

Rebuilding Our Transportation Vision Subgroup Charge

Purpose and Role

Subgroups provide topic-area expertise, analysis, and constituency perspectives to help the Vision Workgroup understand system needs, priorities, and tradeoffs.

Subgroup members are expected to bring the perspectives, needs, and concerns of the constituencies they represent, while working in good faith to inform a broader statewide package.

The Vision Workgroup is responsible for integrating and reconciling subgroup inputs across topic areas and developing final recommendations for the Governor's report.

Each subgroup will develop a concise, decision-ready input memo for the Vision Workgroup. The memo should describe the problem, current condition, 10-year outlook under three funding scenarios, key tradeoffs, and recommended actions or decision points.

Subgroup input should help the Vision Workgroup identify recommendations that help improve long-term system solvency, support accountability, and simplify Oregon's transportation tax and funding structure where possible.

Subgroup Work Framework

Each subgroup will use the following four-step framework to develop its input memo: define the problem, understand current conditions, evaluate priorities under three funding scenarios, and develop recommendations for the Vision Workgroup using the Governor's priorities and the Oregon Transportation Plan lenses.

Define the problem

- What is the condition, gap, or pressure we are trying to address?
- What are the real-world impacts if this problem is not addressed?
- Who is affected?
- What gets more expensive, less reliable, less safe, or harder to fix over time?
- What are the near-term and 10-year consequences of inaction?

Understand current conditions

- What is funded today?
- What service level or outcome does that buy?
- What are the current performance trends and how do they compare to KPMs, Oregon Transportation Plan goals, or other adopted targets?
- What assumptions and funding constraints are necessary to understand?

Evaluate three funding scenarios

- Scenario 1: no new funding
 - What happens from 2027–2037 with no new funding?
 - What gets worse, takes longer, closes, gets deferred, becomes less reliable, or becomes more expensive?
 - What are the impacts?
- Scenario 2: stabilize and sustain core services
 - What funding is needed to account for inflation and key cost pressures?
 - What services, conditions, or outcomes should be protected first?
 - Where would additional investment help avoid unacceptable decline or reduce long-term costs?
 - What still gets worse, deferred, or left unmet at this funding level?
 - What should be reduced, delayed, or deprioritized to stay within this level?
 - What outcomes or goals would be advanced?
 - What funding options could support this scenario?
- Scenario 3: incremental investment
 - If funding were increased roughly 20% above Scenario 2, generally aligning with the Oregon Transportation Plan “Incremental” investment scenario, what targeted improvements could be achieved?
 - What practical improvement would make the biggest difference?
 - What outcomes or goals would be advanced as a result of these improvements?
 - What funding level is needed to achieve and sustain that improvement?
 - What are the funding options to achieve improvements?
 - Are there any programs or activities that should be reduced, delayed, or deprioritized even in this scenario?

Apply a decision lens to develop recommendations

- What are the consequences, assumptions, dependencies, or implementation constraints the Vision Workgroup needs to understand?
- How does each recommendation advance the Governor’s priorities of affordability, economic development, and long-term system solvency?
- How does it perform against the Oregon Transportation Plan lenses of safety, equity, and climate? How does it support or avoid undermining adopted state goals related to air quality, water quality, and environmental protection?
- How does it affect accessibility, reliability, operational efficiency, and applicable KPMs or legislatively adopted performance measures?
- What depends on statutory change, local action, staffing, delivery capacity, or public support?
- What accountability, transparency, or efficiency measures should accompany the recommendation?
- Does the recommendation simplify or reduce complexity in Oregon’s transportation funding system?

Scope Clarification

Subgroups are not expected to evaluate ODOT’s internal organizational structure or develop recommendations on agency restructuring. However, if organizational, staffing, or delivery capacity issues are necessary to achieve recommended outcomes, those issues may be identified as implementation considerations for the Vision Workgroup and final report.

Meeting Arc

Meeting 1: Charge, Problem, and Current Conditions

- Focus: Orient the subgroup, review the charge and expected final product, discuss and confirm the problem statement, and identify key current condition information needed for the work ahead.

Meeting 2: Reference Case and Scenario 1

- Focus: Review the funding baseline used for scenario comparisons, what that funding currently supports, and what changes under Scenario 1/no new funding from 2027–2037, including the implications of doing nothing.

Meeting 3: Scenarios 2 and 3

- Focus: Review the stabilize/sustain and incremental investment scenarios, identify what should be protected first, what remains unmet, where targeted investment could make the biggest difference, and what funding options or implementation considerations should be explored.

Meeting 4: Priorities, Tradeoffs, and Draft Direction

- Focus: Review refined scenarios, identify emerging priorities, tradeoffs, dependencies, and decision points, and develop key messages and draft direction for subgroup recommendations.

Meeting 5: Draft Recommendations and Final Input

- Focus: Review draft recommendations and memo content, identify areas of agreement, unresolved issues, assumptions, dependencies, and implementation constraints, and confirm final subgroup input for the memo.

An additional meeting may be scheduled if needed to resolve remaining issues and finalize subgroup input.

Timing

The Vision Workgroup will review the subgroup charge at its June 1 meeting. Subgroups are expected to launch in mid-June and complete their work on an accelerated timeline. Subgroup chairs will provide touchpoint updates to the Vision Workgroup on August 7 and September 9. Final subgroup input should be completed by the end of September so the Vision Workgroup can deliberate on integrated recommendations in October.

Interim and Final Deliverables

Before the August 7 Vision Workgroup meeting, each subgroup should identify the key problems, impacts, and implications of doing nothing in its focus area. This interim input should summarize current conditions and Scenario 1, including what gets worse, takes

longer, closes, gets deferred, becomes less reliable, or becomes more expensive under a no-new-funding scenario from 2027–2037.

Before the September 9 Vision Workgroup meeting, each subgroup should identify emerging priorities, key tradeoffs, and draft recommendations for Vision Workgroup feedback.

By the end of September, each subgroup should complete a concise, decision-ready input memo for the Vision Workgroup. The final memo should build from the interim input and include the subgroup’s problem statement, key impacts, current condition, 10-year outlook, implications of doing nothing, priorities and tradeoffs under the funding scenarios, and recommended actions or decision points. The memo should also identify areas of agreement, unresolved issues, key assumptions, dependencies, implementation constraints, and any accountability, efficiency, or tax/funding simplification measures that should accompany the recommendations.

Support Materials

Subgroups will receive background materials to help ground the discussion and support development of the required deliverables. Materials may include, but are not limited to, draft problem statements, funding scenarios, current conditions, relevant performance measures, and prior Vision Workgroup materials.

Additional technical, program, funding, and policy materials will be provided as needed throughout the subgroup process to support discussion and completion of the subgroup memo.

Vision Workgroup Coordination

Each subgroup will have a Vision Workgroup liaison assigned to support alignment between subgroup discussions and the broader Vision Workgroup process. Subgroup chairs or designated leads will provide updates to the Vision Workgroup at regular intervals and may be asked to participate in other Vision Workgroup meetings as needed to support report-outs and cross-topic integration.

Vision Workgroup liaisons are encouraged to participate in subgroup meetings as they are able, help connect the discussion back to the broader questions the Vision Workgroup needs to answer, and share relevant context from the Vision Workgroup table when useful.

Liaisons may also help flag when subgroup discussions appear stuck, overly technical, or disconnected from the broader charge, tradeoffs, or decision points.

ODOT and Consultant Support

ODOT staff and consultant support will help subgroups produce clear, consistent, and decision-ready input for Vision Workgroup consideration. Staff will provide technical and administrative support, including background materials, funding and performance information, meeting logistics, documentation of assumptions, and coordination with subgroup chairs.

Consultant support includes facilitation at key decision points, documentation of subgroup discussions, and developing a draft subgroup memo to be integrated into the final report.

Participation Expectations

Subgroup members are expected to participate consistently throughout the subgroup process and make every effort to attend scheduled meetings. Proxies should be avoided whenever possible. Necessary staff support may attend to help members participate effectively, provide technical context, or support follow-up.

Communication Guidance

Subgroup members may share general information about the subgroup process, schedule, and topics under discussion. Members should not characterize subgroup discussions as final recommendations before they are reviewed by the Vision Workgroup. Members should distinguish between their own views and the work of the subgroup and should not speak on behalf of the subgroup, ODOT, the Governor's Office, or the Vision Workgroup unless asked to do so. Questions about the official process should be directed to ODOT or Governor's Office staff.

Decision-Making and Final Input

Subgroups should aim for consensus where possible, but consensus is not required. Final subgroup input should identify areas of agreement, unresolved issues, and any major dissenting views.