Transportation Performance Management

State Biennial Performance Report for Performance Period 2026-2029 (NEW TARGETS)

2026

Baseline Performance Period Report

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 Target	4-Year Target
Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Good Condition	38.5%	30.0%	25.0%
Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Poor Condition	2.3%	3.5%	5.0%
Percentage of Pavements of the Non- Interstate NHS in Good Condition	20.8%	17.5%	15.0%
Percentage of Pavements of the Non- Interstate NHS in Poor Condition	8.0%	12.5%	15.0%
Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Good Condition	14.7%	11.0%	10.0%
Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Poor Condition	2.2%	4.5%	6.0%
Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable	83.0%	78.0%	78.0%
Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable	90.0%	78.0%	78.0%
Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index	1.34	1.45	1.45
Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita: Eugene, OR	4.9	8.5	9.0
Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita: Salem, OR	7.2	7.5	7.7
Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel: Eugene, OR	35.4%	35.0%	37.0%
Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel: Salem, OR	31.9%	30.0%	30.0%
Total Emission Reductions: PM2.5	77.187	0.000	0.000
Total Emission Reductions: NOx	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total Emission Reductions: VOC			
Total Emission Reductions: PM10	295.831	0.350	0.700
Total Emission Reductions: CO	7.013	0.000	14.200

Overview

OVERVIEW SECTION 1		
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)	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. 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 non freight users. As such, Oregon has used a methodology of declining performance for the measures. 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.
O2	Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Coordination: Please provide a description of how the State DOT is coordinating with relevant MPOs in target selection. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(2)] (Optional)	Oregon DOT has established a Federal Performance Measure Coordination Protocol document that outlines the roles and responsibilities, along with the coordination processes for how Oregon DOT will establish the statewide targets in coordination with the MPOs. This document also discusses how ODOT will coordinate with the MPOs in setting MPO specific targets – if they choose to do so.
OVERVIEW SECTION 2		
O3	Who should FHWA contact with questions?	Philip Kase
O4	What is the phone number for this contact?	5039100288
O5	What is the email address for this contact?	philip.j.kase@odot.oregon.gov

Pavement

Overview: Pavement Performance		
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 baseline condition, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	N/C
Overview: Interstate System Pavement Performance		
P2	Relationship to Performance Expectations in Other Plans and National Goals: Discuss how the 2-year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the measure of the condition of pavements on the Interstate System [23 CFR 490.105(c)(1)] support expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan required by 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the long-range statewide transportation plan, and other relevant planning and programing documents. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(C)]	The ODOT pavement preservation program follows an asset management strategy that incorporates a life-cycle cost approach to preservation and maintenance and a route prioritization strategy to manage the impacts of declining pavement conditions across the system. Oregon has been in a reduced funding scenario for the last several years and has allocated federal and state funding to preserve and maintain the existing transportation system to the extent possible. The 2 and 4 year targets are aligned with the 10 year funding level projections outlined in our Transportation Asset Management Plan.
Statewide Performance Targets for the Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Good Condition		
P3	Baseline: Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	38.5
P4	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate in Good Condition for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	30.0
P5	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Good Condition for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	25.0
P6	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for the Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	The overall pavement program, including the interstate, is underfunded compared to needs. The interstate system because of its significance and importance, is prioritized to ensure that pavement conditions will deteriorate less steeply than other parts of the system. The percent of pavement of the interstate system in good condition is a function of pavement deterioration rates, project paving schedules, weather and environmental effects, and data collection variances. As such, it is more volatile than the percent poor condition and is more difficult to precisely predict due to its volatility. Looking at the historical

		data from 2022 to 2025 the percent good decreased from 57.8% to the current level of 38.5%. While some of that drop was due to a change in data collection vendors which resulted in some differences in rut depth that impacted the numbers, the most significant factor to the decline in the percentage of good pavement condition is the funding gap. For 2022-2025, approximately 107 lane miles per year of interstate was paved (~28 year paving cycle) which is short of the long-term steady state goal of 160 lane miles of interstate paving per year (approximately 20 year paving cycle). For 2026-2029, the funding gap is even worse. It is estimated that only 64 lane miles per year will be paved (~47 year paving cycle). Therefore, the 2-year and 4-year condition targets were set lower than baseline in expectation of further condition decline.
Statewide Performance Targets for the Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Poor Condition		
P7	Baseline: Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	2.3
P8	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate in Poor Condition for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	3.5
P9	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Poor Condition for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	5.0
P10	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	Historical data from 2022 to 2025 showed the percent poor increased from 0.1% to the current level of 2.3%. While some of that increase was due to a change in data collection vendors which resulted in some differences in rut depth that impacted the numbers, the most significant factor to the increase in the percentage of poor pavement condition is the funding gap. For 2022-2025, approximately 107 lane miles per year of interstate was paved (~28 year paving cycle) which is short of the long-term steady state goal of 160 lane miles of interstate paving per year (approximately 20 year paving cycle). For 2026-2029, the funding gap is even worse. It is estimated that only 64 lane miles per year will be paved (~47 year paving cycle). Therefore, the 2-year and 4-year condition targets

		were set higher than baseline in expectation of further condition decline. For the upcoming 4-year performance period, it is expected that the 4-year condition will approach the maximum of 5% poor condition for interstate pavement required by 23CFR 490.115. To help ODOT stay within this requirement, funding for the Major Interstate Maintenance (MIM) program, which applies intermittent paving repair to localized areas of deterioration, was increased.
Overview: Non-Interstate NHS Pavement Performance		
P11	Relationship to Performance Expectations in Other Plans and National Goals: Discuss how the 2- year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the measure of the condition of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS (excluding the Interstate) [23 CFR 490.105(c)(2)] support expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan required by 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the long-range statewide transportation plan, and other relevant planning and programing documents. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(C)]	The ODOT pavement preservation program follows an asset management strategy that incorporates a life-cycle cost approach to preservation and maintenance and a route prioritization strategy to manage the impacts of declining pavement conditions across the system. Rather than following a “worst first” philosophy, the Program applies a “mix of fixes” including preventive maintenance seal coats, resurfacing preservation projects, pavement rehabilitation, and reconstruction. The strategy follows a tiered approach to prioritize by highway classification and cost-effectiveness. Oregon has been in a reduced funding scenario for the last several years and has allocated federal and state funding to preserve and maintain the existing transportation system to the extent possible. The 2 and 4 year targets are aligned with the 10 year funding level projections outlined in our Transportation Asset Management Plan.
Statewide Performance Targets for the Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition.		
P12	Baseline: Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	20.8
P13	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	17.5
P14	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition that the State DOT has established for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	15.0
P15	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the current Performance Period for the Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an	As mentioned earlier under the interstate discussion, the percent of pavement in good condition is more volatile year over year

	explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	compared to the percent poor condition. We expect the percent of non-interstate pavement in good condition to decline based on historical trends and the limited funding of the agency. Looking at the historical data from 2022 to 2025 the percent good decreased from 33.4% to the current level of 20.8%. While some of that drop was due to a change in data collection vendors which resulted in some differences in rut depth that impacted the numbers, the most significant factor to the decline in the percentage of good pavement condition is the funding gap. For 2022-2025, approximately 200 lane miles per year of non-interstate NHS was paved (~39 year paving cycle) and another 167 lane miles per year was chip sealed. The equivalent paving cycle time is longer than most NHS pavements will last in a state of good repair. For 2026-2029, the funding gap is even worse. It is estimated that only 120 lane miles per year will be paved (~65 year paving cycle). Therefore, the 2-year and 4-year condition targets were set higher than baseline in expectation of further condition decline.
Statewide Performance Targets for the Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition		
P16	Baseline: Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	8.0
P17	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	12.5
P18	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	15.0
P19	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for the Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	Historical data from 2022 to 2025 showed the percent poor increased from 2.9% to the current level of 8.0%. While some of that increase was due to a change in data collection vendors which resulted in some differences in rut depth that impacted the numbers, the most significant factor to the increase in the percentage of poor pavement condition is the funding gap. For 2022-2025, approximately 200 lane miles per year of non-interstate NHS was paved (~39 year paving cycle) and another 167 lane miles per year was chip sealed. For 2026-2029, the

		funding gap is even worse. It is estimated that only 64 lane miles per year will be paved (~47 year paving cycle). The equivalent paving cycle time is longer than most NHS pavements will last in a state of good repair. Therefore, the 2-year and 4-year condition targets were set higher than baseline in expectation of further condition decline.
Optional Additional Pavement Performance Target #1 [23 CFR 490.105(e)(3)]		
P20	Additional Target: Which measure are you establishing an optional additional target? Percentage of Pavements of the: (Optional)	
P21	Area(s) for Target: Indicate what area(s) the State DOT is establishing this additional target for (UZA stands for Urbanized Area).	
P22	UZA(s): If this target is for a single UZA or group of UZAs, indicate which UZA(s) are included in this target. This field is not applicable if the target is for the statewide urbanized area (all UZAs) or the non-UZA area (Statewide Rural and Small Urban Areas).	N/A
P23	Baseline: Provide the baseline condition for the selected measure in this target area. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	
P24	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the selected measure in this target area for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	
P25	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the selected measure in this target area for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	
P26	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for the selected measure for this target area. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets. Also include the source of the urbanized dataset used to establish the targets. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(D)]	N/A

Bridge

Overview: Bridge Performance		
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 baseline condition, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	N/C
B2	Relationship to Performance Expectations in Other Plans and National Goals: Discuss how the 2-year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the measure of the condition of bridges on the NHS [23 CFR 490.105(c)(3)] support expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan required by 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the long-range statewide transportation plan, and other relevant planning and programing documents. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(C)]	The goal of the ODOT bridge program is to keep bridges in the best condition possible with available funding, by taking bridge conditions and life-cycle cost approach to preserve, maintain and replace ridges. The program follows an asset management strategy to reduce the impacts of declining bridge conditions across the system. The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is the state's long range ransportation 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 2 and 4 year targets are aligned with the 10 year projections outlined in our Transportation Asset Management Plan. The investment strategy outlined in our TAMP prioritizes the National Highway System at the highest level and has the highest level of investment which has been effective at keeping bridges in a state of good repair.
Statewide Performance Targets for Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition		
B3	Baseline: Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	14.7
B4	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	11.0
B5	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS classified as in Good Condition for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	10.0
B6	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for the	The majority of NHS bridges in good condition have NBI values of

	Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	7 (11.4%). Bridges with deck NBIs of 7 are most at risk of moving to fair condition. Recently constructed bridges (within the last 30 years) that currently have deck NBI values of 7 were analyzed and found to move from good to fair in about 24 years. Typically bridges less than 30 years old are not prioritized for rehab, so there is little chance these bridges will get work. We also considered trends for bridges that are older than 30 years that are in fair condition and expected to remain fair or degrade to poor based on current program funding. The analysis considered which bridges would move from poor or fair to good, based on projected rehab or replacement. Bridges can only move from poor to good condition if it is replaced. The deck area of possible replacement in the next 10 years was calculated.
Statewide Performance Targets for Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition		
B7	Baseline: Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	2.2
B8	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	4.5
B9	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	6.0
B10	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for the Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	The majority of NHS bridges in poor condition have an NBI value of 4 (2.1%). From 2002 through 2016, ODOT targeted the reduction in poor bridges through the OTIA III Program using bonded funding for strengthening and limited replacements, and using Major Bridge Maintenance for strengthening and repair. The percent poor has been reduced from 7.7% in 2009 to the current 2.2%. The majority of bridges that were poor are now fair and could move back to poor in the next few years. A bridge can only move from poor to good condition if it is replaced. Based on projections of the number of bridges moving to poor condition needing replacement, rather than continually repairing, the deck area of the resulting poor is projected to increase slightly rather than decrease.
Optional Additional Bridge Performance Target #1 [23 CFR 490.105(e)(3)]		

B11	Additional Target: Which measure are you establishing an optional additional target? Percentage of deck area of Bridges on the NHS classified as in:	
B12	Area(s) for Target: Indicate what area(s) the State DOT is establishing this additional target for (UZA stands for Urbanized Area).	
B13	UZA(s): If this target is for a single UZA or group of UZAs, indicate which UZA(s) are included in this target. This field is not applicable if the target is for the statewide urbanized area (all UZAs) or the non-UZA area (Statewide Rural and Small Urban Areas).	N/A
B14	Baseline: Provide the baseline condition for the selected measure in this target area. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	
B15	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the selected measure in this target area for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	
B16	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the selected measure in this target area for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	
B17	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the selected measure in this target area. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets. Also include the source of the urbanized dataset used to establish the targets. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(D)]	N/A

Reliability

Overview: Travel Time Reliability Performance		
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 baseline performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	N/C
R2	Relationship to Performance Expectations in Other Plans and National Goals: Discuss how the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for the NHS Travel Time Reliability performance measures [23 CFR 490.105(c)(4)] support expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan required by 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the long-range statewide transportation plan, and other relevant planning and programing documents. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(C)]	Current goals and objectives are identified in the following statewide plans: • Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) (https://www.oregon.gov/odot//Planning/Pages/Plans.aspx) • Oregon Transportation Commission's Strategic Action Plan (https://www.oregon.gov/odot/SAPDocs/Strategic-Action-Plan.pdfx). Obectives identified within these plans include optimizing system performance and efficiency, which specifically calls out congestion relief and improving reliability. ODOT implements performance-based planning and programming through the Agency modal plans. (See the OTP webpage above for more details.)
Statewide Performance Targets for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable		
R3	Baseline: Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	83.0
R4	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	78.0
R5	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	78.0
R6	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for the Percent of the Person-miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	A trend analysis was conducted on the historic values [2018 – 2025] of the subject performance measure—to estimate [plausible] values within the performance period. Other congestion information [from the Statewide Congestion Overview report] was reviewed for a fuller understanding of current congestion levels across the State. These levels were in line with the trend analysis. Congestion impacts of anticipated major construction projects were qualitatively assessed by expert judgement. It was determined that

		these impacts would not significantly change estimates from the trend analysis. Population forecasts were reviewed—and also determined not to significantly change estimates from the trend analysis. The trend analysis indicated increased congestion levels—but within the range that would not warrant a change to previous target values. Assessed influencing factors (major projects, population growth) were also not at levels to warrant changes. Thus, the technical recommendation was to retain previous targets. ODOT anticipates using the same [general] technical approach for future target setting—but with the best available information [latest performance measure values, congestion information in the updated Statewide Congestion Overview, population forecasts, etc.].
Statewide Performance Targets for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non- Interstate NHS That Are Reliable		
R7	Baseline: Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	90.0
R8	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	78.0
R9	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	78.0
R10	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for the Percent of the Person-miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	A trend analysis was conducted on the historic values [2018 – 2025] of the subject performance measure—to estimate [plausible] values within the performance period. Other congestion information [from the Statewide Congestion Overview report] was reviewed for a fuller understanding of current congestion levels across the State. These levels were in line with the trend analysis. Congestion impacts of anticipated major construction projects were qualitatively assessed by expert judgement. It was determined that these impacts would not significantly change estimates from the trend analysis. Population forecasts were reviewed—and also determined

		not to significantly change estimates from the trend analysis. The trend analysis indicated increased congestion levels—but within the range that would not warrant a change to previous target values. Assessed influencing factors (major projects, population growth) were also not at levels to warrant changes. Thus, the technical recommendation was to retain previous targets. ODOT anticipates using the same [general] technical approach for future target setting—but with the best available information [latest performance measure values, congestion information in the updated Statewide Congestion Overview, population forecasts, etc.].
Optional Additional Reliability Performance Target #1 [23 CFR 490.105(e)(3)]		
R11	Additional Target: Which measure are you establishing optional additional targets? Percentage of Person-miles Traveled on the: (Optional)	
R12	Area(s) for Target: Indicate what area(s) the State DOT is establishing this additional target for (UZA stands for Urbanized Area).	
R13	UZA(s): If this target is for a single UZA or group of UZAs, indicate which UZA(s) are included in this target. This field is not applicable if the target is for the statewide urbanized area (all UZAs) or the non-UZA area (Statewide Rural and Small Urban Areas).	N/A
R14	Baseline: Provide the baseline performance for the selected measure in this target area. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	0.0
R15	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the selected measure in this target area for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	0.0
R16	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the selected measure in this target area for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	0.0
R17	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the selected measure in ths target area. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets. Also include the source of the urbanized dataset used to establish the targets. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(D)]	N/A

Freight

Overview: Freight Reliability (Movement) Performance		
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 baseline performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	N/C
F2	Truck Freight Bottlenecks: Attach a PDF document listing locations of truck freight bottlenecks within the State, including those identified in the National Freight Strategic Plan. If the State DOT has prepared a State Freight Plan under 49 U.S.C. 70202, within the last 2 years, then it may serve as the basis for identifying truck freight bottlenecks. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(E)]	Yes, document was uploaded in the Attachment tab.
F2a	If the required document was not included in this biennial reporting, provide an explanation.	
F3	Relationship to Performance Expectations in Other Plans and National Goals: Discuss how the 2-year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the freight movement on the Interstate System performance measure [23 CFR 490.105(c)(6)] support expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan required by 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the long-range statewide transportation plan, and other relevant planning and programing documents. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(C)]	The economic vitality of Oregon is strongly linked to the transportation system performance, especially in the Portland Metropolitan region. Portland serves as an economic hub for the state and the interstate system plays a key role in current and future economic vitality. This region experiences the majority of challenges related to reliability, which impacts freight movement coming in, going out and through the state. Regional performance is monitored in detail in the ODOT Portland Region Traffic Performance Report, which includes using emerging data sources and tracking metrics in the area of congestion, commodity flows, bottlenecks, reliability, and safety. (https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Projects/Project%20Documents/TPR-2020.pdf).
Statewide Performance Targets for the Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index		
F4	Baseline: Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	1.34
F5	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Truck Travel Time Reliability Index for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	1.45
F6	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Truck Travel Time Reliability Index for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	1.45
F7	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for the Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	A trend analysis was conducted on the historic values [2018 – 2025] of the subject performance measure—to estimate [plausible] values within the performance period. Other congestion information [from the Statewide Congestion Overview report] was reviewed for a fuller

		understanding of current congestion levels across the State. These levels were in line with the trend analysis. Congestion impacts of anticipated major construction projects were qualitatively assessed by expert judgement. It was determined that these impacts would not significantly change estimates from the trend analysis. Population forecasts were reviewed—and also determined not to significantly change estimates from the trend analysis. The trend analysis indicated increased congestion levels—but within the range that would not warrant a change to previous target values. Assessed influencing factors (major projects, population growth) were also not at levels to warrant changes. Thus, the technical recommendation was to retain previous targets. ODOT anticipates using the same [general] technical approach for future target setting—but with the best available information [latest performance measure values, congestion information in the updated Statewide Congestion Overview, population forecasts, etc.].
Optional Additional Freight Reliability Performance Target (TTTR) #1 [23 CFR 490.105(e)(3)]		
F8	Additional Target: Are you establishing optional targets for Freight Reliability Performance?	No
F9	Area(s) for Target: Indicate what area(s) the State DOT is establishing this additional target for (UZA stands for Urbanized Area).	
F10	UZA(s): If this target is for a single UZA or group of UZAs, indicate which UZA(s) are included in this target. This field is not applicable if the target is for the statewide urbanized area (all UZAs) or the non-UZA area (Statewide Rural and Small Urban Areas).	N/A
F11	Baseline: Provide the baseline performance for this measure in this target area. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	
F12	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the measure in this target area for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	
F13	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the measure in this target area for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	
F14	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the measure in this target area. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets. Also include	N/A

	the source of the urbanized dataset used to establish the target. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(D)]	

Peak Hour Excess Delay (PHED)

Overview: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) Per Capita Performance		
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 baseline 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		
D3	Urbanized Area:	Eugene, OR
D4	Note: Two performance measures are related to traffic congestion: the annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita (PHED) measure and the percent of non-single occupancy vehicle (non-SOV) measure. This question is asked for each UZA on the PHED tab only, but it also applies to the UZAs on the non-SOV tab. The response provided on the PHED tab should encompass both measures. Relationship to Performance Expectations in Other Plans and National Goals: Discuss how the 2-year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the traffic congestion performance measures for this UZA [23 CFR 490.105(c)(7)] support expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan required by 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the long-range statewide transportation plan, and other relevant planning and programing documents. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(C)]	The Central Lane MPO (CLMPO) adopted its 2049 Regional Transportation Plan and Congestion Management Process in December 2025. The PHED targets directly support two of the the RTP goals: 1. ""Reliability and Efficiency"" goal which states: The region prioritizes a range of travel options to manage and optimize the transportation system and ease congestion so people and goods can reliably and efficiently reach their destinations. This goal applies to the NHS. Objectives and actions supporting this goal include increased active transportation modes, leveraging technology (including ITS) to increase efficiency for all travel modes, and reduce the impact of roadway incidents. 2. ""Transportation Choices"" goal which states: People throughout the region have access to affordable, healthy, active, and shared transportation options that safely and conveniently connect them with their destinations while reducing reliance on driving alone and minimizing transportation related pollution. CLMPO supports and encourages non-SOV travel through transportation options and Safe Routes to Schools programming, as well as infrastructure and safety projects that demonstratively work towards a reduction in non-SOV travel. These goals, objectives, and actions directly support the long-term national congestion reduction performance goal and are tied to CLMPO's project and decision making framework.

D5	Report the agencies that established the unified Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita target for this urbanized area. Use a semicolon to separate multiple agencies. (Optional)	N/A
D6	Baseline: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita in this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	4.9
D7	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita in this UZA for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(A)]	8.5
D8	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita in this UZA for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(A)]	9.0
D9	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita in this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets. Also include the source of the urbanized dataset used to establish the targets. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(D)]	The RITIS platform was used to examine the PHED data available. CLMPO staff presented the data to its Technical Advisory Committee and then Policy board and discussed the past data and likely trends over the next four years coupled with goals, objectives, projects and programs aimed at addressing congestion and decreasing non-SOV travel. The targets were adopted September 2026.
Urbanized Area Target #2 - Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita		
D10	Urbanized Area:	Salem, OR
D11	Note: Two performance measures are related to traffic congestion: the annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita (PHED) measure and the percent of non-single occupancy vehicle (non-SOV) measure. This question is asked for each UZA on the PHED tab only, but it also applies to the UZAs on the non-SOV tab. The response provided on the PHED tab should encompass both measures. Relationship to Performance Expectations in Other Plans and National Goals: Discuss how the 2-year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the traffic congestion performance measures for this UZA [23 CFR 490.105(c)(7)] support expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan required by 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the long-range statewide transportation plan, and other relevant planning and programing documents. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(C)]	Goals and objectives in the SKATS Metropolitan Transportation Plan (adopted May 2023 and currently being updated) support minimizing the increase in congestion on the regional road system (including the NHS). The project evaluation process uses criteria based on the MTP goals to determine whether the project addresses each goal (see Appendix C for discussion of this process). The projects in the long-range plan support the use of all modes and efficient movement of vehicular traffic. Additionally, SKATS provides funds to support the Salem Area Mass Transit District's Transportation Options program, which encourages people to use non-SOV means to meet their daily needs (including telecommuting). SKATS also provides funds to the Regional Traffic Signal Control Center which operates the signals on the NHS routes to reduce delay caused by traffic signals.
D12	Report the agencies that established the unified Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita target for this urbanized area. Use a semicolon to separate multiple agencies. (Optional)	The Salem-Keizer Area Transportation Study (SKATS) set the target after initial discussions with ODOT, review and discussion by the SKATS

		Technical Advisory Committee, and discussion, modification, and approval by the SKATS Policy Committee (Resolution 26-13).
D13	Baseline: Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita in this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	7.2
D14	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita in this UZA for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(A)]	7.5
D15	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita in this UZA for the Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(A)]	7.7
D16	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita in this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets. Also include the source of the urbanized dataset used to establish the targets. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(D)]	The two-year and four-year targets for PHED were developed using the RITIS platform to understand the historical trends. Initial targets were developed and discussed with ODOT. These targets were then reviewed and modified by the SKATS Technical Advisory Committee before being discussed, modified, and approved by the SKATS Policy Committee. Both the two-year and four-year targets take into consideration the roadway projects on the NHS that will be under construction in the next four years that could contribute to Excessive Delay, and the post-2020 increase in the percentage of workers who work-from-home one or more days a week. These targets are supported by investments in the Salem Area Mass Transit District's Transportation Options program which encourages people to use non-SOV means of travel, including telecommuting, and in the Regional Traffic Signal Control Center. These programs help reduce the increase in congestion on the NHS (and other roads) and bring secondary benefits as well.

Percent of Non-SOV Travel

Overview: Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel Performance		
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 baseline 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		
T3	Urbanized Area:	Eugene, OR
T4	Note: Two performance measures are related to traffic congestion: the annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita (PHED) measure and the percent of non-single occupancy vehicle (non-SOV) measure. This question is asked for each UZA on the PHED tab only, but it also applies to the UZAs on the non-SOV tab. The response provided on the PHED tab should encompass both measures. The response cannot be changed on the Non-SOV tab. Relationship to Performance Expectations in Other Plans and National Goals: Discuss how the 2- year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the traffic congestion performance measures for this UZA [23 CFR 490.105(c)(7)], support expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan required by 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the long-range statewide transportation plan, and other relevant planning and programing documents. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(C)]	See Response in D4
T5	Report the agencies that established the unified Non-SOV target for this urbanized area. Use a semicolon to separate multiple agencies. (Optional)	N/A
T6	Method: Provide the data collection method for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel measure. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(I)]	Method A - American Community Survey
T6a	Please provide a brief description of the method used for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel measure if Method B or Method C were selected above. [23 CFR 490.709 (f)(2)]	
T7	Baseline: Percent of Non-SOV Travel. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(C)]	35.4
T8	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	35.0
T9	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	37.0
T10	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel in this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets. Also include the source of the urbanized dataset used to establish the targets. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(D)]	Data from the five-year ACS for the Eugene (OR) urbanized area (table S0801) were examined to understand the trend. CLMPO staff presented the data to its Technical Advisory Committee and then Policy board and discussed the past data and likely trends over the next four years (considering strong regional support and focus on increasing

		non-SOV travel and the projects in and not in the pipeline). The targets were adopted in September 2026.
Urbanized Area Target #2 - Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel		
T11	Urbanized Area:	Salem, OR
T12	Note: Two performance measures are related to traffic congestion: the annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita (PHED) measure and the percent of non-single occupancy vehicle (non-SOV) measure. This question is asked for each UZA on the PHED tab only, but it also applies to the UZAs on the non-SOV tab. The response provided on the PHED tab should encompass both measures. The response cannot be changed on the Non-SOV tab. Relationship to Performance Expectations in Other Plans and National Goals: Discuss how the 2- year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the traffic congestion performance measures for this UZA [23 CFR 490.105(c)(7)], support expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan required by 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the long-range statewide transportation plan, and other relevant planning and programing documents. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(C)]	See Response in D11
T13	Report the agencies that established the unified Non-SOV target for this urbanized area. Use a semicolon to separate multiple agencies. (Optional)	The Salem-Keizer Area Transportation Study (SKATS) set the target after initial discussions with ODOT, review and discussion by the SKATS Technical Advisory Committee, and discussion and approval by the SKATS Policy Committee (Resolution 26-14).
T14	Method: Provide the data collection method for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel measure. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(I)]	Method A - American Community Survey
T14a	Please provide a brief description of the method used for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel measure if Method B or Method C were selected above. [23 CFR 490.709 (f)(2)]	
T15	Baseline: Percent of Non-SOV Travel. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(C)]	31.9
T16	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	30.0
T17	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	30.0
T18	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for the Percent of Non-SOV Travel in this UZA. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets. Also include the source of the urbanized dataset used to establish the targets. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(D)]	The two-year and four-year targets for non-SOV were developed after reviewing both five-year and one-year travel to work data from the American Community Survey to understand the historical trends. Initial targets were developed and discussed with ODOT. These targets were then reviewed by the SKATS Technical Advisory Committee before being discussed, and approved by the SKATS Policy Committee. Both the two-year and

		four-year targets take into consideration the roadway projects on the NHS that will be under construction in the next four years that could contribute to more people reducing their SOV travel (especially to work), and the post-2020 increase in the percentage of workers who work-from-home one or more days a week. These targets are supported by investments in the Salem Area Mass Transit District's Transportation Options program which encourages people to use non-SOV means of travel, including telecommuting. These help reduce the increase in congestion on the NHS (and other roads) and bring secondary benefits as well.

Emissions

Overview: Total Emission Reduction Performance		
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 baseline performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	"The baseline calculations do not include projects with qualitative methodology, that continued from prior years, or that had CMAQ funds de-obligated, per federal CMAQ database parameters. Due to ODOT shifting much of the selection process to the MPOs, some of the changes that may impact target setting include: 1. ODOT provides a narrow list of eligible project types, MPOs and local agencies are ultimately responsible for identifying CMAQ projects for funding, rather than ODOT. Forecasting accurately what projects MPOs and local agencies might bring to ODOT for approval in addition to those already programmed is uncertain at best. Other limitations for estimating air quality targets include the following: 2. Certain projects provide high air quality benefits but are highly infrequent, such as street sweepers. The infrequent nature of these projects makes it difficult to accurately forecast future targets. 3. Emission rates for pollutants used for baseline emissions are higher - particularly for CO - than for projects programmed for future years because of EPA regulations for vehicle engines and fuels have significantly reduced vehicle emissions. Estimated emissions benefits therefore are declining from one STIP cycle to the next for the same project types.
E2	Relationship to Performance Expectations in Other Plans and National Goals: Discuss how the 2- year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for the on-road mobile source emissions measures [23 CFR 490.105(c)(8)] support expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan required by 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the long-range statewide transportation plan, and other relevant planning and programing documents. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(C)]	The targets are based on the projects that ODOT anticipates occuring in the 4 year period. The 2 year target is half of the 4 year target. Projects reduce emissions and support mode shift and align with ODOT Transportation Plan goals. The emission reductions targets support 2023 OTP Goal 6 for 'Health and Environment' where transportation options support a healthier natural and build environments by reducing air

		quality emissions reduction. The goal includes policies and strategies that support reduction of environmental impacts and improvement of health through transportation options.
E3	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM2.5?	Yes
E4	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?	Yes - NOx ONLY
E5	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM10?	Yes
E6	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
E7	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for CO?	Yes
E8	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for ozone?	No
Statewide Total Emission Reduction PM2.5 Target #1		
E12	Baseline: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(D)]	77.187
E13	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5 for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	0.000
E14	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the cumulative emissions reductions(total daily kilograms) of PM2.5 for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] and [23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	0.000
E15	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	In Oregon, there are two PM2.5 Maintenance/Nonattainment areas located in rural areas. The two areas infrequently use CMAQ dollars to fund projects. Neither Klamath Falls nor Oakridge have projects in the 27-30 STIP so we have no projects to create a target from.
Statewide Total Emission Reduction NOx Target #2		
E16	Baseline: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(D)]	0.000
E17	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	0.000
E18	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	0.000
E19	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	In Oregon, Klamath Falls is the only area required to quantify NOx as part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP), all other nonattainment and maintenance areas do not. For the 27-30 STIP there are no

		projects in Klamath Falls in which to create a target from.
Statewide Total Emission Reduction VOC Target #3		
E20	Baseline: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(D)]	
E21	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] and [23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	
E22	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] and [23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	
E23	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	
Statewide Total Emission Reduction PM10 Target #4		
E24	Baseline: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(D)]	295.831
E25	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10 for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	0.350
E26	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10 for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	0.700
E27	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	The 4-year total emission reduction targets are based on the sum of emissions reductions from anticipated projects planned in the 27-30 STIP. The 2-year target values are set as one-half of the 4-year target.
Statewide Total Emission Reduction CO Target #5		
E28	Baseline: Estimated cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(D)]	7.013
E29	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	0.000
E30	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO for the current Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	14.200
E31	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4- year targets established for the Performance Period for emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	The 4-year total emission reduction targets are based on the sum of emissions reductions from anticipated projects planned in the 27-30 STIP. We did not set a 2-year target due to projects that have CO benefit not starting until after 2028.
Optional Additional Emission Reduction Target #1 [23 CFR 490.105(e)(9)(iv)]		

E32	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 baseline performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. (Optional)	N/A
E33	What pollutant does this optional additional target apply to?	N/A
E34	Area(s) for Target: Indicate what non-attainment and maintenance area or combination of areas that the State DOT is establishing this additional target. List the area name(s) as it appears in the EPA Green Book. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(9)(iv)] Separate multiple names using semicolons.	N/A
E35	Baseline: Provide the baseline estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of the pollutant for the selected non-attainment and maintenance area or combination of areas. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(D)]	0.000
E36	2-year Target: Provide the 2-year target for the cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the applicable pollutant for the current Performance Period for the selected non-attainment and maintenance area or combination of areas. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	0.000
E37	4-year Target: Provide the 4-year target for the cumulative emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the applicable pollutant for the current Performance Period for the selected non-attainment and maintenance area or combination of areas. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	0.000
E38	Basis for Targets: Provide a discussion of the basis for the 2-year and 4-year targets established for the Performance Period for emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the applicable pollutant for the current Performance Period for the selected non-attainment and maintenance area or combination of areas. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] This includes an explanation of any data, method(s), or process(s) used individually or in combination to identify the targets.	N/A

Attachments

S.No	Section	Attachment Name
0	Freight	2026_BPP_OR_Freight_Oregon_Freight_Highway_Bottleneck.pdf