 2015 gives a better indicator of actual customer experience in DMV offices. The 70% target is a stretch goal considering forecasted customer visits and existing computer systems, business processes, and staffing levels.

Fact
In FY 2016, over 60% of DMV field office customers waited less than 20 minutes to be served by a DMV employee.
DMV Field Office Wait Time, cont.

How we are doing and how we compare
The new measure and target were started informally during FY 2013. About half of the customer visits in FY 2013 and 2014 resulted in wait times under 20 minutes, which was below the 70% target. The results improved in FY 2015 to over 65% and dropped to 60% in FY 2016 despite efforts to try and keep pace with demand. We are not aware of other state motor vehicle agencies with a similar measure for comparison purposes.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done
The number of customers visiting an office and the time of day, plus the mixture and complexity of transactions, play major factors in the customer wait time experience. Another factor is the number of approved positions, and the ability to keep positions filled and employees trained. Agency workforce rightsizing obligations in 2011-13 eliminated 11 field office positions just as the economy was improving (vehicle sales) and Oregon’s population began growing (increasing workload and demand of driver licensing, vehicle titling and registration).

Additional online services via the Service Transformation Program (STP) will reduce the need for in-person visits. Installing lobby management systems and self-service kiosks would improve the efficiency of offices, and continued exploration of business process improvements and staffing strategies should increase the throughput of existing offices.

About the data
Field office wait time data is collected daily from simple “pull-a-ticket” wait time machines in the 37 largest DMV field offices. Smaller offices with two employees or fewer do not have wait time machines, and are assumed to serve customers in less than 20 minutes. Likewise, express line customers are assumed to receive service in less than 20 minutes. Stopwatch timings are done periodically to confirm these assumptions. The data are routinely reported weekly and after each fiscal year. Managers also have on-demand access to the data, and customers now may view real-time wait times in 37 field offices via the DMV website.

Previous Measure
DMV’s previous measure calculated an average wait time for each office, and then compiled another average by summing the office wait times and dividing by the number of offices. Although the measure was used for decades as the indicator of customer wait time, it gave a skewed view of the overall customer experience at DMV field offices. Large and small offices were treated as equal, even though large offices served more people and tended to have longer wait times. The Legislature officially approved the new measure and target beginning with FY 2015.

Contact information
Tom McClellan, DMV Administrator
Oregon Department of Transportation
503-945-5100

Data source
Driver and Motor Vehicle Services Division
Our strategy
Provide excellent customer service to customers.

About the target
The overall target for 2017-19 is 90 percent customer satisfaction with ODOT services. The actual performance in 2016 was 91 percent.

How we are doing and how we compare
We continue to achieve high overall customer service ratings. On the whole, we continue to provide customers with good to excellent service. Variations in results between 2006 and 2016 are not statistically significant and have been near the target of 90 percent. Data to compare with other state departments of transportation is not available. Specific to motor carrier regulation, Oregon is one of just a handful of states asking the trucking industry about satisfaction with motor carrier enforcement.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done
The sampling of customers for the 2016 survey included major customer groups of DMV and Motor Carrier Transportation Division. In future surveys, additional customer groups may be added. We will continue to monitor customer satisfaction levels and take corrective action as needed.

About the data
Both DMV and Motor Carrier conduct surveys of customers that are based on the recommended Statewide Customer Service Performance Measure guidelines.

DMV received over 336 survey responses in 2016 from customers who visited DMV field offices. Customers were selected on a random, repetitive basis from the DMV

Fact
The 2016 overall satisfaction rate was 91 percent. Just over our target.
computer system database of driver and motor vehicle transactions during the month of January. This survey is conducted every two years. DMV also collects customer satisfaction data separately using a cumulative average of the division’s monthly customer satisfaction surveys.

Motor Carrier surveys 11 customer groups. Survey groups include companies subject to safety compliance reviews, truck safety inspections, or audits. The surveys also cover drivers subject to driver safety inspections and persons calling for registration or over-dimension permits. Taken together, the 11 Motor Carrier surveys have a total of 583 responses.

The combined surveys are large enough to provide a 95 percent confidence level and a 4.03 percent margin of error.

Contact information
Andrea McCausland
ODOT Driver and Motor Vehicle Services Division
503-945-5294

Data source
Biennial surveys of customers by Oregon Department of Transportation
Construction Projects On-Budget: The percentage of projects for which total construction expenditures are within 10% of the baselined construction authorization

Our strategy
Our goal for any given construction project is to ensure that total construction costs do not exceed the project’s baselined construction authorization (i.e. budget) by more than 10%. We achieve this through accurate schedule and budget development and effective contract and risk management throughout the life of the project.

ODOT is currently redefining how it categorizes contract change orders that affect project authorizations, allowing us to determine which changes were avoidable. By doing so and reporting on the frequency of and reasons for re-baselining the project authorization, ODOT can provide greater transparency of its change management practices and take actions to reduce the number of avoidable contract change orders.

About the target
Because this is a new measure, a target will be set once sufficient data is available.

How we are doing and how we compare
Actual on-budget performance, based on ODOT’s new measurement definition, has been between 82% and 94% for the last five fiscal years. Sufficient data does not yet exist to allow for initial performance to be precisely measured.

In response to an ODOT management assessment (McKinsey & Co. 2017), ODOT revised its construction on-budget measure to be more consistent with peer DOTs and to also account for the appropriate re-baselining of contract authorizations for on-budget measurement.

Any project on-budget measure must have a budget to which to compare actual expenses, referred to here as the baseline contract authorization. For ODOT construction projects there are two options for a baseline authorization: the original authorization or an adjusted authorization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Base Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reflecting changes to the construction contract. For most projects the original authorization is used to determine on-budget performance; however, there are circumstances, described below, where ODOT would use a re-baselined authorization.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done
Final construction costs can incorporate a number of cost components not included in the original authorization amount. These cost components can include variance between actual and planned quantities, contract change orders, extra work orders, force accounts, pay factors, escalation/de-escalation, and anticipated items. These components can result in positive or negative cost adjustments in the contract.

While such components are estimated when project budgets are established, uncertainties are inherent in any complex construction project. For example, market trends such as higher than expected inflation and rises in steel, oil, and asphalt prices can contribute to cost increases. Unanticipated geological features, archeological finds, or environmental impacts can also lead to unanticipated costs.

Not all unanticipated costs are a bad thing, however. The expansion of a project’s scope in construction, for example, can meet agency goals and regional needs despite increasing overall project costs. ODOT’s new on-budget measure accounts for this by rebaselining contract budgets in the case of elective actions or unavoidable contract changes.

For this on-budget measure, circumstances allowing for the rebaselining of contract authorizations include:

- Elective expansion of project scope by ODOT
- New requirements or interpretations from regulatory agencies, including FHWA, affecting project budgets
- Unavoidable budget impacts due to natural events

Circumstances that would not result in rebaselining the original authorization include:

- Errors in plans, specifications, and/or design
- Unacceptable traffic impacts
- Construction engineering errors

About the measure
When determining projects on budget, all state administered projects that have issued final payment are considered. Total construction expenses for each project are compared to the project’s original authorization (also known as the net construction authorization) or re-baselined authorization (tracked by change process). If total expenses do not exceed the original authorization by more than 10%, the project is considered on-budget. Performance is reported as a percentage of projects that are on budget in any given state fiscal year.

Data source
ODOT Contractor Payment System (CPS)

Contact information
ODOT Highway Division, Strategic Business Services | 503-986-5875
Construction Projects On-Time: The percentage of state administered projects that have satisfactorily completed all on-site work within 90 days of the baselined contract completion date

Our strategy
ODOT’s goal is that construction projects satisfactorily complete all on-site work within 90 days of the final completion date listed in their contracts. We achieve this through accurate schedule development and effective contract and risk management throughout the life of the project.

ODOT is currently redefining how it categorizes contract change orders that affect project schedules, allowing us to tell if a given change was avoidable. By doing so and reporting on the frequency of and reasons for re-baselining the project schedule, ODOT can provide greater transparency of its change management practices, and take actions to reduce the number of avoidable construction change orders.

About the target
As this is a new measure, a target will be set once sufficient data is available.

How we are doing and how we compare
Actual construction project on-time performance, based on ODOT’s new measurement definition, has been between 76% and 100% for the last five fiscal years. Sufficient data does not yet exist to allow for initial performance to be precisely measured.

In response to an ODOT management assessment (McKinsey & Co. 2017), ODOT revised its construction on-time measure to be more consistent with peer DOTs and to also account for the appropriate re-baselining of contract completion dates for on-time measurement.

Any project on-time measure must have an end date to compare the actual completion date against; this is referred to here as the baseline contract completion date. For ODOT construction projects there are two

| Completion Timeliness - Percent of projects that have satisfactorily completed all on-site work within 90 days of the baselined last contract completion date |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Base Performance  | 78%  | 67%  | 68%  | 76%  | 90%  | 75%  | 75%  | 75%  |

Fact
Potential baseline performance has remained above 75% for the last five fiscal years.
options for a baseline end date: the original contract completion date or a modified contract completion date reflecting changes to the construction contract.

For most projects the original contract completion date is used to determine on-time performance; however, there are circumstances, described below, where ODOT would use a re-baselined end date.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done
There are many factors that can affect the on-time performance of construction projects. There are elective actions taken by ODOT that can extend or compress project schedules as well as unavoidable events, beyond the control of project managers, that can occur and to which we must react. There are also avoidable issues—such as errors or defects in a project’s design—that can impact the schedule.

For this on-time measure, circumstances allowing the contract completion date to be re-baselined include:

- Elective expansion of project scope by ODOT
- New requirements or interpretations from regulatory agencies, including FHWA, affecting project schedules
  - Unavoidable delays due to natural events
- Circumstances that would not allow for re-baselining the schedule include:
  - Errors in plans, specifications, and/or design
  - Unacceptable traffic impacts
  - Construction engineering errors

About the measure
When projects are awarded to a contractor, the construction contract may specify more than one contract completion date for different phases of the project. The last original contract completion date is the default baseline contract completion date used in this measure. This date may be re-baselined if specific elective or unavoidable contract change orders allow for it.

Operationally, this measure reports on-time performance by calculating the percentage of projects reaching the project milestone of 2nd Notification (all on-site work is satisfactorily completed) within 90 days of the baselined contract completion date.

The measure considers state administered projects only; locally administered projects are excluded.

Data source
Contractor Payment System for baselined contract completion date, actual completion date, and any contract change orders that may affect the baselined completion date.

Contact information
ODOT Highway Division, Strategic Business Services | 503-986-5875
Our strategy
Providing safe and efficient mobility for people and goods on Oregon highways plays a foundational role in support of economic opportunity and livability for Oregonians. A mobility perspective focuses on providing people and goods access to the markets they wish to reach. As Oregon grows, there are more people, businesses and freight to accommodate by means of a transportation system that is not significantly growing in capacity.

Current state highway investment dollars focus on safety, preservation, maintenance and seismic preparation. As economic activity outpaces transportation system capacity, traffic congestion increases, which impacts mobility. There is no single solution to eliminate all congestion, but there are different approaches to manage the rate at which it increases. As long as the economy continues to grow we can expect total congestion to increase, but we have a variety of methods and techniques to manage it. This mobility performance measure will help Oregon monitor the level and extent of congestion over time. This information will assist in evaluating the impacts of different techniques applied to manage and optimize the system as the Oregon economy continues to grow and place more demands on the system.

About the Target
Traffic congestion results in slower speeds, longer trip times and increased vehicle queues. As traffic congestion increases, other issues arise, such as reduced reliability, reduced vehicle fuel efficiency, higher emissions, and peak periods of congestion spreading beyond typical morning and afternoon rush hours. This measure reveals whether the duration and intensity of congested periods is rising or falling over time. The Ratio of Annual Average Daily

Fact
Currently 450 Oregon state highway lane miles are classified as congested using this measure. This is expected to increase to 700 lane miles, an increase of 66% by 2035.
Traffic to Hourly Capacity (AADT/C) best suits the objective to measure highway mobility in Oregon. There are several different measures that can be used to evaluate mobility, but this measure reflects both the quantity and utilization of travel on the highway system. AADT/C measures both the extent and duration of congestion, which is appropriate as congested periods spread beyond one hour of the day. AADT/C values range from 0 to 15 or higher. Values 1 to 6 represent smooth traffic conditions; 7 to 9 represents the beginning stages of congestion; 10 to 12 represent congested conditions; and values greater than 13 represent severe congestion. The “Number of Congested Lane Miles” represents locations where the AADT/C is a value of 10 or higher.

How we are doing
Delay caused by traffic congestion is classified into two types: 1) recurring congestion due to demand approaching capacity; and 2) non-recurring congestion due to traffic incidents, weather, and construction work zones. Recurring congestion may be reduced a variety of ways, such as enhancing design to increase pedestrian and bike use, increasing vehicle occupancy rates (carpools, mass transit, parking fees), slowing growth in vehicle travel demand (affordable housing located near work site, services and shopping; road pricing), roadway operations (ramp meters, variable speeds), and adding road capacity (new lanes). Non-recurring congestion may be reduced by safety-enhancement projects (reduces crashes), incident response programs (reduces incident clearing times) and roadway operations aimed at enhancing safety or smoothing traffic flow.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done
We have a three-part approach to provide mobility: optimize the use of infrastructure, traffic network management, and support transportation options. We optimize the use of infrastructure by employing new technology and construction techniques to improve performance and safety. We invest in safety projects which decrease crash-induced congestion, as well as construction projects designed to relieve bottlenecks. Through traffic network management we employ new technology to provide timely information to travelers and optimize traffic flow. These systems help travelers choose alternative modes and routes to avoid congestion caused by crashes and other disruptions. Finally, Oregon ranks among the top states for numbers of walk, bike, ride-transit, telecommute and shared-rides. Strategies to provide transportation options reduce single-vehicle occupancy use, while improving the health and wellness of Oregonians, promoting environmental benefits and providing access to jobs, goods and services.

About the data
The data used to calculate this measure comes from the annual Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data submittal to FHWA. The HPMS was developed to measure the scope, condition, performance, use and operating characteristics of the Nation’s highways. This data is also used to determine the apportionment of Federal-aid Highway Program funds to states as well as serves as the primary data source for the biennial “Conditions and Performance Report” to U.S. Congress, which supports the development and evaluation of the FHWA’s legislative, program and budget planning activities.

Contact information
Rich Arnold
ODOT Transportation Development Division
503-986-4218

Data source
Highway Performance Monitoring System
2015 Highway Capacity Manual
Our strategy
Oregon’s transportation system supports the state’s quality of life and economy across a diversity of geographies, economy and people. Public transportation is a key piece of the transportation system for those who cannot or choose not to drive. The demand for public transportation in Oregon is anticipated to increase as population grows.

Starting in 2019, an influx of funds from the Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF), created as part of the 2017 transportation funding package, Keep Oregon Moving, will fund new and expanded public transportation service, resulting in increased ridership throughout Oregon. This Key Performance Measure will assist ODOT in assessing the impact of the new funds.

With more money, transit providers will:
- Increase service levels in urban and rural areas
- Offer more intercity and regional route service
- Improve transit supports such as increasing the number of improved passenger facilities, and expanding use of technologies such as electronic fare and other integrated fare systems.
- Procure low- and no-emission vehicles.
- Expand services to better serve low income Oregonians.

About the target
The target is an annual goal of 32 rides per Oregonian. The goal will need to be re-evaluated in three to five years. The target is set by evaluating transit ridership trends and population growth over a five year period: 2011 to 2016.

How we are doing
The average number of reported rides per Oregonian for the years 2011 to 2017 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>33.17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>33.61</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>32.79</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32.62</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>32.61</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>31.95</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 18.9% of households report having a person who regularly uses transit (at least once a week)
- 5.0% of workers report normally using transit to get to work
- 4.6% of students report normally using transit to get to school & to work
Transit Rides, cont.

About 90 percent of all trips in Oregon are provided by Lane Transit District, Salem Area Mass Transit District and TriMet. Although all public transit providers in Oregon will be investing in improved services and will show increase in rides, the biggest gains are expected to result from these three agencies.

The cost of providing transit service is going up. Much of the increase of new funds, over time, will be invested in sustaining service levels and other improvements, potentially affecting future ridership increases by limiting the amount of funds available for transit expansion.

ODOT funds have historically contributed an average of 11 percent of the state’s available transit funding. With new funding approved in 2017, ODOT is projected to provide 20 percent of statewide transit funding by 2020. Local government decisions may impact ridership, for example, in some communities there is a need for transit support infrastructure such as stable workforce, secure bus parking, technology, and passenger shelters, resulting in less investment in direct service.

Factors affecting results and what needs to be done

The Oregon Public Transportation Plan, to be adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission in 2018, will encourage ridership increases due to policies that encourage improved transit education, comprehensive planning for transit and better transit facilities among many transit-supportive policies.

STIF will begin to be distributed in 2019, which will initiate improvements in transit. It usually takes one or more years to develop ridership sufficient to determine effectiveness of the investment in new services.

About the data

The data is gathered by the Rail and Public Transit Division using reports from the Portland State University Population Research Center and transit providers.

Contact information
Andrew O’Keefe
ODOT Rail and Public Transit Division
503-986-3267

Data source
ODOT Rail and Public Transit Division;
National Transit Database;
Oregon Public Transit Information System;
Portland State University Oregon Population Report;
Oregon Travel and Activity Survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Short Name</th>
<th>Measure Definition</th>
<th>Desired Performance Result</th>
<th>Goals Addressed</th>
<th>Performance Status</th>
<th>Unchanged/New/Modified</th>
<th>How strong an indicator is the measure of the desired result?</th>
<th>Degree of ODOT influence</th>
<th>Alignment with agency strategic goals</th>
<th>Data Quality Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Fatalities (Rate)</td>
<td>Traffic Fatalities per 100 Million VMT</td>
<td>Reduce traffic fatalities</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Performance is getting worse</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Traffic Injuries (Rate)</td>
<td>Serious Traffic Injuries per 100 Million VMT</td>
<td>Reduce traffic injuries</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Performance is getting worse</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Truck At-fault Crashes</td>
<td>Number of Large truck at-fault crashes per 1 Million VMT</td>
<td>Reduce traffic injuries and fatalities</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Performance is unpredictable or chaotic</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derailment Incidents</td>
<td>Number of train derailments caused by human error, track, or equipment</td>
<td>Rails run without derailment</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Performance has reached or exceeded target</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Condition</td>
<td>Percent of pavement lane miles rated &quot;fair&quot; or better out of total lane miles in state highway system</td>
<td>2000T pavement is in good condition and integrity is maintained</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Performance is stable and predictable</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Condition</td>
<td>Percent of state highway bridges that are not &quot;distressed&quot;</td>
<td>2000T bridges are safe and structurally sound</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Performance is stable and predictable</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Vehicle Condition</td>
<td>Public Transit buses that meet replacement standards</td>
<td>2000T &quot;interested&quot; PT Vehicles are safe and efficient</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Performance is stable and predictable</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Traffic congestion)</td>
<td>Total Lane Miles rated as Moderately Congested or Worse</td>
<td>Reduce travel delay and improve congestion conditions</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Performance is getting worse</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Rail Ridership</td>
<td>Number of state-supported rail service passengers</td>
<td>Promote transportation options and increase ridership</td>
<td>Mobility/Sustainability</td>
<td>Performance is getting worse</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Rides</td>
<td>Average Number of Transit rides each year per Oregonian</td>
<td>Increase accessibility and use of public transportation</td>
<td>Mobility/Sustainability</td>
<td>Performance is getting worse</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes and Sidewalks</td>
<td>Percent of urban state highway miles with bike lanes and pedestrian facilities in &quot;fair&quot; or better condition</td>
<td>Increase access for active transportation and intermodal connections (as measured by coverage)</td>
<td>Mobility/Sustainability</td>
<td>Performance is stable and predictable</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Projects On-time</td>
<td>Percent of state administered projects that have satisfactorily completed all on-site work within 90 days of the baseline contract completion date</td>
<td>Construction projects are completed on time to reduce costs and impacts on the traveling public</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Performance is unpredictable or chaotic</td>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Projects On Budget</td>
<td>Percent of projects for which total construction expenditures are within 10% of its baseline construction authorization</td>
<td>Construction projects are completed on budget to maximize resources</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Performance has reached or exceeded target and is stable and predictable</td>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Firms</td>
<td>Percent of ODOT Awarded Contracts to Oregon Certified Small Businesses (Minority, Women, Emerging Small Businesses and Disabled Veteran)</td>
<td>Increase utilization of MWESBDV &quot;Certified&quot; firms</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Performance is getting worse</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV Field Office Wait Time</td>
<td>Percentage of DMV Field Office Customers Served within 20 Minutes</td>
<td>reduce number 20 minutes, 100% in under 60 Minutes</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Performance is getting worse</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Customer Service</td>
<td>Percent of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency's customer service as &quot;good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot;: overall customer service, timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise, and availability of information</td>
<td>Provide excellent customer service to customers</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Performance has reached or exceeded target and is stable and predictable</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures Proposed for Delistion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Short Name</th>
<th>Measure Definition</th>
<th>Desired Performance Result</th>
<th>Goals Addressed</th>
<th>Performance Status</th>
<th>Unchanged/New/Modified</th>
<th>How strong an indicator is the measure of the desired result?</th>
<th>Degree of ODOT influence</th>
<th>Alignment with agency strategic goals</th>
<th>Data Quality Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Transit Rides</td>
<td>Average number of special transit rides per each elderly and disabled Oregonian annually</td>
<td>Seniors and people with disability have travel options to stay independent</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Performance is stable and predictable</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Crossing Incidents</td>
<td>Number of highway-railroad at-grade incidents</td>
<td>Reduce the numbers of crossing incidents</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Performance is getting worse</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Response</td>
<td>Percent of Lane Blocking Crashes Cleared within 90 Minutes</td>
<td>Rapidly respond to lane blocking crashes to reduce congestion</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Performance is improving at a rate fast enough that the target will likely be met by some specified time</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Passage</td>
<td>Stream miles of access restored or improved to blocked fish habitat</td>
<td>Open up access (remove barriers) to native fish passage</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Performance is stable and predictable</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs from Construction Spending</td>
<td>Number of jobs sustained as a result of annual construction expenditures</td>
<td>Support economic growth through investment in highway and bridge infrastructure projects</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Performance is unpredictable or chaotic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>