Transportation Performance Management

State Biennial Performance Report for Performance Period 2022-2025 (PROGRESS)

2026

FULL PERFORMANCE PERIOD PROGRESS REPORT (FPP)

Oregon

Report Due: 10/1/2026
Report Status: Recommend Acceptance
Report Updated On:
Report Exported on 11/3/2026

This document is exported from the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) web-based Performance Management Form (PMF) of the Policy Information Data Portal (PIDP).

The web-based PMF is the State's official report to FHWA.

State Contact:

Name : Philip Kase
Phone number : 5039100288
Email : philip.j.kase@odot.oregon.gov

Summary of Performance Measures and Targets

Performance Measures	Baseline	2-Year Condition/ Performance	2-Year Target	4-Year Condition/ Performance	4-Year Target
Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Good Condition	57.8%	38.7%	30.0%	38.5%	30.0%
Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Poor Condition	0.1%	2.5%	2.5%	2.3%	2.5%
Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition	33.4%	28.1%	20.0%	20.8%	20.0%
Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition	2.9%	6.1%	10.0%	8.0%	10.0%
Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Good Condition	12.4%	13.2%	11.0%	14.7%	9.0%
Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Poor Condition	1.1%	1.9%	1.8%	2.2%	3.0%
Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable	87.4%	84.6%	78.0%	83.0%	78.0%
Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable	91.2%	91.4%	78.0%	90.0%	78.0%
Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index	1.31	1.33	1.45	1.34	1.45
Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita: Eugene, OR	4.6	4.4	8.5	4.9	9.0
Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita: Salem, OR	7.9	7.0	7.0	7.5	7.0
Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel: Eugene, OR	31.8%	32.7%	33.0%	32.7%	35.0%
Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel: Salem, OR	25.2%	26.8%	23.2%	26.8%	22.7%
Total Emission Reductions: PM2.5	0.016	0.000	0.000	77.187	0.000
Total Emission Reductions: NOx	0.488	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total Emission Reductions: VOC					
Total Emission Reductions: PM10	679.444	0.925	557.510	295.831	1115.030
Total Emission Reductions: CO	102.368	0.201	46.130	7.013	92.250

Overview

OVERVIEW SECTION 1

Question No	Description	Field Type
O1	Overview General Comments: Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of your submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current condition/performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	Oregon is facing a significant funding challenge. State revenue is simply not keeping pace with inflation. Additionally, revenues are flattening as the vehicle fleet becomes more fuel efficient. Due to these factors and more, Oregon is projecting that revenues will be insufficient to preserve transportation assets at their current performance levels and has therefore assumed a model of managed system decline. This will affect pavement, bridges, culvert, other assets and will also mean Oregon will not be able to make substantial headway on several key bottlenecks that cause significant delay to motorists and freight.
O2	Investment Strategy Discussion: Assess the effectiveness of implementing the investment strategies for the National Highway System (NHS) documented in your State's Asset Management Plan (AMP). Discuss the factors that contributed to the effectiveness. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(C)]	The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is the state's long range transportation plan. The OTP established clear funding priorities related to available funding. Oregon has been in a reduced funding scenario for many years and has focused the vast majority of federal and state funding to preserving and maintaining the existing transportation system. However, even with this focus on maintaining system assets, Oregon has been projecting a steady decline in asset conditions. This is also reflected in our Federal Transportation Asset Management Plan. The Oregon Legislature passed a significant state transportation funding increase in 2017. This increase in funding is focused primarily on improving safety and preserving the transportation system assets. ODOT is also in the process of creating a 10 year investment plan - called the Capital Investment Plan (CIP). While not final, this CIP mostly focuses on system asset condition projects, however, current funding levels continue to show asset condition decline. With the focus of funding centered on preserving system assets, there is very little funding targeted to improving system

		performance and reliability for freight and nonfreight users.
O3	Significant Progress Additional Reporting: As of mid-summer, FHWA has not received the required significant progress additional reporting information, and it must be included in the PMF. [23 CFR 490.109(f)(2)] Did you upload the additional reporting for target(s) achievement to the PMF on the Attachment tab?	No
O3a	Explain why the additional reporting for target(s) achievement was not uploaded to the PMF as required. [23 CFR 490.109(f)(2)]	N/A

OVERVIEW SECTION 2

Question No	Description	Field Type
O4	Who should FHWA contact with questions?	Philip Kase
O5	What is the phone number for this contact? *Please provide 10-digit number (area code and phone number) without formatting. (e.g., 1234567890)*	5039100288
O6	What is the email address for this contact?	philip.j.kase@odot.oregon.gov

Pavement

Overview: Pavement Performance

Question No	Description	Field Type
P1	General Comments: Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current condition, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	The overall goal of Oregon's pavement program is to keep highways in the best condition possible with available funding, by taking a lifecycle cost approach to preservation and maintenance. Rather than following a "worst first" philosophy, ODOT's pavement program applies a "mix of fixes" including preventive maintenance seal coats, resurfacing preservation projects, pavement rehabilitation, and reconstruction. Due to the funding gap between needs and current funding, the Program follows an asset management strategy to reduce the slope of declining pavement conditions across the system. The strategy for state highways follows a tiered approach to prioritize highway routes and also prioritizes projects where the most cost-effective maintenance treatments can be employed.

Statewide Performance Target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition

Question No	Description	Field Type
P2	Baseline: Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.*	57.8
P3	2-year Actual Condition: Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	38.7
P4	2-year Target: Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year condition at the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	30.0
P5	4-year Actual Condition: Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)]	38.5

	This value is the actual 4-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period. *The value must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent.*	
P6	4-year Target: Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year condition at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	30.0
P7	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual condition, and if they were effective in achieving the intended condition for the Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year condition to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	Pavement condition is a function of pavement deterioration rates, weather and environmental effects, programmed pavement projects and their schedules, and data collection variances. Due to insufficient funding, the mileage of pavement being preserved and rehabilitated has dropped significantly, and as a result, pavement conditions on Oregon's Interstate and NHS highways are declining. This was anticipated when the 4-year pavement condition targets were set lower than the baseline. Added to this, a change in data collection vendors between the Baseline and 2-year data also resulted in some differences in rut depth that had an impact to the percentage of good pavement condition results. The measured 2-year condition for Interstate pavement in good condition of 38.7% dropped significantly from the baseline of 57.8%, reflecting both the vendor change and the declining mileage of pavement preservation. After this, the condition stayed nearly the same and the 4-year condition of 38.5% exceeded the 4-year condition target (30%) by 8.5%.
P8	Significant Progress Discussion: The State DOT shall: 1) Document if it expects that significant progress was or was not made toward the 4-year target for Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition.	Approximately 429 lane miles of interstate pavement were preserved or rehabilitated over the 4 year performance period, which averages to approximately 107 lane miles per year and equates to a 28 year paving cycle. This falls short of the long-term steady state goal of 160 lane miles of interstate paving per year (approximately 20 year paving

	2) Summarize the accomplishments achieved during the Performance Period that demonstrate whether the State DOT expects to make significant progress or not. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(E)]	cycle). As such, the interstate Good target was set lower than the baseline. While the actual 4-year good Interstate pavement condition of 38.5% is lower than baseline of 57.8%, it exceeds the 4-year target of 30%, therefore according to CFR 490.109(e)(2), significant progress was made.
P9	Extenuating Circumstance(s): Did any of the extenuating circumstance(s) identified in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevent the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	No
P9a	Select the extenuating circumstance(s) that prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
P9b	Explain how the extenuating circumstance(s), listed in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition, and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	

Statewide Performance Target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Poor Condition

Question No	Description	Field Type
P10	Baseline: Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.*	0.1
P11	2-year Actual Condition: Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	2.5
P12	2-year Target: Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year condition at the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	2.5
P13	4-year Actual Condition: Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)]	2.3

	This value is the actual 4-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period. *The value must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent.*	
P14	4-year Target: Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year condition at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	2.5
P15	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual condition, and if they were effective in achieving the intended condition for the Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Poor Condition. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year condition to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	As mentioned previously, the mileage of pavement being preserved and rehabilitated has dropped due to declining funding, This was anticipated when the 4-year pavement condition targets were set higher than the baseline. The actual 4-year condition for Interstate pavement in poor condition of 2.3% is lower than, and therefore meets, the 4-year condition target (2.5%). It also meets the maximum of 5% poor condition for interstate pavement required by 23CFR 490.115.
P16	Significant Progress Discussion: The State DOT shall: 1) Document if it expects that significant progress was or was not made toward the 4-year target for Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Poor Condition. 2) Summarize the accomplishments achieved during the Performance Period that demonstrate whether the State DOT expects to make significant progress or not. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(E)]	Approximately 429 lane miles of interstate pavement were preserved or rehabilitated over the 4 year performance period, which averages to approximately 107 lane miles per year and equates to a 28 year paving cycle. This falls short of the long-term steady state need of 160 lane miles of interstate paving per year. Accordingly, the 4-year Interstate Poor pavement condition was 2.3%, which was higher than the baseline of 0.1% but lower than the 4-year target of 2.5%, therefore according to CFR 490.109(e)(2), significant progress was made.
P17	Extenuating Circumstance(s): Did any of the extenuating circumstance(s) identified in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevent the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Poor Condition? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	No

P17a	Select the extenuating circumstance(s) that prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
P17b	Explain how the extenuating circumstance(s), listed in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Poor Condition, and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	

Statewide Performance Target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition

Question No	Description	Field Type
P18	Baseline: Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.*	33.4
P19	2-year Actual Condition: Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	28.1
P20	2-year Target: Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year condition at the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	20.0
P21	4-year Actual Condition: Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the actual 4-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period.* *The value must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent.*	20.8
P22	4-year Target: Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year condition at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	20.0
P23	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual condition, and if they were effective in achieving the intended condition for	Pavement condition is a function of pavement deterioration rates, weather and environmental

	the Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year condition to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	effects, programmed pavement projects and their schedules, and data collection variances. Due to insufficient funding, the mileage of pavement being preserved and rehabilitated has dropped significantly, and as a result, pavement conditions on Oregon's Interstate and NHS highways are declining. This was anticipated when the 4-year pavement condition targets were set lower than the baseline. Added to this, a change in data collection vendors between the Baseline and 2-year data also resulted in some differences in rut depth that had an impact to the percentage of good pavement condition results. The measured 2-year condition for Non-Interstate NHS pavement in good condition of 28.1% was lower than the baseline of 33.4%, reflecting both the vendor change and the declining mileage of pavement preservation. Between the 2-year and 4-year period, the percentage of non-interstate NHS in good condition continued to decline to the 4-year condition of 20.8%. This is just above the 4-year condition target of 20% good.
P24	Significant Progress Discussion: The State DOT shall: 1) Document if it expects that significant progress was or was not made toward the 4-year target for Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition. 2) Summarize the accomplishments achieved during the Performance Period that demonstrate whether the State DOT expects to make significant progress or not. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(E)]	A "mix of fixes" strategy was applied to the Non-Interstate NHS pavement system to keep the percent good above the 4-year target. Approximately 800 lane miles of non-interstate NHS was paved over the 4-year performance period, which averages to approximately 200 lane miles per year and equates to a 39 year paving cycle. Additionally, chip seals were applied to another 667 lane miles (167 lane miles per year) to extend pavement service life where applicable. The equivalent paving cycle time is longer than most NHS pavements will last in a state of good repair. As such, the non-interstate NHS Good target was set lower than the baseline. While the actual 4-year good Non-Interstate NHS pavement condition of 20.8% is lower than baseline of 33.4%, it exceeds the 4-year target of 20%, therefore according to CFR 490.109(e)(2), significant progress was made.

P25	Extenuating Circumstance(s): Did any of the extenuating circumstance(s) identified in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevent the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	No
P25a	Select the extenuating circumstance(s) that prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
P25b	Explain how the extenuating circumstance(s), listed in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition, and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	

Statewide Performance Target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition

Question No	Description	Field Type
P26	Baseline: Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.*	2.9
P27	2-year Actual Condition: Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	6.1
P28	2-year Target: Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year condition at the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	10.0
P29	4-year Actual Condition: Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the actual 4-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period.* *The value must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent.*	8.0
P30	4-year Target: Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	10.0

	This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year condition at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.	
P31	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual condition, and if they were effective in achieving the intended condition, for the Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year condition to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	As mentioned previously, the mileage of pavement being preserved and rehabilitated has dropped due to declining funding. This was anticipated when the 4-year pavement condition targets were set higher than the baseline. The actual 4-year condition for Non-Interstate NHS pavement in poor condition of 8.0% is lower than, and therefore meets, the 4-year condition target (10.0%).
P32	Significant Progress Discussion: The State DOT shall: 1) Document if it expects that significant progress was or was not made toward the 4-year target for Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition. 2) Summarize the accomplishments achieved during the Performance Period that demonstrate whether the State DOT expects to make significant progress or not. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(E)]	Approximately 800 lane miles of non-interstate NHS was paved over the 4-year performance period, which averages to approximately 200 lane miles per year and equates to a 39 year paving cycle. Additionally, chip seals were applied to another 667 lane miles (167 lane miles per year) to extend pavement service life where applicable. The equivalent paving cycle time is longer than most NHS pavements will last in a state of good repair. Accordingly, the 4-year Non-Interstate NHS Poor pavement condition was 8.0%, which was higher than the baseline of 2.9% but lower than the 4-year target of 10.0%, therefore according to CFR 490.109(e)(2), significant progress was made.
P33	Extenuating Circumstance(s): Did any of the extenuating circumstance(s) identified in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevent the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	No
P33a	Select the extenuating circumstance(s) that prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
P33b	Explain how the extenuating circumstance(s), listed in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition, and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	

Bridge

Overview: Bridge Performance

Question No	Description	Field Type
B1	General Comments: Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current condition, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	N/C

Statewide Performance Target for Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition

Question No	Description	Field Type
B2	Baseline: Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.*	12.4
B3	2-year Actual Condition: Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	13.2
B4	2-year Target: Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year condition at the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	11.0
B5	4-year Actual Condition: Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the actual 4-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period.* *The value must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent.*	14.7
B6	4-year Target: Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year condition at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	9.0

B7	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual condition, and if they were effective in achieving the intended condition for the Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year condition to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	ODOT has more Good bridges than the percentage set in the 4 year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition and has therefore exceeded the target. This increase is not due to investments, as ODOT typically replaces three state highway bridges each year. The increase is due to the implementation of the Specifications for the National Bridge Inventory. There were structures that were Fair, but just barely under the Good-Fair border, and the reevaluation placed several of them into the Good classification. This caused a net increase in the quantity (by deck area) of Good structures. This could not have been anticipated.
B8	Significant Progress Discussion: The State DOT shall: 1) Document if it expects that significant progress was or was not made toward the 4-year target for Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition. 2) Summarize the accomplishments achieved during the Performance Period that demonstrate whether the State DOT expects to make significant progress or not. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(E)]	The increase in the percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition is a result of the efforts to implement the Specifications for the National Bridge Inventory. Although ODOT was able to exceed the 2-year and 4-year targets, we will eventually lose ground as ODOT replaces only 1-3 aging structures annually thus changing fair or poor condition bridges to good at a rate of 1-3 bridges per year.
B9	Extenuating Circumstance(s): Did any of the extenuating circumstance(s) identified in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevent the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	No
B9a	Select the extenuating circumstance(s) that prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
B9b	Explain how the extenuating circumstance(s), listed in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition, and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	

Statewide Performance Target for Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition

Question No	Description	Field Type
B10	Baseline: Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.*	1.1
B11	2-year Actual Condition: Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	1.9
B12	2-year Target: Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year condition at the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	1.8
B13	4-year Actual Condition: Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the actual 4-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period.* *The value must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent.*	2.2
B14	4-year Target: Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year condition at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	3.0
B15	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual condition, and if they were effective in achieving the intended condition for the Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year condition to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met.	While ODOT had slightly more Poor bridges than the percentage set in the 2-year target ODOT has less Poor bridges than the 4-year target. The primary reason that the 2-year target was not met is that the bridge inventory is deteriorating at a rate that is greater than the capacity of the STIP and the Major Bridge Maintenance (MBM) program to match. The MBM program funding has been increased from $12M to $15M each year. The MBM

	[23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	program can address individual bridge elements that are heavily deteriorated. While the overall bridge condition continues to deteriorate, replacement of the most heavily deteriorated elements through the MBM program allows more bridges to remain in service in Fair condition. An increase in STIP funding is also needed to slow the rate of increase of bridges in Poor Condition.
B16	Significant Progress Discussion: The State DOT shall: 1) Document if it expects that significant progress was or was not made toward the 4-year target for Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition. 2) Summarize the accomplishments achieved during the Performance Period that demonstrate whether the State DOT expects to make significant progress or not. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(E)]	The 2-year and 4-year targets show an increase in the statewide Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified in Poor Condition. This reflects a system that is in decline despite a limited number of bridge replacements and the efforts of the Major Bridge Maintenance (MBM) program to address critical maintenance needs. The actual 2-year condition was only 0.1% greater than the 2-year target, so the decline of the system was accurately predicted. The 4-year target was met. The MBM program was recently increased from $12M to $15M per year. This should help to slow the future increase in the Percent of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified in Poor Condition, but will not stop the future increase.
B17	Extenuating Circumstance(s): Did any of the extenuating circumstance(s) identified in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevent the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	No
B17a	Select the extenuating circumstance(s) that prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
B17b	Explain how the extenuating circumstance(s), listed in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition, and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	

Reliability

Overview: Travel Time Reliability Performance

Question No	Description	Field Type
R1	General Comments: Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	The travel time reliability performance of the Oregon State Highway System is above the PM3 target, indicating acceptable performance.

Statewide Performance Target for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable

Question No	Description	Field Type
R2	Baseline: Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.*	87.4
R3	2-year Actual Performance: Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	84.6
R4	2-year Target: Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year performance at the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	78.0
R5	4-year Actual Performance: Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable. *This value is the actual 4-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)]* *The value must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent.*	83.0
R6	4-year Target: Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year performance at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	78.0

R7	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual performance, and if they were effective in achieving the intended performance for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate that are Reliable. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year performance to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	The Interstate system has shown a steady decline in reliability as travel returns to pre-pandemic levels. Despite this downward trend, the system's four-year performance remains above the state's four-year target. This sustained reliability is largely the result of ODOT's three-part approach to improving mobility: • Optimizing infrastructure, • Managing system performance, and • Supporting transportation options. ODOT optimizes the use of existing infrastructure by deploying new technologies and investing in projects designed to improve both safety and system performance. Safety investments help reduce crash-related congestion, while targeted enhancement projects address known bottlenecks. Through active traffic management, ODOT uses real-time technologies to provide travelers with timely information, enabling them to avoid congested areas and choose more efficient routes. In addition, ODOT invests in programs that expand transportation options, making it easier for people across the state to access goods, services, and economic opportunities through a variety of travel choices.
R8	Significant Progress Discussion: The State DOT shall: 1) Document if it expects that significant progress was or was not made toward the 4-year target for Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate that are Reliable. 2) Summarize the accomplishments achieved during the Performance Period that demonstrate whether the State DOT expects to make significant progress or not. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(E)]	Significant progress has been made, with the four-year performance remaining above the state's four-year target despite factors contributing to reduced system reliability. Key challenges included: • The post-pandemic recovery, with telecommuting declining and daily activities resuming. Between 2021 and 2025, population and employment grew by 2% and 6%, respectively. As travel increased toward pre-pandemic levels, it was anticipated reliability would decline toward the target threshold.

		• Major freeway construction projects added delay and contributed to reduced system reliability. ODOT delivered these key projects: • Construction of OR217 auxiliary lane, I-5 northbound auxiliary lane in Wilsonville, I-5 Aurora–Donald Interchange Phase 1A. • Installation of ramp meters at the Elligsen Road entrance ramps to I-5. • Expansion of ATM to an additional segment of I-5 from Marquam to Terwilliger. These mobility and congestion relief projects are designed to address existing bottlenecks and improve traffic flow along critical freeway corridors. Additional strategies—such as expanded public transportation, enhanced freight rail capacity, policies encouraging off peak freight movement, and programs that shift travel to non peak periods or to non auto modes—support a comprehensive, multimodal approach to improving system performance.
R9	Extenuating Circumstance(s): Did any of the extenuating circumstance(s) identified in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevent the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate that are Reliable? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	No
R9a	Select the extenuating circumstance(s) that prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
R9b	Explain how the extenuating circumstance(s), listed in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate that are Reliable, and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	

Statewide Performance Target for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable

Question No	Description	Field Type

R10	Baseline: Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.*	91.2
R11	2-year Actual Performance: Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	91.4
R12	2-year Target: Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year performance at the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	78.0
R13	4-year Actual Performance: Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the actual 4-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period.* *The value must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent.*	90.0
R14	4-year Target: Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year performance at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	78.0
R15	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual performance, and if they were effective in achieving the intended performance for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year performance to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	The Non-Interstate NHS system has shown a steady decline in reliability as travel returns close to pre-pandemic levels. Despite this downward trend, the system's four-year performance remains above the state's four-year target. This sustained reliability is largely the result of ODOT's three-part approach to improving mobility: • Optimizing infrastructure, • Managing system performance, and • Supporting transportation options. ODOT optimizes the use of existing infrastructure by

		deploying new technologies and investing in projects designed to improve both safety and system performance. Safety investments help reduce crash-related congestion, while targeted enhancement projects address known bottlenecks. Through active traffic management, ODOT uses real-time technologies to provide travelers with timely information, enabling them to avoid congested areas and choose more efficient routes. In addition, ODOT invests in programs that expand transportation options, making it easier for people across the state to access goods, services, and economic opportunities through a variety of travel choices.
R16	Significant Progress Discussion: The State DOT shall: 1) Document if it expects that significant progress was or was not made toward the 4-year target for Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable. 2) Summarize the accomplishments achieved during the Performance Period that demonstrate whether the State DOT expects to make significant progress or not. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(E)]	Significant progress has been made, with the four-year performance remaining above the state's four-year target despite factors contributing to reduced system reliability. The post pandemic recovery was a key challenge with telecommuting declining and daily activities resuming. Between 2021 and 2025, population and employment grew by 2% and 6%, respectively. As travel increased toward pre-pandemic levels, it was anticipated reliability would decline toward the target threshold. However, the reason for the four-year performance being well above the state's four-year target and also above the pre-pandemic levels may have been attributed to ODOT's three-part approach to transportation system investement: • Optimize use of infrastructure, • Manage system performance, and • Support transportation options.
R17	Extenuating Circumstance(s): Did any of the extenuating circumstance(s) identified in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevent the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	No

R17a	Select the extenuating circumstance(s) that prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
R17b	Explain how the extenuating circumstance(s), listed in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	

Freight

Overview: Freight Reliability (Movement) Performance

Question No	Description	Field Type
F1	General Comments: Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	The performance of the Oregon State Highway System is below the current PM3 target, indicating acceptable performance.
F2	Progress on truck freight bottlenecks: Discuss progress of the State DOT's efforts in addressing congestion at truck freight bottlenecks within the State (described in § 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(E)) through comprehensive freight improvement efforts of State Freight Plan or MPO freight plans; the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program and Transportation Improvement Program; regional or corridor level efforts; other related planning efforts; and operational and capital activities targeted to improve freight movement on the Interstate System. *If the State has prepared a State Freight Plan under 49 U.S.C. 70202, within the previous 2 years, then it may serve as the basis for addressing congestion at truck freight bottlenecks. If the State Freight Plan has not been updated since the previous State Biennial Performance Report, then an updated analysis of congestion at truck freight bottlenecks must be included via this field or as an attachment. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(D)]* *Upload related document(s) in the Attachment tab.*	ODOT completed a truck freight bottleneck study in 2016 and the Oregon Freight Plan is underway with an adoption target set for 2027. Both efforts include analysis related to delay areas and freight corridors. ODOT continues to strategically address freight bottlenecks thru a combination of TSMO, passenger Demand Management, and some larger scale initiatives. The Oregon Freight Plan progress information page is located here: https://www.oregon.gov/odot/planning/pages/oregon-freight-plan-update.aspx

Statewide Performance Target for the Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index

Question No	Description	Field Type
F3	Baseline: Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.*	1.31
F4	2-year Actual Performance: Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	1.33
F5	2-year Target: Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year performance at the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	1.45

F6	4-year Actual Performance: Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the actual 4-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period.* *The value must be reported to the nearest hundredth of a percent.*	1.34
F7	4-year Target: Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year performance at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	1.45
F8	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual performance, and if they were effective in achieving the intended performance for the Truck Travel Time Reliability Index measure. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year performance to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	The four-year performance for the "Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index" has increased (worsened) incrementally from baseline but is performing within the four-year target. This sustained reliability is largely the result of ODOT's three-part approach to improving mobility: • Optimizing infrastructure, • Managing system performance, and • Supporting transportation options. ODOT optimizes the use of existing infrastructure by deploying new technologies and investing in projects designed to improve both safety and system performance. Safety investments help reduce crash-related congestion, while targeted enhancement projects address known bottlenecks. Through active traffic management, ODOT uses real-time technologies to provide travelers with timely information, enabling them to avoid congested areas and choose more efficient routes. In addition, ODOT invests in programs that expand transportation options, making it easier for people across the state to access goods, services, and economic opportunities through a variety of travel choices. As more people switches to non-SOV

		travel options, more roadway capacity is available for freight.
F9	Significant Progress Discussion: The State DOT shall: 1) Document if it expects that significant progress was or was not made toward the 4-year target for the Truck Travel Time Reliability Index measure. 2) Summarize the accomplishments achieved during the Performance Period that demonstrate whether the State DOT expects to make significant progress or not. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(E)]	Significant progress has been made, with the four-year performance remaining within the state's four-year target despite factors contributing to reduced system reliability. Key challenges included: • The post-pandemic recovery, with telecommuting declining and daily activities resuming. Between 2021 and 2025, population and employment grew by 2% and 6%, respectively. As travel increased toward pre-pandemic levels, it was anticipated reliability would decline toward the target threshold. Commuters share the same roadway with trucks, therefore impacting truck travel time reliability. • Major freeway construction projects added delay and contributed to reduced system reliability. ODOT delivered these key projects: • Construction of OR217 auxiliary lane, I-5 northbound auxiliary lane in Wilsonville, I-5 Aurora–Donald Interchange Phase 1A. • Installation of ramp meters at the Elligsen Road entrance ramps to I-5. • Expansion of ATM to an additional segment of I-5 from Marquam to Terwilliger. These mobility and congestion relief projects are designed to address existing bottlenecks and improve traffic flow along critical freeway corridors. Additional strategies—such as expanded public transportation, enhanced freight rail capacity, policies encouraging off peak freight movement, and programs that shift travel to non peak periods or to non auto modes—support a comprehensive, multimodal approach to improving system performance. These mobility and congestion relief projects are designed to address existing bottlenecks and improve traffic flow along critical

		freeway corridors. Additional strategies—such as expanded public transportation, enhanced freight rail capacity, policies encouraging off peak freight movement, and programs that shift travel to non peak periods or to non auto modes—support a comprehensive, multimodal approach to improving system performance.
F10	Extenuating Circumstance(s): Did any of the extenuating circumstance(s) identified in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevent the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Truck Travel Time Reliability Index measure? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	No
F10a	Select the extenuating circumstance(s) that prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
F10b	Explain how the extenuating circumstance(s), listed in 23 CFR 490.109(e)(5) prevented the State DOT from making significant progress toward achieving its 4-year target for the Truck Travel Time Reliability Index measure, and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(F)]	

Peak Hour Excess Delay (PHED)

Overview: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) Per Capita Performance

Question No	Description	Field Type
D1	General Comments: Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	N/C
D2	The total number of applicable UZA(s) required to establish targets and report progress for the Traffic Congestion Measures in your State are:	2

Urbanized Area Target #1 - Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita

Question No	Description	Field Type
D3	Urbanized Area:	Eugene, OR
D4	Baseline: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(D)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.*	4.6
D5	2-year Actual Performance: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita in this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	4.4
D6	2-year Target: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year performance at the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	8.5
D7	4-year Actual Performance: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the actual 4-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period.* *The value must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent.*	4.9

D8	4-year Target: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year performance at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	9.0
D9	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual performance, and if they were effective in achieving the intended performance for the Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year performance to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	The actual 4-year Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita performance was 4.9; the 4-year target was 9.0. Therefore the PHED target was met for this reporting cycle. The baseline performance was 4.6 and the 2-year performance was 4.4. Looking at these three years of actual performance, congestion is relatively stable but trending to increasking. This region is managing Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita through investment in strategies that are tied to CLMPO's project and decision making framework including leveraging technology (including ITS) to increase travel efficiency, and reduce the impact of roadway incidents, programming to encourage and support non-SOV travel (including transportation options and Safe Routes to Schools), and also investment in infrastructure supporting active transportation modes.

Urbanized Area Target #2 - Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita

Question No	Description	Field Type
D10	Urbanized Area:	Salem, OR
D11	Baseline: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(D)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.*	7.9
D12	2-year Actual Performance: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita in this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	7.0
D13	2-year Target: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	7.0

	This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year performance at the midpoint of the Performance Period.	
D14	4-year Actual Performance: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the actual 4-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period.* *The value must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent.*	7.5
D15	4-year Target: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year performance at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	7.0
D16	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual performance, and if they were effective in achieving the intended performance for the Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year performance to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	The actual 4-year Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita performance was 4.9; the 4-year target was 9.0. Therefore the PHED target was met for this reporting cycle. The baseline performance was 4.6 and the 2-year performance was 4.4. Looking at these three years of actual performance, congestion is relatively stable but trending to increasking. This region is managing Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita through investment in strategies that are tied to CLMPO's project and decision making framework including leveraging technology (including ITS) to increase travel efficiency, and reduce the impact of roadway incidents, programming to encourage and support non-SOV travel (including transportation options and Safe Routes to Schools), and also investment in infrastructure supporting active transportation modes.

Percent of Non-SOV Travel

Overview: Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel Performance

Question No	Description	Field Type
T1	General Comments: Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	N/C
T2	The total number of applicable UZA(s) required to establish targets and report progress for the Traffic Congestion Measures in your State are:	2

Urbanized Area Target #1 - Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel

Question No	Description	Field Type
T3	Urbanized Area:	Eugene, OR
T4	Baseline: Percent of Non-SOV Travel for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(D)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.*	31.8
T5	Data Collection Method: In the Baseline Performance Period Report, the State DOT selected the following data collection method for calculating the Percent of Non-SOV Travel measure for the Performance Period: The actual Performance is calculated using the data collection method selected in Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(I), 23 CFR 490.709(f)(2) and (3)]	Method A - American Community Survey
T6	2-year Actual Performance: Percent of Non-SOV Travel for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	32.7
T7	2-year Target: Percent of Non-SOV Travel for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year performance at the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	33.0
T8	4-year Actual Performance: Percent of Non-SOV Travel for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)]	32.7

	This value is the actual 4-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period. *The value must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.713(d)] Enter 86.5% as 86.5.* *Note: If the State DOT selected Method A in the Baseline Performance Report (see T5), the actual performance for the UZA based on American Community Survey (ACS) data (Method A) will be prepopulated.* *If the State DOT selected Method B or C in the Baseline Performance Report (see T5), this field will not be prepopulated. Since the measure is calculated the same way for the entire performance period, the State DOT must calculate the actual performance for the UZA based on the Method selected in the Baseline Performance Report (see T5), and enter it here.*	
T9	4-year Target: Percent of Non-SOV Travel for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year performance at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	35.0
T10	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual performance, and if they were effective in achieving the intended performance for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel for this UZA. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year performance to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	The actual 4-year Percent of Non-SOV Travel performance was 32.7%; the 4-year target was 35%. Therefore the Non-SOV target was not met for this reporting cycle. The baseline performance was 31.8% and the 2-year performance was 32.7%. Looking at these three years of actual performance, non-SOV travel is slowly trending upwards. This region set aspirational non-SOV 2- and 4-year targets and is actively worked towards meeting them through investments in strategies that are tied to CLMPO's project and decision making framework including transportation options and Safe Routes to Schools programming to encourage and support non-SOV travel, as well as investment in infrastructure supporting active transportation modes.

Urbanized Area Target #2 - Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel

Question No	Description	Field Type
T11	Urbanized Area:	Salem, OR
T12	Baseline: Percent of Non-SOV Travel for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(D)]	25.2

	This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the Performance Period.	
T13	Data Collection Method: In the Baseline Performance Period Report, the State DOT selected the following data collection method for calculating the Percent of Non-SOV Travel measure for the Performance Period: The actual Performance is calculated using the data collection method selected in Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(I), 23 CFR 490.709(f)(2) and (3)]	Method A - American Community Survey
T14	2-year Actual Performance: Percent of Non-SOV Travel for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the actual 2-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	26.8
T15	2-year Target: Percent of Non-SOV Travel for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the anticipated 2-year performance at the midpoint of the Performance Period.*	23.2
T16	4-year Actual Performance: Percent of Non-SOV Travel for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the actual 4-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the end of the Performance Period.* *The value must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.713(d)] Enter 86.5% as 86.5.* *Note: If the State DOT selected Method A in the Baseline Performance Report (see T5), the actual performance for the UZA based on American Community Survey (ACS) data (Method A) will be prepopulated.* *If the State DOT selected Method B or C in the Baseline Performance Report (see T5), this field will not be prepopulated. Since the measure is calculated the same way for the entire performance period, the State DOT must calculate the actual performance for the UZA based on the Method selected in the Baseline Performance Report (see T5), and enter it here.*	26.8
T17	4-year Target: Percent of Non-SOV Travel for this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the anticipated 4-year performance at the end of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	22.7
T18	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual performance,	The four-year target was set at 22.7 percent and the actual value

	and if they were effective in achieving the intended performance for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel for this UZA. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year performance to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	was 26.8 percent, thus the target was met. The primary reason for meeting this target was the high number of people who work from home at least one day-a-week. SKATS provides funding for the Salem Area Mass Transit District's Transportation Options program that encourages people to use modes other than SOV to meet their daily needs. This includes telecommuting.

Emissions

Overview: Total Emission Reduction Performance

Question No	Description	Field Type
E1	General Comments: Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	Oregon's CMAQ program is managed by ODOT using a formula distribution of CMAQ funds to non-attainment and maintenance areas. ODOT develops statewide policy, and projects are selected by the non-attainment/maintenance areas and ODOT checks for eligibility and approves/rejects.
E2	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM2.5?	Yes
E3	If the State includes any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM2.5, are NOx, VOC, or both a significant contributor to PM2.5 emissions anywhere in the State? A significant contributor is defined as a precursor pollutant that the State or EPA has made a finding that the precursor has a significant impact on particulate matter (PM) air quality problem in a given area; or, the State Implementation Plan establishes approved or adequate motor vehicle emissions budgets for that precursor. [40 CFR 93.102(b) and 40 CFR 93.119(f)]	Yes - NOx ONLY
E4	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM10?	Yes
E5	If the State includes any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM10, are NOx, VOC, or both a significant contributor to PM10 emissions anywhere in the State?	No significant contributors
E6	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for CO?	Yes
E7	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for ozone?	No

Statewide Total Emission Reduction PM2.5 Target #1

Question No	Description	Field Type
E11	Baseline: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	0.016

	This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal fiscal years before the start of the Performance Period.	
E12	2-year Actual Performance: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the estimated cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) for the first 2 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.*	0.000
E13	2-year Target: Cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) anticipated for the first 2 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.*	0.000
E14	4-year Actual Performance: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the estimated cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) for the 4 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.* *The data needed to calculate the measure came from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a)]* *The value must be reported to the "nearest one thousandths".*	77.187
E15	4-year Target: Cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) anticipated for the 4 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	0.000
E16	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual performance, and if they were effective in achieving the intended performance for PM2.5. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year performance to the 4-year target, and	Oregon met the 2 and 4 year target. Rural cities in non-attainment/maintenance areas were able to use the small grants waiver to purchase street sweepers to help reduce emissions with their limited allocations.

	2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	

Statewide Total Emission Reduction NOx Target #2

Question No	Description	Field Type
E17	Baseline: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal fiscal years before the start of the Performance Period.*	0.488
E18	2-year Actual Performance: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the estimated cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) for the first 2 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.*	0.000
E19	2-year Target: Cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) anticipated for the first 2 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.*	0.000
E20	4-year Actual Performance: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the estimated cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) for the 4 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.* *The data needed to calculate the measure came from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a)].* *The value must be reported to the "nearest one thousandths".*	0.000
E21	4-year Target: Cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms)*	0.000

	anticipated for the 4 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.	
E22	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual performance, and if they were effective in achieving the intended performance for NOx. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year performance to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	N/A

Statewide Total Emission Reduction VOC Target #3

Question No	Description	Field Type
E23	Baseline: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal fiscal years before the start of the Performance Period.*	
E24	2-year Actual Performance: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the estimated cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) for the first 2 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.*	
E25	2-year Target: Cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) anticipated for the first 2 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.*	
E26	4-year Actual performance: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the estimated cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) for the 4 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.*	

	The data needed to calculate the measure came from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a)] *The value must be reported to the "nearest one thousandths".*	
E27	4-year Target: Cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) anticipated for the 4 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	
E28	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual performance, and if they were effective in achieving the intended performance for VOC. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year performance to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	

Statewide Total Emission Reduction PM10 Target #4

Question No	Description	Field Type
E29	Baseline: Estimated cumulative emissions Reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal fiscal years before the start of the Performance Period.*	679.444
E30	2-year Actual Performance: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the estimated cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) for the first 2 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.*	0.925
E31	2-year Target: Cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	557.510

	This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) anticipated for the first 2 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.	
E32	4-year Actual Performance: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the estimated cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) for the 4 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.* *The data needed to calculate the measure came from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a)]* *The value must be reported to the "nearest one thousandths".*	295.831
E33	4-year Target: Cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) anticipated for the 4 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	1115.030
E34	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual performance, and if they were effective in achieving the intended performance for PM10. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year performance to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	Oregon did not meet the four year target. Various projects have slipped from one funding year to the next or were cancelled and project completion is often not within ODOT's control. Projects that are advancing to construction have been smaller projects that are easier to implement, such as bikeways, which are less complex but provide little to no PM10 emissions benefit.

Statewide Total Emission Reduction CO Target #5

Question No	Description	Field Type
E35	Baseline: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and is the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal fiscal years before the start of the Performance Period.*	102.368

E36	2-year Actual Performance: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and is the estimated cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) for the first 2 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.*	0.201
E37	2-year Target: Cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)] *This value is carried over from the Baseline Performance Period Report and reflects the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) anticipated for the first 2 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.*	46.130
E38	4-year Actual Performance: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(A)] *This value is the estimated cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) for the 4 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period.* *The data needed to calculate the measure came from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a)]* *The value must be reported to the "nearest one thousandths".*	7.013
E39	4-year Target: Cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] *This value is carried over from the Mid Performance Period Progress Report and reflects the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) anticipated for the 4 Federal fiscal years of the Performance Period. If the target was adjusted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report, the adjusted value is shown here.*	92.250
E40	Progress Discussion: Discuss the decisions and investments that contributed to the actual performance, and if they were effective in achieving the intended performance for CO. This discussion shall at a minimum: 1) Compare the actual 4-year performance to the 4-year target, and 2) document the reasons the target was or was not met. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(3)(ii)(B)]	Oregon did not meet the four year target. Various projects have slipped from one funding year to the next or were cancelled and project completion is often not within ODOT's control. Projects that are advancing to construction have been smaller projects that are easier to implement, such as bikeways, which are less complex but provide little to no CO emissions benefit.

Attachments

S.No	Section	Attachment Detail
0	Freight	**Filename:** 2026_FPP_OR_Freight_Oregon_Freight_Highway_Bottleneck.pdf **Notes:** Freight - Oregon Freight Highway Bottleneck Report (pg. 34-36) **Attachment Url:**