



Delivering on HB 2025: A Shared Accountability Framework for Oregon's Transportation Future

Background

In 2024, a [Strategic Review of ODOT](#) was conducted to assess the agency's alignment and effectiveness across key functions. The review aimed to identify actions that would help ODOT become a high-performing transportation agency with credible stewardship of public funds and infrastructure.

Yet despite this effort, serious accountability issues remain. Miscalculations, misalignments, and mismanagement at ODOT continue to erode public trust and raise concerns about the agency's ability to responsibly oversee the additional \$1.9 billion in revenue from increased taxes and fees Oregonians are being asked to pay. The Move Oregon Forward campaign urges that the following tools be written into statute to help restore trust, uphold Oregon's fiduciary duty to manage public resources responsibly, and ensure Oregon delivers on its promise of a safe, low-carbon, multimodal transportation system for all.

Our proposed framework aligns with the recommendations in the strategic management review, which include:

- Refined and expanded tools, structures, and systems to improve outcomes;
- Greater strategic alignment, collaboration, and shared ownership of transportation decisions and outcomes; and
- Strengthening ODOT's culture of performance management and accountability.

Proposed Framework

To improve trust, transparency, and fiscal responsibility, Oregon must adopt an enhanced performance-based, outcomes-oriented framework for how transportation projects are selected, evaluated, and delivered. We propose codifying an enhanced framework into the transportation package to align spending with results and ensure public oversight.

1. Prioritization & Planning

- Projects must undergo rigorous pre-STIP (Statewide Transportation Improvement Program) evaluation.
- ODOT should apply transparent and objective screening criteria to ensure projects support statewide and regional goals, including eliminating traffic deaths and serious

injuries, reducing climate pollution, and increasing equity, *before* they are added to the STIP. This mirrors best practices from states like [Virginia \(Smart Scale\)](#), [Kentucky \(SHIFT\)](#), [Colorado \(GHG Pollution Reductions Planning Standard, SB 21-260, 2021\)](#), and [Minnesota \(GHG Planning Requirements, HF 2887, 2023\)](#), where projects are competitively scored based on clearly delineated priorities, clearly defined metrics, and public goals. Project scoring and prioritization should be transparent and standardized. Scores should be vetted before inclusion in any funding plan.

- Compliance with relevant state and regional rules and plans should be assessed in this phase, such as Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP), Climate Friendly & Equitable Communities (CFEC), Regional Transportation Plans.

2. Performance Management & Public Reporting

- All projects in the STIP must demonstrate expected outcomes across standardized measures, such as lives saved, emissions reduced, congestion relieved, or cost efficiency (Note: ODOT's MOSAIC corridor planning tool enables such evaluations.) Projects that fail to perform should not advance.
- ODOT must conduct mandatory, quarterly public reporting of transportation performance metrics via a public dashboard modeled on, for example, [Missouri's "Tangible Results,"](#) [Virginia "Smart Scale" Dashboard](#) or Minnesota's [annual performance reports](#). These reports must include outcome-based metrics tied to state goals and may require audits, evaluations, or investigations through an independent body or Inspector General model (e.g., California's SB1 OIG office via [SB1, 2017](#)). This streamlines reporting for ODOT staff by eliminating duplicative for ODOT staff completing separate reports for OTC, lawmakers, and the public, while ensuring consistent, timely public access to project delivery and outcomes evaluated independently from in-department sponsors and project teams.

3. Partnerships/Shared Governance:

- We need to reform the state-regional dynamic, such as exemplified in [Utah's Unified Transportation Plan](#) model (which coordinates long-term transportation investments among the state's Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), transit agencies, and UDOT). Following a similar model, Oregon's long-range state planning should align with and build upon the MPOs and regional plans, not override them. ODOT should be required to convene with MPOs and transit authorities to co-develop timeframes, modeling assumptions, shared goals, and investment strategies.
- The composition of key governing bodies - like the Oregon Transportation Commission and proposed Continuous Improvement Advisory Committee - should be revised to reflect the diversity of stakeholders engaged in the above processes, and Oregon Transportation Commission funding and FTE updated to reflect the enhanced scope of their financial/administrative responsibilities.

Prepared by:

Indi Namkoong, Verde; contact: indinamkoong@verdenw.org

Sarah Iannarone, The Street Trust; contact: Thomas.Baker@cascadiapa.com