

Transportation Performance Management
State Biennial Performance Report
for Performance Period 2018-2021

2020

**MID PERFORMANCE PERIOD
(MPP) PROGRESS REPORT**

Oregon

Report Due: 10/1/2020
Report Status: Accepted
Report Updated On:
Report Exported on 12/3/2020

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.state.or.us

Summary of Performance Measures and Targets

Performance Measures	Baseline	2-Year Condition/ Performance	2-Year Target	4-Year Target	4-Year Adjustment
Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Good Condition		64.4%		35.0%	
Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Poor Condition		0.2%		0.5%	
Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition	63.9%	65.9%	50.0%	50.0%	
Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition (Full Distress + IRI)					
Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition	6.6%	6.6%	10.0%	10.0%	
Percentage of Pavements of the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition (Full Distress + IRI)					
Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Good Condition	12.4%	13.2%	11.4%	10.0%	
Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Poor Condition	1.9%	1.9%	2.4%	3.0%	
Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable	80.9%	83.8%	78.0%	78.0%	
Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable		87.9%		78.0%	
Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index	1.39	1.37	1.45	1.45	
Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita: Urbanized Area 1					
Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel: Urbanized Area 1					
Total Emission Reductions: PM2.5	0.450	0.000	0.120	0.230	
Total Emission Reductions: NOx		0.000			
Total Emission Reductions: VOC					
Total Emission Reductions: PM10	520.470	98.330	363.000		
Total Emission Reductions: CO	3618.440	95.830	584.000	1168.000	

Overview

OVERVIEW SECTION 1

Question No	Description	Field Type
O1	Please provide a discussion on the effectiveness of the investment strategies developed and documented in the State asset management plan for the National Highway System (NHS) required under [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(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. 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 system performance for the PM 3 measures.
O2	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. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	N/C

OVERVIEW SECTION 2

Question No	Description	Field Type
O3	Who should FHWA contact with questions?	Philip Kase
O4	What is the phone number for this contact? <i>Please provide 10-digit number (area code and phone number) without formatting. (e.g., 1234567890)</i>	5039100288
O5	What is the email address for this contact?	philip.j.kase@odot.state.or.us

Pavement

Pavement Performance Overview

Question No	Description	Field Type
P1	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. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	The Oregon Department of Transportation has used performance measures for more than 25 years to track the agency's performance at meeting a series of transportation-related benchmarks, including public safety, asset condition, livability, and economic prosperity. The National Goals and Performance Measures established under MAP-21 are consistent with Oregon's transportation performance measures, however discrepancies exist between the state and national performance measures in terms of the scope of assets considered and condition metrics. To address the challenge of overlapping state and federal performance measures and targets and how they impact agency decision-making, ODOT's policy is to continue to emphasize the central role of state performance measures in shaping bridge and pavement investment decisions and project selection. ODOT's process for selecting investments is aimed at achieving a more complex set of performance measures that are intended to result in a balanced program across many competing needs rather than solely meeting the limited scope of the national performance measures pertaining to asset condition. This continued focus on, and prioritization of, state performance measures is anticipated to have the practical effect of meeting the more narrow scope of the national performance measures and targets for NHS bridges and pavements.

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

Question No	Description	Field Type
P2	The 2-year statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition. This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] <i>For the 2018-2021 Performance Period, this 2-year condition value will be used as the baseline value for this measure per</i>	64.4

	<i>the phase-in of new requirements for this measure. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(7)(iii)]</i>	
P3	The 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	35.0
P4	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
P4a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition. The adjusted target should reflect expected condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] <i>The adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.313(f)(2)]</i>	
P4b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	

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

Question No	Description	Field Type
P5	The 2-year statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition. This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] <i>For the 2018-2021 Performance Period, this 2-year condition value will be used as the baseline value for this measure per the phase-in of new requirements for this measure. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(7)(iii)]</i>	0.2
P6	The 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	0.5
P7	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
P7a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition. The adjusted target should reflect expected	

	<p>condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</p> <p><i>This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5 [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.313(f)(3)]</i></p>	
P7b	<p>Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</p>	

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

Question No	Description	Field Type
P8	<p>The baseline statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition. This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]</p> <p><i>For the first performance period, FHWA calculated this value using IRI only (or PSR values for road sections where speed is less than 40 mph). [23 CFR 490.313(e)]</i></p>	63.9
P9	<p>The 2-year statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition. This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)]</p> <p><i>For the first performance period, FHWA calculated this value using IRI only (or PSR values for road sections where speed is less than 40 mph). [23 CFR 490.313(e)]</i></p>	65.9
P10	<p>If the State DOT reported its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition based on “Full Distress + IRI” data in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, FHWA has calculated an actual condition level using “Full Distress + IRI” data. [23 CFR 490.313 (c) and (d)]</p> <p><i>When a State DOT reported the 2-year target based on “Full Distress + IRI” data, FHWA will use this value to determine whether the actual condition level is equal to or better than the established 2-year target as part of the 2-year significant progress determination. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(2)(ii)]</i></p>	
P11	<p>The 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]</p>	50.0
P12	<p>Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition. At</p>	For the Non-Interstate NHS Pavement Condition Measures, the first performance period from 2018

	<p>a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year condition with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</p> <p><i>For State DOTs that established a 2-year target using IRI only, the baseline value (P8), actual condition calculated with IRI only (P9), and the 2-year target (P11) all use the same metrics and can be compared to each other.</i></p> <p><i>State DOTs that established a 2-year target using “Full Distress + IRI” will see an actual condition value in both P9 and P10. These values must be used correctly in order to provide a meaningful discussion of progress. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</i></p> <p><i>-The actual condition calculated with IRI only (P9) is ONLY comparable to the baseline value calculated with IRI only (P8).</i></p> <p><i>-The actual condition calculated with “Full Distress + IRI” (P10) is ONLY comparable to the State DOT’s 2-year target established based on “Full distress + IRI” (P11).</i></p>	<p>to 2021 is a "transition" period using IRI values only. For future performance periods, condition for Non-Interstate Pavements will be based on full distress and IRI. The 2-year target was set by analyzing historical IRI data from 2008 to 2016 where Percent Good ranged from 50 to 65%. A long term declining condition trend is expected. Pavement funding levels have remained flat while project costs have increased, reducing the number of miles repaired. At the same time, the pavement inventory continues to age and deteriorate, increasing the number of miles needing repair. Lack of familiarity with the new federal performance measures, combined with the target values for the first performance period being in transition, led ODOT to select conservative 2-Year and 4-year target values of 50.0% which is on the lower end of the actual historic range since 2008. The actual 2-year Percent Good condition is 65.9%, which is above the baseline condition of 63.9% and above the 2-year target of 50%. This increase is believed to be a temporary blip resulting from early delivery of Keep Oregon Moving (HB 2017) funded pavement projects, which was enacted after the 2-year target was set. Even with the additional investments from HB2017, the pavement program is underfunded, but these additional investments will help slow the decline of pavement conditions. Because the IRI based targets are temporary for the first performance period and new target values based on full distress and IRI will be established for future performance periods, no adjustment to the 2-year IRI only target is planned.</p>
P13	<p>The 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]</p>	50.0
P14	<p>Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]</p>	No
P14a	<p>Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide</p>	

	<p>percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition. The adjusted target should reflect expected condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</p> <p><i>This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.313(f)(4)]</i></p>	
P14b	<p>Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</p>	
P15	<p>Please provide a summary of prior accomplishments and planned activities that will be conducted during the remainder of the performance period to make significant progress toward achievement of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(F)]</p>	<p>The Pavement Program's overall goal is to keep highways in the best condition possible with available funding, by taking a life-cycle cost approach to preservation and maintenance. 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. Over the period between baseline and 2-year measures, approximately 270 Non-Interstate NHS state highway lane miles per year were paved and another 280 lane miles per year were chip sealed. While the chip seal mileage is on pace with a sustainable pavement program as outlined in Oregon's Transportation Asset Management Plan, the paving mileage falls short of the 400 lane mile goal for Non-Interstate NHS state highway state of good repair. This shortfall is due to lack of available funding to keep up with needs over the entire state highway system. Because of 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. State highway pavement preservation investments prioritize pavement</p>

		<p>conditions by state highway classification into four levels</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Interstate Highways (highest priority, condition target, and level of investment) 2) Fix-It Priority Routes (e.g., US-97, OR-58, or US-26) 3) Remaining State Level NHS Routes (e.g., US-101) 4) Region and District Level Non-NHS Routes
P16	Are there any extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	No
P16a	Please select the extenuating circumstance(s) that apply. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
P16b	Please explain the extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide 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)(2)(ii)(G)]	

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

Question No	Description	Field Type
P17	<p>The baseline statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition. This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]</p> <p><i>For the first performance period, FHWA calculated this value using IRI only (or PSR values for road sections where speed is less than 40 mph). [23 CFR 490.313(e)]</i></p>	6.6
P18	<p>The 2-year statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition. This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)]</p> <p><i>For the first performance period, FHWA calculated this value using IRI only (or PSR values for road sections where speed is less than 40 mph). [23 CFR 490.313(e)]</i></p>	6.6
P19	<p>If the State DOT reported its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition based on "Full Distress + IRI" data in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, FHWA has calculated an actual condition level using "Full Distress + IRI" data. [23 CFR 490.313 (c) and (d)]</p> <p><i>When a State DOT reported the 2-year target based on "Full Distress + IRI" data, FHWA will use this value to determine</i></p>	

	<i>whether the actual condition level is equal to or better than the established 2-year target as part of the 2-year significant progress determination. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(2)(ii)]</i>	
P20	The 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	10.0
P21	<p>Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition. At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year condition with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</p> <p><i>For State DOTs that established a 2-year target using IRI only, the baseline value (P8), actual condition calculated with IRI only (P9), and the 2-year target (P11) all use the same metrics and can be compared to each other.</i></p> <p><i>State DOTs that established a 2-year target using “Full Distress + IRI” will see an actual condition value in both P9 and P10. These values must be used correctly in order to provide a meaningful discussion of progress. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</i></p> <p><i>-The actual condition calculated with IRI only (P9) is ONLY comparable to the baseline value calculated with IRI only (P8).</i></p> <p><i>-The actual condition calculated with “Full Distress + IRI” (P10) is ONLY comparable to the State DOT’s 2-year target established based on “Full distress + IRI” (P11).</i></p>	<p>As discussed under the Non-Interstate NHS Percent Good section, the first performance period from 2018 to 2021 is a "transition" period using IRI values only. For future performance periods, condition for Non-Interstate Pavements will be based on full distress and IRI. The 2-year target was set by analyzing historical IRI data from 2008 to 2016 where Percent Poor ranged from 6.5% to 8.5%. A long term declining condition trend is expected. Pavement funding levels have remained flat while project costs have increased, reducing the number of miles repaired. At the same time, the pavement inventory continues to age and deteriorate, increasing the number of miles needing repair. Lack of familiarity with the new federal performance measures, combined with the target values for the first performance period being in transition, led ODOT to select conservative 2-Year and 4-year target values of 10.0% which is slightly worse than the upper end of the actual historic range since 2008. The actual 2-year Percent Poor condition is 6.6%, which matches the baseline condition of 6.6% and is below the 2-year target of 10%. Although pavement conditions are expected to decline in the future, an increase in poor mileage hasn't occurred to date. As noted in the Non-Interstate NHS Good discussion, Keep Oregon Moving (HB 2017) funded pavement projects, which was enacted after the 2-year target was set, likely had an effect. Because the IRI based targets are temporary for the first performance period and new target values based on full distress and IRI will be established for future performance periods, no adjustment to the 2-year IRI only</p>

		target is planned.
P22	The 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	10.0
P23	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
P23a	<p>Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition. The adjusted target should reflect expected condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</p> <p><i>This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5 [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.313(f)(5)]</i></p>	
P23b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	
P24	Please provide a summary of prior accomplishments and planned activities that will be conducted during the remainder of the performance period to make significant progress toward achievement of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(F)]	The Pavement Program's overall goal is to keep highways in the best condition possible with available funding, by taking a life-cycle cost approach to preservation and maintenance. 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. Over the period between baseline and 2-year measures, approximately 270 Non-Interstate NHS state highway lane miles per year were paved and another 280 lane miles per year were chip sealed. While the chip seal mileage is on pace with a sustainable pavement program as outlined in Oregon's Transportation Asset Management Plan, the paving mileage falls short of the 400 lane mile goal for Non-Interstate NHS state highway state of good repair. This shortfall is due to lack of available funding to keep up with needs over the entire state

		<p>highway system. Because of 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. State highway pavement preservation investments prioritize pavement conditions by state highway classification into four levels</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Interstate Highways (highest priority, condition target, and level of investment) 2) Fix-It Priority Routes (e.g., US-97, OR-58, or US-26) 3) Remaining State Level NHS Routes (e.g., US-101) 4) Region and District Level Non-NHS Routes
P25	Are there any extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	No
P25a	Please select the extenuating circumstance(s) that apply. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
P25b	Please explain the extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide 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)(2)(ii)(G)]	

Bridge

Bridge Performance Overview

Question No	Description	Field Type
B1	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. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	N/C

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

Question No	Description	Field Type
B2	The baseline statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition. <i>This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]</i>	12.4
B3	The 2-year statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition. <i>This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)]</i>	13.2
B4	The 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	11.4
B5	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition. <i>At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year condition achieved (based on data contained within the National Bridge Inventory as of June 15, 2020, and made available by FHWA) with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</i>	ODOT has more Good bridges than the percentage set in the 2 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. When considering the structures leaving Good condition and new and replacement structures entering the population as Good structures there would be a net decrease in bridges in Good condition from the baseline percentage. However, inspectors reevaluate structures every year. There were structures that were Fair, but just barely over the Good-Fair border, and the reevaluation placed many 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.
B6	The 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	10.0
B7	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
B7a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition. <i>The adjusted target should reflect expected condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</i> <i>This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5 [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.409(c)(1)]</i>	
B7b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	
B8	Please provide a summary of prior accomplishments and planned activities that will be conducted during the remainder of the performance period to make significant progress toward achievement of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(F)]	Although it appears that ODOT will be able to meet the 4 year target without taking further action, we will eventually lose ground as ODOT replaces only 2-3 aging structures annually changing fair or poor condition bridges to good.
B9	Are there any extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	No
B9a	Please select the extenuating circumstance(s) that apply. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
B9b	Please explain the extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide 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)(2)(ii)(G)]	

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

Question No	Description	Field Type
B10	The baseline statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition. <i>This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]</i>	1.9
B11	The 2-year statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition. <i>This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)]</i>	1.9
B12	The 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	2.4
B13	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition. <i>At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year condition achieved (based on data contained within the National Bridge Inventory as of June 15, 2020, and made available by FHWA) with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</i>	The total deck area of bridges in the inventory was increased with the addition of several new bridges added as part of a modernization project. These new bridges are all in Good condition. The result of this increase, while not changing the deck area of Poor bridges, did result in the reduction of the percent of the total deck area the Poor bridges represent. This added increase of Good bridges on the NHS resulted in the target for Poor bridges being exceeded. With the addition of some Poor bridges being replaced, the offset of the amount of bridges deteriorating from Fair to Poor lead to a net decrease in the amount of Poor structures even compared to the baseline.
B14	The 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	3.0
B15	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
B15a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition.	

	<p><i>The adjusted target should reflect expected condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</i></p> <p><i>This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5 [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.409(c)(2)]</i></p>	
B15b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	
B16	Please provide a summary of prior accomplishments and planned activities that will be conducted during the remainder of the performance period to make significant progress toward achievement of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(F)]	Replacements and bridges new to the inventory have allowed us to reduce the percentage of Poor bridges by deck area to below that of what it was at the baseline. Although it appears we could meet or exceed the 4 year target for Poor structures without further action, we will continue replacing some structures and performing repairs on others which will improve their condition.
B17	Are there any extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	No
B17a	Please select the extenuating circumstance(s) that apply. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
B17b	Please explain the extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide 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)(2)(ii)(G)]	

Reliability

Travel Time Reliability Performance Overview

Question No	Description	Field Type
R1	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. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	The performance of the Oregon State Highway System is well above the current PM3 target.

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

Question No	Description	Field Type
R2	The baseline statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable. <i>This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]</i>	80.9
R3	The 2-year statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable. <i>This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)]</i>	83.8
R4	The 2-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	78.0
R5	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable. <i>At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</i>	With the addition of several auxillary lanes within the Metro area and improved TSMO technology, the State of Oregon has successfully maintained the target level for "the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable"
R6	The 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	78.0
R7	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
R7a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide	

	<p>percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable.</p> <p><i>The adjusted target should reflect expected condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</i></p> <p><i>This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5 [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.513(b)]</i></p>	
R7b	<p>Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</p>	
R8	<p>Please provide a summary of prior accomplishments and planned activities that will be conducted during the remainder of the performance period to make significant progress toward achievement of the 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(F)]</p>	<p>ODOT continues to invest in Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) / Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSM&O) projects to relieve congestion and improve operations and safety. ODOT expanded our Active Traffic Management System, including vehicle message signs, variable advisory speed signs and traveler information, on four freeway corridors in the Portland metropolitan area (I-5, I-84, I-205 and US 26). We will be expanding this system onto additional sections of the I-5 corridor in the next Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). These projects will reduce congestion and enhance traffic operations and safety throughout the project area. We also completed the construction of five auxiliary lanes (one on I-5 and four on I-205). These Mobility and Congestion Relief projects are intended to relieve existing bottlenecks in each of these freeway corridors. Other strategies, such as expanded and enhanced public transportation, facilities to move more freight by rail and policies that support moving freight during non-rush hours, measures that shift travel out of cars, move trips to other times of the day and eliminate some auto trips altogether and support a multimodal approach are implemented as appropriate. For example, we have a pilot bus on shoulder project on I-205 and we are planning for an</p>

		additional project on I-5 in the near future. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) prepared for the Portland metropolitan area outlines the strategies that will be implemented. Metro, the MPO for the Portland region, is also leading an update to the ten-year regional TSMO Strategy, a sub-section of the RTP, which is focused on system management and operational improvement strategies for key corridors in the region. The Portland region also has a Corridor Bottleneck Operations Study and Active Traffic Management Strategy, which contribute to the development of operational improvements that could be added to the STIP list.
R9	Are there any extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable for the 2018-2021 Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	No
R9a	Please select the extenuating circumstance(s) that apply. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
R9b	Please explain the extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide 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)(2)(ii)(G)]	

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	<p>The 2-year statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable.</p> <p><i>This value is the actual 2-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)]</i></p> <p><i>For the 2018-2021 Performance Period, this 2-year performance value will be used as the baseline value for this measure per the phase-in of new requirements for this measure. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(7)(iii)]</i></p>	87.9
R11	The 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	78.0

R12	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
R12a	<p>Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable.</p> <p><i>The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of the Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</i></p> <p><i>This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5 [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.513(c)]</i></p>	
R12b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	

Freight

Freight Reliability (Movement) Performance Overview

Question No	Description	Field Type
F1	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. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	The performance of the Oregon State Highway System is well above the current PM3 target.
F2	<p>Please 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.</p> <p><i>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 completed. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(D)]</i></p> <p><i>Please upload related document(s) in the "Attachment" tab.</i></p>	<p>ODOT completed a comprehensive study to identify freight truck bottlenecks on the system and thru the Oregon Legislature, has programmed improvements at a couple of the largest bottlenecks in Oregon, primarily in the Portland Metro area. These include the Rose Quarter on I-5, I-205 widening project, I-5 and I-205 Tolling project, as well as starting a new bi-state effort with Washington State for the Interstate Bridge on I-5. In addition in the Portland area, ODOT has embarked on an operational analysis of many of the freeway segments to try and identify smaller operational solutions to help reduce congestion for freight. Across the state we continue to try to address freight bottlenecks thru a combination of TSMO, Demand Management, and some larger scale initiatives as well.</p>

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

Question No	Description	Field Type
F3	<p>The baseline statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index.</p> <p><i>This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]</i></p>	1.39
F4	<p>The 2-year statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index.</p> <p><i>This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)]</i></p>	1.37
F5	<p>The 2-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]</p>	1.45
F6	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward	The State of Oregon has added

	<p>achieving the 2-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index.</p> <p><i>At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</i></p>	<p>improved TSMO techniques within the Metro area to maintain and improve the freight traffic flow on the Interstate system.</p>
F7	<p>The 4-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]</p>	1.45
F8	<p>Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]</p>	No
F8a	<p>Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index.</p> <p><i>The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</i></p> <p><i>This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest hundredth. For example, enter 2.54. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.613(b)]</i></p>	
F8b	<p>Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</p>	
F9	<p>Please provide a summary of prior accomplishments and planned activities that will be conducted during the remainder of the performance period to make significant progress toward achievement of the 4-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(F)]</p>	<p>ODOT completed a comprehensive study to identify freight truck bottlenecks on the system and thru the Oregon Legislature, has programmed improvements at a couple of the largest bottlenecks in Oregon, primarily in the Portland Metro area. These include the Rose Quarter on I-5, I-205 widening project, I-5 and I-205 Tolling project, as well as starting a new bi-state effort with Washington State for the Interstate Bridge on I-5. In addition in the Portland area, ODOT has embarked on an operational analysis of many of the freeway segments to try and identify smaller operational solutions to help reduce congestion for freight. Across the state we continue to try to address freight bottlenecks thru a combination of TSMO, Demand Management, and some larger</p>

		scale initiatives as well.
F10	Are there any extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index for the 2018-2021 Performance Period? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	No
F10a	Please select the extenuating circumstance(s) that apply. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
F10b	Please explain the extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	

Emissions

Emissions Reduction Performance Overview

Question No	Description	Field Type
E1	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. This text may be shared verbatim online. (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. Oregon currently has no non-attainment/maintenance areas (MPOs >1,000,000) responsible for reporting on PHED or Non-SOV, but will beginning in 2022 with MPOs >200,000. ODOT is working with applicable MPOs to develop targets for the second cycle of TPM, and to develop a more strategic approach to CMAQ project selection and implementation better aligned to meet targets.
E2	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM2.5? <i>Note: Based on the response to E2, the State is required to provide a statewide target for annual emissions reductions for PM2.5.</i>	Yes
E3	If the State includes any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM2.5, are NOx and/or VOC a significant contributor to PM2.5 emissions anywhere in the State?	Yes - NOx ONLY
E4	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM10? <i>Note: Based on the response to E4, the State is required to provide a statewide target for annual emissions reductions for PM10.</i>	Yes
E5	If the State includes any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM10, are NOx and/or VOC 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? <i>Note: Based on the response to E6, the State is required to provide a statewide target for annual emissions reductions for CO.</i>	Yes
E7	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for ozone?	No

Statewide Total Emission Reductions PM2.5 Target #1

Question No	Description	Field Type
E11	<p>The baseline emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5.</p> <p><i>This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal Fiscal Years before the start of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]</i></p> <p><i>This value is carried over from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report.</i></p>	0.450
E12	<p>Please provide the current estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(iii)(B)]</p> <p><i>The current data for the performance period must include the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) over the Federal Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.</i></p> <p><i>The data needed to calculate the measure shall come from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a) and 23 CFR 490(b)(2).]</i></p> <p><i>The data must be reported to the nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]</i></p> <p><i>FHWA provided the prepopulated data from the CMAQ Public Access System. If the DOT feels that a different value is appropriate due to an error, please contact the FHWA Division Office in your State.</i></p>	0.000
E13	<p>The 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5 for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]</p>	0.120
E14	<p>Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5.</p> <p><i>At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</i></p>	<p>Oregon did not meet the two year targets. Oregon has had difficulty finding vendors that meet FHWA "Buy America" requirements. Rural cities in non-attainment/maintenance areas have requested street sweepers and school buses to help reduce emissions with their limited allocations. In response, they have changed projects to paving gravel roads to reduce particulate matter, or developing traffic improvements, but these are more expensive and require them to wait several years to "pool" their annual allocations before construction. MPOs have also begun paving gravel roads for</p>

		dust mitigation. Second, some projects have slipped from one funding year to the next, sometimes several times. Projects advancing to construction have been smaller projects that are easier to implement, such as bikeways, which are less complex, but provide little to no PM2.5 emissions benefit.
E15	The 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5 established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	0.230
E16	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
E16a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5. The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] <i>This adjusted target must be reported to nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]</i>	
E16b	Please provide the basis for adjustments of the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5 established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	

Statewide Total Emission Reductions NOx Target #2

Question No	Description	Field Type
E17	The baseline emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx. <i>This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal Fiscal Years before the start of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]</i>	
E18	Please provide the current estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(iii)(B)] <i>The current data for the performance period must include the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) over the Federal Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.</i> <i>The data needed to calculate the measure shall come from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR</i>	0.000

	<p>490.809(a) and 23 CFR 490(b)(2).</p> <p><i>The data must be reported to the nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]</i></p> <p><i>FHWA provided the prepopulated data from the CMAQ Public Access System. If the DOT feels that a different value is appropriate due to an error, please contact the FHWA Division Office in your State.</i></p>	
E19	The 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of NOx for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	
E20	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of NOx. At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]	N/A
E21	The 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of NOx established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	
E22	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of NOx? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
E22a	<p>Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of NOx.</p> <p><i>The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</i></p> <p><i>This adjusted target must be reported to nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]</i></p>	
E22b	Please provide the basis for adjustments of the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of NOx established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)].	

Statewide Total Emission Reductions VOC Target #3

Question No	Description	Field Type
-------------	-------------	------------

E23	<p>The baseline emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC.</p> <p><i>This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal Fiscal Years before the start of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]</i></p>	
E24	<p>Please provide the current estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(iii)(B)]</p> <p><i>The current data for the performance period must include the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) over the Federal Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.</i></p> <p><i>The data needed to calculate the measure shall come from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a) and 23 CFR 490(b)(2).</i></p> <p><i>The data must be reported to the nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]</i></p> <p><i>FHWA provided the prepopulated data from the CMAQ Public Access System. If the DOT feels that a different value is appropriate due to an error, please contact the FHWA Division Office in your State.</i></p>	
E25	<p>The 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of VOC for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]</p>	
E26	<p>Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of VOC.</p> <p><i>At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</i></p>	
E27	<p>The 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of VOC established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]</p>	
E28	<p>Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of VOC? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]</p>	
E28a	<p>Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of VOC.</p> <p><i>The adjusted target should reflect expected performance</i></p>	

	<p>by the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</p> <p><i>This adjusted target must be reported to nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]</i></p>	
E28b	<p>Please provide the basis for adjustments of the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of VOC established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E) and [23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)].</p>	

Statewide Total Emission Reductions PM10 Target #4

Question No	Description	Field Type
E29	<p>The baseline emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10.</p> <p><i>This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal Fiscal Years before the start of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]</i></p>	520.470
E30	<p>Please provide the current estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(iii)(B)]</p> <p><i>The current data for the performance period must include the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) over the Federal Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.</i></p> <p><i>The data needed to calculate the measure shall come from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a) and 23 CFR 490(b)(2)].</i></p> <p><i>The data must be reported to the nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]</i></p> <p><i>FHWA provided the prepopulated data from the CMAQ Public Access System. If the DOT feels that a different value is appropriate due to an error, please contact the FHWA Division Office in your State.</i></p>	98.330
E31	<p>The 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM10 for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]</p>	363.000
E32	<p>Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM10.</p> <p><i>At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for</i></p>	Oregon did not meet the two year targets. Oregon has had difficulty finding vendors that meet FHWA "Buy America" requirements. Rural cities in non-attainment/maintenance areas have requested street sweepers and school buses to help reduce

	<i>differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</i>	PM and CO emissions with their limited allocations. They have responded by paving gravel roads, and developing traffic improvements, but these are more expensive and require them to wait several years to “pool” their annual allocations before construction. Second, some projects have slipped from one funding year to the next, sometimes several times. Projects advancing to construction have been smaller projects that are easier to implement, such as bikeways and walkways, which are less complex, but provide little to any PM10 emissions benefit. In FY2019, the majority of projects that moved forward were Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities.
E33	The 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM10 established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	726.400
E34	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM10?[23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
E34a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM10. <i>The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</i> <i>This adjusted target must be reported to nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]</i>	
E34b	Please provide the basis for adjustments of the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM10 established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)].	

Statewide Total Emission Reductions CO Target #5

Question No	Description	Field Type
E35	The baseline emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO. <i>This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal Fiscal Years before the start of the</i>	3618.440

	<i>performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]</i>	
E36	<p>Please provide the current estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(iii)(B)]</p> <p><i>The current data for the performance period must include the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) over the Federal Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.</i></p> <p><i>The data needed to calculate the measure shall come from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a) and 23 CFR 490(b)(2).</i></p> <p><i>The data must be reported to the nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]</i></p> <p><i>FHWA provided the prepopulated data from the CMAQ Public Access System. If the DOT feels that a different value is appropriate due to an error, please contact the FHWA Division Office in your State.</i></p>	95.830
E37	The 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of CO for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	584.000
E38	<p>Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of CO.</p> <p><i>At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</i></p>	<p>Oregon did not meet the two year targets. Oregon has had difficulty finding vendors that meet FHWA "Buy America" requirements. Rural cities in non-attainment/maintenance areas have requested street sweepers and school buses to help reduce PM and CO emissions with their limited allocations. They have responded by paving gravel roads, and developing traffic improvements, but these are more expensive and require them to wait several years to "pool" their annual allocations before construction. Second, some projects have slipped from one funding year to the next, sometimes several times. Projects advancing to construction have been smaller projects that are easier to implement, such as bikeways, which are less complex, but provide smaller CO emissions benefit than the more complex projects. . In FY2018 and FY2019, the majority of projects that moved forward were Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities.</p>
E39	The 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of CO established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	1168.000

E40	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of CO? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
E40a	<p>Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of CO.</p> <p><i>The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]</i></p> <p><i>This adjusted target must be reported to nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]</i></p>	
E40b	Please provide the basis for adjustments of the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of CO established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)].	

Attachments

S.No	Section	Attachment Detail
1	Freight	Filename: 2020_OR_Freight_ODOT Freight Bottleneck Report.pdf Notes: Attachment Url: