

Department of Land Conservation and Development

Wildfire Adapted Communities Draft Recommendations

Stakeholder Group Review Draft 8/12/22

IV. Recommendations

Background

As directed by SB 762 (2021) Section 11: Land Use, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) has prepared recommendations for consideration by the Oregon Legislature on potential changes to the statewide land use planning program and local comprehensive plans and zoning codes that minimize wildfire risk and create more wildfire adapted communities, including appropriate levels of state and local resources necessary for effective implementation. Recommended changes may include, but need not be limited to, provisions regarding sufficient defensible space, building codes, safe evacuation, and development considerations in areas of extreme and high wildfire risk, allowing for regional differences. DLCD's recommendations do not currently address incorporating risk maps; we are awaiting future iterations of the Statewide Map of Wildfire Risk before making those recommendations.

Land use planning plays an important role in helping communities mitigate wildfire and other natural hazard risks. Oregon's statewide land use planning program provides a policy framework that supports local implementation of strategies that reduce the risks to people and property¹. As with all land use planning processes, both state and local implementation of these recommendations should be equity-informed, including inclusive engagement strategies, consistent with the state's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan, and evaluation of impacts to socially and economically vulnerable² communities. Understanding the location of vulnerable populations can help communities mitigate impacts before a wildfire or can help distribute needed recovery dollars after an event, leading to more equitable and effective outcomes.

DLCD's recommendations are based on extensive community and stakeholder engagement (described in Section III of this report), research into best practices, including policies currently used by Oregon jurisdictions, 2020 wildfire recovery lessons, and feedback from the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC), and are guided by the following principles that came out of the engagement process:

1. Protect human life from the growing risks of wildfires
2. Increase the ability of Oregon communities to withstand and recover from wildfires
3. Focus on achieving equitable outcomes and increasing community capacity, with greater attention to historically and currently underserved and under-resourced communities

¹ <https://www.oregon.gov/osp/Docs/GovWildfireCouncilRpt-FinalRecs.pdf>

² Social vulnerability refers to the social, economic, and cultural attributes that can limit access to resources, making some communities more vulnerable and exacerbating the impacts of wildfire, as defined by Oregon State University in relation to the development of the social vulnerability map required under SB 762; <https://osuwildfireriskmap.forestry.oregonstate.edu/social-vulnerability>. SB 762 also includes provisions to support socially and economically vulnerable communities, persons with limited proficiency in English, and persons of lower income.

4. Protect and increase the resilience of important infrastructure³ and community assets, particularly those that are critical to survival and recovery
5. Protect the places where people live, work, and gather
6. Work with communities to identify regional and local differences for consideration within the context of Statewide Land Use Planning Goals to mitigate wildfire risk
7. Consider local capacity and state support in the implementation of wildfire mitigation measures

DLCD evaluated many possible recommendations raised during the community and stakeholder engagement process and, after careful consideration, we have included the following recommendations that align with the guiding principles and have the highest potential for reducing wildfire risk. The recommendations range from implementing robust community engagement strategies, to providing technical assistance to cities and counties that increase local capacity, conducting policy research, and to establishing regulations through rulemaking by LCDC. Whenever necessary, the recommendations also include state and local financial resources to support implementation. A glossary of terms is included in [Appendix X](#). The recommendations cover the following topics:

- Community Information and Engagement
- Safe Evacuation and Firefighting Response
- Wildfire Risk Mitigation Requirements for Areas of New Development
- Recovery Planning
- Areas Subject to Natural Hazards

As directed by SB 762 and consistent with the goal of minimizing wildfire risk in updating state and local land use planning programs, DLCDC presents the following recommendations for the Legislature's consideration. While the growing threat of wildfires is an urgent issue and action must be taken to protect Oregon, DLCDC recognizes that policies integrating land use and wildfire risk can raise complex and controversial questions. For these reasons, this report focuses on those recommendations that most effectively protect people and property within the capacity of the state and cities and counties to implement. This report intentionally identifies multiple implementation options for several of the recommendations, providing the Legislature with flexibility and a range of choices to achieve the recommendations.

For the recommendations that have more than one option, Option A provides a regulatory approach where the Legislature provides policy direction and "sidebars" for LCDC to undertake rulemaking with a robust community engagement process to define terms and establish minimum land use requirements, coupled with direction and funding to support city and county implementation through grant funding and technical assistance. Option B provides a voluntary pathway where cities and counties that opt to develop approaches that meet minimum actions or outcomes established by LCDC through a robust community engagement process can access grant funding and technical assistance to support local implementation. Each recommendation also comes with a suggested "toolbox" of specific strategies that can support implementation, and a list of needed resources.

³ Important infrastructure includes "Community Lifelines" as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, <https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/practitioners/lifelines>

Community Information and Engagement

Recommendation 1: Prioritize robust and inclusive community information and engagement in planning efforts to create wildfire adapted communities

DLCD recommends that cities and counties use best practices and a meaningful participatory process to engage community members, particularly those from traditionally under-served and under-represented populations, in planning efforts for creating more wildfire adapted communities. Successfully mitigating for wildfire works best when the entire community participates in the effort. Communities become more resilient when they develop and follow plans that have broad community buy-in and support. Plans to mitigate wildfire must recognize the many ways that people interact with and depend on the built and natural environment. That interdependence necessitates inclusive community conversations about vulnerability. Understanding Oregonians' lived experiences and needs, especially socially and economically vulnerable community members, and prioritizing such needs in planning outcomes can increase overall community resilience and the ability to recover.

Efforts to prioritize robust and inclusive community information and engagement include:

- Providing important information to public officials about community vulnerabilities, capabilities, and preferences that influence how community members can contribute to mitigation efforts and anticipate, respond to, and recover from natural hazards and disasters.
 - For example, design collaborative planning activities that also serve as educational opportunities to generate consensus and understanding of mitigation actions and to increase the likelihood that community members will engage in recommended behaviors.
- Intentionally including community groups that have been traditionally under-served, under-represented, and excluded to empower and build resilience in the community as a whole.
- Reflecting the interests and concerns of a representative population, based on area demographics.
- Ground truthing, using local expertise to increase ownership and legitimacy for wildfire mitigation planning efforts.
- Developing community education materials and events to effectively communicate with all community members.
- Developing evacuation and response strategies with special attention to residents and visitors who are elderly, have mobility challenges, have any form of disability, have limited transportation options, or have limited English proficiency.

Both Options A and B can potentially achieve this recommendation, although the voluntary nature of Option B would likely limit its overall effectiveness.

Option A (Rulemaking)

In coordination with cities and counties, LCDC undertakes rulemaking to develop comprehensive community engagement strategies for cities and counties to use with planning processes for wildfire evacuation, mitigation, and recovery planning. DLCD provides grant funding and technical assistance for local implementation. This rulemaking would establish requirements under Goal 1: Citizen Involvement or Goal 7: Hazards.

Option B (Voluntary)

Cities and counties that elect to develop comprehensive community engagement strategies for use with planning processes for wildfire evacuation, mitigation, and recovery that meet minimum requirements can access grant funding and technical assistance from DLCDC to support their efforts.

Toolbox

A range of specific strategies would be developed to support either of the implementation options. These strategies include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Model policies and guidance that establish appropriate standards
- Guidelines for developing community engagement best practices, including “[Putting the People in Planning](#)”⁴
- Funding for consultants, technical expertise, and community engagement

Needed Resources:

Option A

- Local resources: TBD [Technical Assistance grants to assist cities and counties with the public planning process, adoption, and implementation, \$ amount to be determined in partnership with cities and counties]
- DLCDC resources: TBD Additional staff capacity to support rulemaking and local implementation

Option B

- Local resources: TBD [Technical Assistance grants to assist cities and counties with the public planning process, adoption, and implementation, \$ amount to be determined in partnership with cities and counties]
- DLCDC resources: TBD Additional staff capacity to support local implementation

Safe Evacuation and Firefighting Response

Recommendation 2: Assess and improve transportation networks for safe evacuation and firefighting response

DLCDC recommends that cities and counties assess their existing transportation network to identify gaps or deficiencies that may hinder safe evacuation of residents and visitors and efficient access for firefighting response. To address identified gaps or deficiencies, if any, cities and counties should amend, as needed, transportation plans, policies, and programs. These may include Transportation System Plans (TSPs); transportation management, operations, and maintenance plans; Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs); and appropriate portions of Comprehensive Plans and zoning codes. The amendments would ensure the community’s network of transportation facilities is planned, managed, and maintained to support effective responses to wildfires. DLCDC recognizes that cities and counties may already be engaged in evacuation planning; this recommendation is intended to support those efforts through land use and transportation planning.

⁴ https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/CPU/Documents/Putting_the_People_in_Planning.pdf

Efforts to assess and improve transportation networks for safe evacuation and firefighting response should:

- Analyze identified and potential evacuation routes⁵ and temporary safe zones for existing conditions, needed improvements, ongoing maintenance, and potential funding sources for improvements and maintenance.
- Identify areas of the community with limited road access for evacuation and emergency response and identify potential alternative routes, including condition.
 - For example, cities and counties could facilitate agreements between private and public landowners to allow evacuation through locked gates or otherwise publicly inaccessible routes and for the maintenance of rural routes.
- Develop strategies, such as applicability thresholds and potential funding sources, for the provision of secondary access for use during an emergency for existing development that was developed with a single access.
- Identify locations where buses may be needed to serve to evacuate those without private vehicle access, in consultation with transit agencies and school districts.
- Provide visible, durable signage, such as evacuation zone demarcations, temporary safe zone signage, and addressing.

A TSP describes the local jurisdiction's transportation system and outlines projects, programs, and policies to meet current and future transportation needs and, therefore, plays a critical role in local land use planning and the provision of transportation infrastructure. A CIP forecasts a city's or county's capital needs over a certain period based on various adopted long-range plans, goals, and policies. Capital projects are generally large-scale efforts in terms of cost, size, and benefit to the community.

Both Options A and B can potentially achieve this recommendation, although the voluntary nature of Option B would likely limit its overall effectiveness.

Option A (Rulemaking)

In coordination with cities, counties, and local and state emergency management and fire protection professionals, LCDC undertakes rulemaking that directs cities and counties to assess existing transportation networks and amend, as needed, plans, policies, and programs. DLCD provides grant funding and technical assistance for local implementation. This rulemaking would establish requirements under Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services and Goal 12: Transportation, as needed.

Option B (Voluntary)

Cities and counties, in coordination with local and state emergency management and fire protection professionals, that elect to assess existing transportation networks and amend, as needed, plans, policies, and programs that meet minimum requirements can access grant funding and technical assistance from DLCD to support their efforts.

Toolbox

A range of specific strategies would be developed to support either of the implementation options. These strategies include, but are not limited to, the following:

⁵ An evacuation, or escape, route is typically focused on private vehicle access, however use of multi-modal transportation networks for evacuation can allow people to use other means to travel to an assembly location for transport by bus or otherwise.

- Model code, polices, and guidance that establish standards and minimum requirements, as appropriate
- Guidelines for developing community engagement best practices, including “[Putting the People in Planning](#)”⁶
- Funding for consultants and technical expertise
- Funding to support real-time wildfire and transportation modeling and zonal evacuation planning and management⁷.

Needed Resources:

Option A

- Local resources: TBD [Technical Assistance grants to assist cities and counties with the public planning process, adoption, and implementation, \$ amount to be determined in partnership with cities and counties]
- DLCDC resources: TBD Additional staff capacity to support rulemaking and local implementation

Option B

- Local resources: TBD [Technical Assistance grants to assist cities and counties with the public planning process, adoption, and implementation, \$ amount to be determined in partnership with cities and counties]
- DLCDC resources: TBD Additional staff capacity to support local implementation

Applicability and Potential Impacts

- Land Use Area: Both options would be applicable within and outside an Urban Growth Boundary
- Development Type: Neither option would apply to new development
- Geographic Scale: Both options could apply at a regional, county, or community scale.
- Potential Impacts:
 - Housing Affordability: No
 - Measure 49 Claims: No, exempt under safety
 - Measure 56 Notice: No

Recommendation 3: Review and amend local land use codes to ensure safe evacuation and efficient access for firefighting response

DLCD recommends cities and counties, in consultation with state and local emergency management and fire protection professionals, review and amend zoning and land division codes to increase street connectivity and site access for new development to allow for safe evacuation of residents and visitors and efficient access for firefighting and other emergency response vehicles. Because of constant change in the landscape and wildfire conditions, it is vital that communities ensure that subdivisions, manufactured home parks, retail centers, and other areas with multiple structures are planned and built to have more than one ingress and egress road with sufficient grade and widths for firefighting equipment and personnel. Geography and other factors may prevent certain locations from complying with this recommendation and, for this reason, DLCDC acknowledges that a waiver process should be provided.

⁶ https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/CPU/Documents/Putting_the_People_in_Planning.pdf

⁷ Zonal evacuation planning and management organizes a community into zones with identified escape routes. The City of Ashland employs this type of system: <https://www.ashland.or.us/Page.asp?NavID=18126>.

Zoning and code review and amendment should address the following:

- Prioritize street connectivity, or a grid system, for streets and roadways for new neighborhood, subdivision, manufactured and mobile home park, and destination resort development, where practicable, to provide multiple evacuation, or escape, route options.
- Review and establish, as needed, additional requirements for site access and driveway standards for new development, such as minimum road width, hydrant placement, maximum grade, and turnarounds, in line with the 2019 Oregon Fire Code, Appendix D⁸. Additional site access and egress requirements should be based on number of dwelling units or building or facility size and exceptions may be granted where buildings are equipped with approved automatic sprinkler systems.
- Review and update, as needed, fire protection and ingress and egress standards for temporary uses such as special events or outdoor mass gatherings, in consultation with fire protection districts, or the State Fire Marshal in the absence.
- Establish a waiver process, including additional wildfire mitigation requirements to reduce risk, where geography and other factors may prevent certain locations from complying.

Both Options A and B can potentially achieve this recommendation, although the voluntary nature of Option B would likely limit its overall effectiveness.

Option A (Regulatory)

In coordination with cities, counties, and local and state emergency management and fire protection professionals, LCDC undertakes rulemaking that directs cities and counties to review and amend their comprehensive plans and zoning and land division codes, with grant funding and technical assistance from DLCD to support local efforts. This rulemaking would establish requirements under Goal 12: Transportation.

Option B (Voluntary)

Cities and counties that elect to review and amend their comprehensive plans zoning and land division codes in a manner that meets minimum requirements can access grant funding and technical assistance from DLCD to support their efforts.

Toolbox

A range of specific strategies would be developed to support either of the implementation options. These strategies include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Model comprehensive plan policies, code, and guidance that establish standards and minimum requirements, as appropriate
- Guidelines for developing community engagement best practices, including “[Putting the People in Planning](#)”⁹
- Funding for consultants and technical expertise

⁸ APPENDIX D FIRE APPARATUS ACCESS ROADS, 2019 Oregon Fire Code | ICC Digital Codes

<https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/OFC2019P1/appendix-d-fire-apparatus-access-roads>

⁹ https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/CPU/Documents/Putting_the_People_in_Planning.pdf

Needed Resources:

Option A

- Local resources: TBD [Technical Assistance grants to assist cities and counties with the public planning process, adoption, and implementation, \$ amount to be determined in partnership with cities and counties]
- DLCDC resources: TBD Additional staff capacity to support rulemaking and local implementation

Option B

- Local resources: TBD [Technical Assistance grants to assist cities and counties with the public planning process, adoption, and implementation, \$ amount to be determined in partnership with cities and counties]
- DLCDC resources: TBD Additional staff capacity to support local implementation

Applicability and Potential Impacts

- Land Use Area: Both options would be applicable within and outside an Urban Growth Boundary.
- Development Type: Both options would apply to new development and redevelopment.
- Geographic Scale: Both options could apply at a regional, county, community scale, or site scale.
- Potential Impacts:
 - Housing Affordability: Both options may have some impact
 - Measure 49 Claims: No, exempt under safety
 - Measure 56 Notice: No

Wildfire Risk Mitigation Requirements for Areas of New Development

Recommendation 4: Review and amend comprehensive plan policies and implement land use codes to incorporate wildfire risk mitigation requirements for areas of new development

DLCD recommends that in areas of greatest wildfire risk¹⁰ cities and counties review and amend comprehensive plan policies and implement zoning, development, and land division codes for new development to: (1) incorporate requirements and standards to reduce wildfire risk, (2) ensure the provision of services, such as adequate water supply and pressure to fight fires, and (3) limit siting of facilities with concentrated, vulnerable populations, such as schools, hospitals, assisted living facilities, clean air shelters, and prisons; critical facilities, infrastructure, and lifelines; and hazardous facilities and materials. DLCDC recognizes that geography and other factors may prevent certain locations from complying with this recommendation and, for this reason, acknowledges that state and local waiver processes should be provided.

Review and amendment of comprehensive plans, zoning, and land division codes should:

- Require land use wildfire mitigation standards for new development, including rebuilding after natural disasters. Standards and requirements may differ depending on the scale of development and should address:
 - Land use and land division approval standards that require clustering of structures in areas of lowest risk, such as structure spacing standards, density modification, and other

¹⁰ Areas of greatest wildfire risk does not refer to a specific wildfire risk classification on the Statewide Map of Wildfire Risk; DLCDC is awaiting future iterations of the Statewide Map of Wildfire Risk before addressing.

types of flexibility for new subdivisions, Planned Unit Developments (PUD), and manufactured home parks.

- Requirements for landscape-scale community protection fire breaks on the perimeter of a development using open space, natural, and built features, where practicable, for subdivision, PUD, and manufactured home park developments. This is in addition to any defensible space requirements on individual lots.
- Setback and home siting standards in forested areas that account for slope steepness, buffers between structures to reduce ignition risk, and setbacks from adjacent forest lands.
- Buffering and screening standards that require fire-resistant materials and plants for fencing and hedges.
- Landscaping standards that require fire-resistant plants and requirements for hazardous vegetation management plans.
- For areas served by a water service provider, adequate water supply and minimum hydrant requirements for subdivisions and neighborhoods. For areas not served by water service providers, onsite water storage and proof of adequate water supply for firefighting.
- Processes that support expedited rebuilding consistent with wildfire risk reduction and mitigation of associated natural hazards, such as landslides and flooding.
- Review and update defensible space standards or references to standards included in land use codes, if applicable, to ensure alignment with the statewide minimum defensible space code being developed by the Oregon Office of State Fire Marshall or locally adopted defensible space standards selected from the framework set forth in the International Wildland-Urban Interface Code as allowed under SB 762.
- When considering areas for new development at the community scale, evaluate and plan for the provision of water supply at sufficient pressure to meet additional capacity needed to protect people and property from wildfires.
- Consider and address wildfire risk when planning, developing, improving, or replacing public facilities and services.
 - For example, evaluate opportunities to increase the resilience of water, wastewater, and other critical infrastructure, and locate future water, sewer, transportation, and communication facilities outside of areas of greatest wildfire risk¹¹ whenever possible, especially infrastructure important to recovery.
- Review and amend open space and parks master plans to incorporate policies that address fire breaks, fire mitigation, and long-term maintenance to reduce risk in parks, open spaces, and trail areas.
- Limit siting of facilities with concentrated, vulnerable populations, such as schools, hospitals, assisted living facilities, clean air shelters, and prisons, and critical facilities, infrastructure, and community lifelines.
- Establish a waiver process, including additional wildfire mitigation requirements that may apply to reduce risk, where geography and other factors may prevent certain locations from complying.
- Limit or prohibit new hazardous facilities and storage of combustible materials that increase wildfire risk. Where limiting or prohibiting such facilities is not practical, require adequate mitigation measures consistent with state and federal requirements.

¹¹ Areas of greatest wildfire risk does not refer to a specific wildfire risk classification on the Statewide Map of Wildfire Risk; DLCDC is awaiting future iterations of the Statewide Map of Wildfire Risk before addressing.

- Prohibit comprehensive plan or zone map amendments that would result in increased residential densities or more intensive uses in areas of greatest wildfire risk¹² unless additional mitigation is implemented. For proposals to rezone lands protected under Goal 3: Agricultural Lands and Goal 4: Forest Lands, additional wildfire mitigation standards should be required.

Both Options A and B can potentially achieve this recommendation, although the voluntary nature of Option B would likely limit its overall effectiveness.

Option A (Regulatory)

In coordination with cities and counties, LCDC undertakes rulemaking that directs cities and counties to review and amend their comprehensive plans, capital improvement plans, public facility plans, and zoning and land division codes, as appropriate to address new areas of development. DLCD provides grant funding and technical assistance for local implementation. This rulemaking would establish requirements under Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Hazards, Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services, and possibly Goal 3: Agricultural Lands, Goal 4: Forest Land, and Goal 5: Natural Resources.

Option B (Voluntary)

Cities and counties that elect to review and amend their comprehensive plans, capital improvement plans, public facility plans, and zoning and land division codes, as appropriate, in a manner that meets minimum requirements can access grant funding and technical assistance from DLCD to support their efforts in areas of new development.

Toolbox

A range of specific strategies would be developed to support either of the implementation options. These strategies include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Model comprehensive plan policies, code, and guidance that establish standards and minimum requirements, as appropriate, and optimize access to federal mitigation and disaster recovery funding
- Guidelines for developing community engagement best practices, including “[Putting the People in Planning](#)”¹³
- Funding for consultants and technical expertise
- State financial assistance to cities, counties, and special districts, as appropriate, to conduct the following studies:
 - Analysis of current and planned water capacity of cities and counties, including supply and pressure, and identification of needed improvements to better protect people and property from wildfires.
 - Feasibility of developing transferrable development credits programs as authorized by ORS 94-531-94.538 to facilitate development outside of areas of greatest wildfire risk.

¹² Areas of greatest wildfire risk does not refer to a specific wildfire risk classification on the Statewide Map of Wildfire Risk; DLCD is awaiting future iterations of the Statewide Map of Wildfire Risk before addressing.

¹³ https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/CPU/Documents/Putting_the_People_in_Planning.pdf

Needed Resources:

Option A

- Local resources: TBD [Technical Assistance grants to assist cities and counties with the public planning process, adoption, and implementation, \$ amount to be determined in partnership with cities and counties]
- DLCDC resources: TBD Additional staff capacity to support rulemaking and local implementation

Option B

- Local resources: TBD [Technical Assistance grants to assist cities and counties with the public planning process, adoption, and implementation, \$ amount to be determined in partnership with cities and counties]
- DLCDC resources: TBD Additional staff capacity to support local implementation

Applicability and Potential Impacts

- Land Use Area: Options A and B would be applicable within and outside an Urban Growth Boundary. Option C would apply statewide.
- Development Type: Options A and B would apply to new development and redevelopment. Option C not applicable
- Geographic Scale: Options A and B could apply at a regional, county, community scale, or site scale. Option C would apply statewide
- Potential Impacts:
 - Housing Affordability: Options A and B may have some impact, Option C not applicable
 - Measure 49 Claims: No, exempt under safety, Option C not applicable
 - Measure 56 Notice: No

Recovery Planning

Recommendation 5: Provide support for post-disaster recovery in local communities through recovery planning services

DLCD recommends that funding from the Legislature be provided for DLCDC to develop a programmatic approach to support cities and counties after wildfire or other disasters through the provision of professional services by contracting with planning consultants and to provide DLCDC staff to assist with pre-disaster recovery planning.

While DLCDC's recommendations primarily focus on wildfire mitigation, recovery professionals and those with lived experience recognize that hazards overlap; that Oregon is vulnerable to a wide range of hazards; hazard events can recur; and that many hazards will increase with climate change. In particular, wildfire can increase risk from flooding and landslides. After a wildfire, the charred ground repels rainwater, increasing the risk of flooding and debris flows for several years. The intense storms that follow can lead to severe flooding and landslides.¹⁴

For example, the 2020 post-wildfire recovery required several local governments to undertake significant and urgent flood hazard work, with help from the DLCDC National Flood Insurance Program

¹⁴ Oregon's 2017 Integrated Water Resources Strategy. Oregon Water Resources Department, p. 86; <https://www.oregon.gov/OWRD/programs/Planning/IWRS/Pages/default.aspx>

Coordinator. DLCD also provided grants to hire planners to assist local government planning offices that were overwhelmed with permit applications. Pre-disaster recovery planning in advance of a hazard event is critical so that policies, regulations, systems, and documents are already in place to facilitate recovery. Pre-planning and reducing barriers can help impacted communities recover more quickly.

Planning in advance for local staffing support is one element of broader recovery planning efforts that communities may want to undertake and that DLCD can support with additional resources.

Toolbox

The following strategies would support the implementation option. These strategies include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Funding for the provision of pre- and post-disaster professional services to cities and counties

Needed Resources:

- Local resources: TBD [Technical Assistance grants to assist cities and counties with the public planning process, adoption, and implementation, \$ amount to be determined in partnership with cities and counties]
- DLCD resources: TBD Additional staff capacity to support local implementation
- State financial assistance to local governments for targeted property acquisition, or buy outs, of properties with repeat or overlapping impact from wildfire and related natural hazards

Areas Subject to Natural Hazards

Recommendation 6: Increase the effectiveness of natural hazards planning through coordination of Community Wildfire Protection Plans and Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan planning processes and integration of policies and actions into comprehensive plans and codes

DLCD recommends that funding from the Legislature be provided for DLCD to develop and implement a programmatic approach to support cities and counties to better coordinate the timing of Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) and Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan (NHMP) development and updates, and their subsequent integration into Comprehensive Plans and land use regulations. Additional technical assistance to cities and counties would result in the following outcomes:

- Streamlined planning processes that could save financial and staff (local, state, university) resources.
- Ensuring that natural hazard mitigation plan action items related to land use are implemented through the comprehensive plan and implementing codes.
- A better understanding of the needed elements to coordinate the planning work to inform future projects through the development of model code and policies.
 - For example, model comprehensive plan polices, code, and guidance regarding process could also address overlapping hazards and risk reduction opportunities, such as floodplains and post-fire debris flows; assessing the unique needs of socially vulnerable communities; and implementing equitable engagement strategies.

DLCD and the University of Oregon (UO) (Institute for Policy Research and Engagement, Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience) currently provide technical assistance to cities, counties, special districts, and Tribal governments to collaboratively develop NHMPs in compliance with Federal

Emergency Management Agency requirements for FEMA approval. The UO also provides services supporting local development of CWPPs, typically developed in a separate local process to meet U.S. Forest Service requirements with Oregon Department of Forestry approval. FEMA and USFS require approved plans to confer eligibility for specific federal funding.

An approach that better integrates updates of these plans would streamline the development process through a combined local planning team with a wider spectrum of expertise, bringing more community voices into the planning process, with the outcome of more actionable policies and strategies that can be implemented locally to reduce risk from wildfires. DLCDC is currently piloting projects to update planning processes and integrate updated CWPPs into NHMPs in Linn and Benton Counties. Cities and counties are very interested in additional technical support from DLCDC to take the next step of integrating their NHMPs into their comprehensive plans, however they lack local capacity and DLCDC does not currently have the funding or staff capacity to provide this service.

Toolbox

The following strategies would support the implementation option. These strategies include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Funding for the provision of professional services to cities and counties
- Model comprehensive plan policies, code, and guidance that establish standards and minimum requirements, as appropriate
- Guidelines for developing community engagement best practices, including “[Putting the People in Planning](#)”¹⁵

Needed Resources:

- Local resources: TBD [Technical Assistance grants to assist cities and counties with the public planning process, adoption, and implementation, \$ amount to be determined in partnership with cities and counties]
- DLCDC and UO resources: TBD Additional funding and staff capacity to support local implementation

¹⁵ https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/CPU/Documents/Putting_the_People_in_Planning.pdf

Department of Land Conservation and Development

Wildfire Adapted Communities Draft Recommendations

Stakeholder Group Review Draft 8/12/22

Appendix X

Glossary of Terms

Terms used in recommendations:

- **Community Engagement:** Comprehensive and equitable engagement activities at the state and local level increase community buy-in and capacity, build trust, foster long-term relationships among stakeholders, and result in community supported, community driven plans.
- **Technical Assistance:** Technical Assistance (TA) grants are competitive awards to local communities that fund projects to update a comprehensive plan, to update local land use ordinances, or other planning compliance projects. The grants must align with the priorities provided in the Grant Allocation Plan. Technical Assistance could include the development of model codes and guidelines, support for recovery planning, and geographic information services mapping and analysis support.
- **Policy Research:** Policy research can take many forms. In some cases, policy research leads to policy development or rulemaking. Policy research can be both quantitative and qualitative, and may rely on academic tools, collaboration, public opinion, and be short- or long-term.
- **Regulation:** Regulations are implementing requirements that local governments use to implement applicable land use rules.
- **State and Local Resources:** Resources for local governments provide direct support to local governments through grants and technical assistance. To better understand needed financial resources to implement recommendations, the department will work closely with local government partners, either through a stand-alone engagement process or during rulemaking. DLCDC will need funding for increase staff capacity to support local government implementation wildfire mitigation and recovery planning, such as support for state-level engagement activities, developing model code and guidance for local governments and other technical assistance, and to engage in rulemaking.
- **Rulemaking:** A rule "interprets or prescribes law or policy" of a state agency (ORS 183.310). State boards and commissions are given the authority to write rules that define details and clarify how a statute or program will be carried out. Almost any time the legislature passes a statute on land use planning, LCDC needs to create or update rules so everyone can understand the processes and steps to best accomplish the legislature's intention. The legislature designates this power to LCDC in ORS 197.040. The rulemaking authority of LCDC is limited to rules that apply to land use. The guiding statute further lists specific steps that the commission must follow to ensure that interested parties and the public can give input.