Chapter 6 Local Capabilities and Planning Coordination

Table of Contents

Chapter 6 Local Capabilities and Planning Coordination 1

6.1 OVERVIEW 1
6.2 LOCAL AND TRIBAL CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT 2
6.2.1 Local Capabilities 2
6.2.2 Effectiveness 3
6.2.3 Tribal Capability 15
6.2.4 Challenges and Obstacles 16
6.2.5 Potential Solutions 18
6.3 STATE AND LOCAL PLANNING COORDINATION 19
6.3.1 Technical Assistance 19
6.3.2 Funding Assistance 22
6.3.3 Training 24
6.3.4 Funding and Technical Assistance Process 26
6.3.5 Prioritizing Applications for Natural Hazard Mitigation Grants 27
6.3.6 Local Mitigation Plan Review Process 29
6.4 REFERENCES 32

6.1 Overview

A capability assessment identifies the resources available to carry out mitigation actions. The policies and programs used to mitigate hazards build on a community's existing capabilities. It is the state's responsibility to coordinate state and local mitigation activities. State support makes communities aware of data, resources, and state priorities for mitigation that could be included in local plans.

Oregon has a robust array of agencies and legislation directed towards hazard mitigation and disaster preparedness and response. The state works diligently to provide multiple resources to each county, municipality, and tribe. However, given the vast range of risks and needs in communities along with the overall sheer size of the state, delivering these services and resources equitably can be challenging.

There is no one consistent way to categorize and assess a local jurisdiction's ability to implement mitigation actions. Cities, counties, and tribes all possess distinct assets and limitations in operations, and it is important for the State of Oregon to approach each jurisdiction's abilities uniquely. As a Home Rule state, jurisdictions are empowered to enact their own laws and codes and make policy choices except where pre-empted by state or federal law.

Members of the Interagency Hazard Mitigation Team (IHMT), a group of 23 agencies that meet quarterly to understand losses arising from natural hazards and coordinate recommended strategies to mitigate loss of life, property, and natural resources represent many of the state's resources for hazard mitigation.

State agencies not only can provide technical assistance and coordination capacity but can also assist counties, cities, special districts, and Tribes in assessing their hazard mitigation capabilities. Coordinating with the appropriate state agencies will help increase the mitigation capacities of local and tribal governments.

6.2 Local and Tribal Capability Assessment

6.2.1 Local Capabilities

Table 6.2.1-1 displays the different capabilities local and tribal jurisdictions have and leverage in pursuing successful mitigation actions. The table is by no means exhaustive but rather is meant for local jurisdictions to locate where their strengths and opportunities are in guiding and developing capacity. Capabilities can be evaluated through an examination of broad categories, including existing authorities, policies, programs, funding, and resources. Those in **bold** under "Mechanisms" have been proven to be most effective capabilities.

Table 6.2.1-1: Local and Tribal Mitigation Capabilities

Capabilities	Description	Mechanisms
Plans & Policies	Plans and policies provide communities with clear priorities and directions. They contain jurisdiction goals and influence decisions mitigation decisions. Plans are developed and adopted through public processes, so the public's feedback has already been thoroughly assessed prior to plan adoption. Integrating hazard planning into local planning documents is the best way to achieve mitigation goals. Further, Local governments can use their broad regulatory authority to advance hazard mitigation actions.	• **Local Comprehensive Plans** • **Capital Improvement Programs** • **Emergency Operations Plan** • Climate Change Adaptation Plans • Streambank Buffer Protection Plan • Park and Recreation Master Plans • Transportation Plans • Water and Sewer Master Plans • Natural Hazards Mitigation Plans • Burn Permits
Codes & Ordinances	Codes and ordinances can direct development in the appropriate locations away from high-hazard areas and ensure the built environment is resilient to impacts from natural hazards.	• **Building Codes** • Zoning Codes • **Subdivision Regulations** • Statewide Planning Goal 7 Regulations • **National Flood Insurance Program** • **Community Rating System** • Stormwater Management Regulations • Erosion Control Regulations

Capabilities	Description	Mechanisms
Administration	Staffing in smaller jurisdictions can often be a challenging limitation, as can the volume of work in more populated jurisdictions. This is especially true if it involves enforcement of codes and ordinances. A robust administrative capacity can provide better planning, funding, and resource allocation. These resources can be leveraged for mitigation implementation.	• **Code Enforcement** • Engineering • **Emergency Management with a full-time Emergency Manager** • Planning Commission • Staffing
Technical	Less resourced local and tribal governments often lack capacity to seek and manage outside funding sources, coordinate with multiple state agencies, and assess the feasibility of mitigation actions.	• **Chief Building Officer** • Building Code Enforcement • Zoning Code Enforcement • Construction Project Management • **Grant Administrator** • **Grant Writer**
Financial	Financial capabilities include local, tribal, and other funding sources that do not need to be repaid and can be used to implement mitigation planning.	• **Capital Improvement Programs** • Taxes • Non-FEMA funding programs • Utility Fees • Impact Fees • **Zoning and Land Use Fees**
Educational	Local educational and outreach campaigns can close the gap in community awareness of hazards and mitigation planning and projects, increasing local capabilities through grassroots efforts.	• StormReady Certification • **Emergency Management and Mitigation Outreach** • Firewise Communities • Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) • Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) • Be 2 Weeks Ready Program • Great ShakeOut
Groups & Associations	Local groups and associations can help spread the word about natural hazards, mitigation plans and projects, as well as identify community champions to drive mitigation actions to completion.	• Neighborhood Associations • Conservation Groups • Chamber of Commerce • Business Associations • Watershed Councils
Social Organizations	Community- or affinity-based social structures that allow people cross-cultural interaction, and public places where people can gather and socialize can be some of the most resilient infrastructure in hazard situations, especially in rural and tribal communities where social capital is paramount.	• Non-Profits • Faith-Based Groups • Community Centers • Assisted Living • Public Plazas • **Resilience Hubs**

6.2.2 Effectiveness

Mitigation actions should be structured around risks facing a jurisdiction and the capabilities and capacity of the jurisdiction to implement them.

6.2.2.1 Plans and Policies

Natural hazard mitigation planning is required by Goal 7: local governments must adopt comprehensive plans to reduce risk to people and property from natural hazards. However, Goal 7 lacks regulatory authority to compel mitigation action implementation. Some jurisdictions will integrate NHMPs, Community Wildfire Protections Plans, Climate Adaption Plans, and Capital Improvement Plans into their Comprehensive Plans. DLCD, OEM, and ODF encourage communities to coordinate these plans for stronger natural hazard mitigation implementation.

The Oregon Department of Emergency Management (OEM) measures the percentage of Oregon's population covered by FEMA-approved local government NHMPs at the end of the state fiscal year. Coverage dropped slightly from a high of 88 percent in 2020 to 86 percent in 2021, then precipitously to 62 percent in 2022 and bottomed out at 61 percent in 2023, an overall loss of 27 percent. Coverage rebounded by 15 percent in 2024, more than half of that lost over the previous three years. In June 2024, 76 percent of Oregon's population was covered by current, FEMA-approved plans.

Factors contributing to the losses include: (a) an increasing number of NHMPs need to be updated as Oregon has encouraged (per FEMA instruction in or about 2018) special districts to develop NHMPs, and many have; (b) the slow pace with which FEMA has approved HMGP and BRIC subgrants, key funding sources for local NHMP updates, over the last five or more years caused NHMPs to expire while awaiting grant approval or during the update process; previously this was not a problem; and (c) the more complex planning standards required by the updated Local Mitigation Planning Policy Guide effective April 19, 2023 require additional data gathering and analysis that slow the planning process. The rebound in 2024 can be explained by six multi-jurisdictional and one stand-alone city plan being re-approved by FEMA during that year.

The comprehensive plan is designed to guide the future actions of a community and provide guidance to implement measures such as land use plans and development regulations. It presents a vision for the future, with long-range goals and objectives for all activities that affect the local government. Oregon's 19 Statewide Planning Goals are achieved through local comprehensive planning. Implementing measures can then be used to guide development to less hazardous areas. Additionally, opportunities for redevelopment projects can be identified to improve hazard mitigation by adjusting current land uses and requiring current building codes and standards for rehabilitation of or other changes to existing structures.

Many communities are directly or indirectly addressing hazard mitigation through their capital improvement plans. Such plans are generally maintained on a five to six-year basis. Capital Improvement Plans distribute the expense of major capital construction projects over time. Long-range infrastructure improvement projects are implemented annually through a jurisdiction's standard budget process. In many cases, bonds are used to finance projects. In recent years, state and federal grants have been used to offset the costs of local infrastructure improvements.

The purpose of an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) is to specifically protect people, property, and the environment during an emergency. It defines roles and responsibilities of how agencies should operate and communicate, operationalizing emergency responses and resources.

6.2.2.2 National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) & the Community Rating System (CRS)

Participating communities must adopt the National Flood Insurance Program's (NFIP's) minimum floodplain management standards through local regulations. They must also adopt the latest effective Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). These are important planning and regulatory capabilities because they support risk-aware development decisions in and around the floodplain.

Local floodplain programs are also built upon statewide requirements for land use planning and implementation of building codes. Local governments implement flood damage prevention ordinances through floodplain development permits, and the state building codes via local building permits. Many local governments in Oregon adopt higher regulatory standards into their flood damage prevention ordinances.

The NFIP's Community Rating System (CRS) allows communities to adopt floodplain management standards that exceed the NFIP's minimum requirements. The CRS rewards participating communities by discounting flood insurance premium rates. CRS participating communities (a) reduce flood damage to insurable property, (b) strengthen and support the insurance aspects of the NFIP, and (c) encourage a comprehensive approach to floodplain management. CRS classifications are based on points a community can achieve in 19 separate activities, providing discounts of flood insurance premium rates in increments of 5 percent. A Class 1 community receives the greatest discount, reaching 45 percent and a Class 10 community receives no discount.

In Oregon, 260 cities, counties, and tribes participate in the NFIP, including eight of the nine federally recognized tribes. Of those, 23 jurisdictions exceed the minimum NFIP standards through the CRS.

Table 6.2.2-1: Jurisdictions Participation in NFIP and CRS [October 2024]

County Name	Community Name	Plan Title	NFIP	CRS Level
Benton	Adair Village	Benton County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP		
Malheur	Adrian		X	
Benton	Albany	Albany NHMP	X	5
Linn	Albany	Albany NHMP	X	5
Yamhill	Amity	Yamhill County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clatsop	Arch Cape Sanitary District	Clatsop County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP		
Gilliam	Arlington	Gilliam County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Jackson	Ashland	Jackson County Multi-jurisdictional NHMP	X	9
Clatsop	Astoria	Clatsop County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Umatilla	Athena		X	
Marion	Aumsville	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Marion	Aurora	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Baker	Baker City	Baker County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	

County Name	Community Name	Plan Title	NFIP	CRS Level
Baker	Baker County	Baker County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Coos	Bandon	Coos County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	10
Washington	Banks		X	
Clackamas	Barlow		X	
Coos	Bay Area Hospital	Coos County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP		
Tillamook	Bay City	Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP2023 Update	X	
Washington	Beaverton	Beaverton NHMP	X	10
Washington	Beaverton	Washington County NHMP		
Deschutes	Bend	Deschutes County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Benton	Benton County	Benton County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	7
Morrow	Boardman	Morrow County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Klamath	Bonanza		X	
Curry	Brookings	Curry County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Harney	Burns	Harney County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Linn	Brownsville		X	
Jackson	Butte Falls	Jackson County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clackamas	Canby	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clatsop	Cannon Beach	Clatsop County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	10
Grant	Canyon		X	
Douglas	Canyonville	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Yamhill	Carlton	Yamhill County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Hood River	Cascade Locks	Hood River County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Josephine	Cave Junction	Josephine County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Jackson	Central Point	Jackson County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	6
Klamath	Chiloquin		X	
Clackamas	Clackamas County	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	10
Columbia	Clatskanie	Columbia County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clatsop	Clatsop County	Clatsop County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Washington	Clean Water Services	Washington County NHMP		
Lane	Coburg	Lane County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Columbia	Columbia City	Columbia County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Columbia	Columbia County	Columbia County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Gilliam	Condon	Gilliam County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Coos	Coos Bay	Coos County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Coos	Coos County	Coos County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Coos	Coquille	Coos County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Washington	Cornelius	Washington County NHMP	X	
Benton	Corvallis	Benton County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	5
Lane	Cottage Grove	City of Cottage Grove NHMP	X	6
Lane	Creswell	Lane County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	

County Name	Community Name	Plan Title	NFIP	CRS Level
Crook	Crook County	Crook County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Jefferson	Culver	Jefferson County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Curry	Curry County	Curry County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Polk	Dallas	Polk County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clackamas	Damascus		X	
Yamhill	Dayton	Yamhill County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Grant	Dayville		X	
Lincoln	Depoe Bay	Lincoln County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Deschutes	Deschutes County	Deschutes County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Marion	Detroit	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Douglas	Douglas County	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	10
Douglas	Drain	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Wasco	Dufur		X	
Yamhill	Dundee		X	
Lane	Dunes City	Lane County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Washington	Durham		X	
Jackson	Eagle Point	Jackson County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Umatilla	Echo	Umatilla County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Union	Elgin		X	
Douglas	Elkton	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Wallowa	Enterprise	Wallowa County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clackamas	Estacada	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lane	Eugene	Lane County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	7
Lane	Eugene Water & Electric Board	Eugene-Springfield City		
Multnomah	Fairview	Multnomah County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Polk	Falls City	Polk County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lane	Florence	Lane County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Washington	Forest Grove	Washington County NHMP	X	
Wheeler	Fossil	Wheeler County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Tillamook	Garibaldi	Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP2023 Update	X	
Washington	Gaston		X	
Marion	Gates		X	
Clatsop	Gearhart	Clatsop County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Marion	Gervais	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Gilliam	Gilliam County	Gilliam County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clackamas	Gladstone	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Douglas	Glendale	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Curry	Gold Beach	Curry County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	

County Name	Community Name	Plan Title	NFIP	CRS Level
Jackson	Gold Hill	Jackson County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Grant	Grant County	Grant County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Josephine	Grants Pass	Josephine County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	8
Sherman	Grass Valley	Sherman County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Multnomah	Gresham	Multnomah County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Baker	Haines		X	
Baker	Halfway	Baker County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Linn	Halsey	Linn County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clackamas	Happy Valley	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Harney	Harney County	Harney County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Linn	Harrisburg	Linn County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Umatilla	Helix	Umatilla County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Morrow	Heppner	Morrow County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	9
Umatilla	Hermiston	Umatilla County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Washington	Hillsboro	Washington County NHMP	X	
Harney	Hines	Harney County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Hood River	Hood River	Hood River County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Hood River	Hood River County	Hood River County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Marion	Hubbard	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Baker	Huntington		X	
Linn	Idanha	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Polk	Independence	Polk County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Morrow	Ione	Morrow County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Morrow	Irrigon	Morrow County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Union	Island City			
Jackson	Jackson County	Jackson County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	7
Jackson	Jacksonville	Jackson County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Marion	Jefferson	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Jefferson	Jefferson County	Jefferson County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Grant	John Day	Grant County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Malheur	Jordan Valley		X	
Wallowa	Joseph	Wallowa County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Josephine	Josephine County	Josephine County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lane	Junction City		X	
Marion	Keizer	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Washington	King City		X	
Klamath	Klamath County	Klamath County	X	
Klamath	Klamath Falls	Klamath County	X	

County Name	Community Name	Plan Title	NFIP	CRS Level
Union	La Grande	City of La Grande NHMP	X	
Yamhill	Lafayette		X	
Lake	Lake County	Lake County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clackamas	Lake Oswego	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Multnomah	Lake Oswego	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Washington	Lake Oswego	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Coos	Lakeside	Coos County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lake	Lakeview	Lake County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lane	Lane County	Lane County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	6
Deschutes	La Pine	Deschutes County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Linn	Lebanon	Linn County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Morrow	Lexington	Morrow County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lincoln	Lincoln City	Lincoln County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lincoln	Lincoln County	Lincoln County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Linn	Linn County	Linn County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Grant	Long Creek		X	
Wallowa	Lostine	Wallowa County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lane	Lowell	Lane County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Linn	Lyons	Linn County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Jefferson	Madras	Jefferson County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Malheur	Malheur County	Malheur County MJ NHMP	X	
Tillamook	Manzanita	Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP2023 Update	X	
Marion	Marion County	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	10
Wasco	Maupin		X	
Yamhill	McMinnville	Yamhill County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Jackson	Medford	Medford City NHMP	X	5
Klamath	Merrill			
Jefferson	Metolius	Jefferson County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP		
Linn	Mill City	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Linn	Millersburg		X	
Umatilla	Milton-Freewater	Umatilla County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clackamas	Milwaukie	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Multnomah	Milwaukie	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Wheeler	Mitchell	Wheeler County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clackamas	Molalla	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Polk	Monmouth	Polk County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Benton	Monroe	Benton County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Grant	Monument		X	
Sherman	Moro city	Sherman County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP		

County Name	Community Name	Plan Title	NFIP	CRS Level
Morrow	Morrow County	Morrow County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Wasco	Mosier		X	
Marion	Mount Angel city	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Grant	Mount Vernon		X	
Multnomah	Multnomah County	Multnomah County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Douglas	Myrtle Creek	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	10
Coos	Myrtle Point	Coos County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Tillamook	Nehalem	Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	7
Yamhill	Newberg	Yamhill County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lincoln	Newport	Lincoln County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Coos	North Bend	Coos County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Washington	North Plains	Washington County NHMP	X	
Union	North Powder		X	
Malheur	Nyssa	Malheur County MJ NHMP	X	
Douglas	Oakland	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lane	Oakridge	Lane County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Malheur	Ontario	Malheur County MJ NHMP	X	
Clackamas	Oregon City	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	6
Lake	Paisley	Lake County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Umatilla	Pendleton	Umatilla County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Benton	Philomath	Benton County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Jackson	Phoenix	Jackson County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Umatilla	Pilot Rock		X	
Polk	Polk County	Polk County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	9
Clackamas	Portland	City of Portland 2021 NHMP	X	5
Multnomah	Portland	City of Portland 2021 NHMP	X	5
Washington	Portland	City of Portland 2021 NHMP	X	5
Curry	Port Orford	Curry County Multi-jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Coos	Powers	Coos County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Grant	Prairie City		X	
Columbia	Prescott	Columbia County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Crook	Prineville	Crook County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Columbia	Rainier	Columbia County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Deschutes	Redmond	Deschutes County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP		
Douglas	Reedsport	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Douglas	Riddle	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Tillamook	Rockaway Beach	Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP2023 Update	X	10
Jackson	Rogue River	Jackson County Multi-jurisdictional NHMP	X	10
Douglas	Roseburg	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	7
Sherman	Rufus	Sherman County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	

County Name	Community Name	Plan Title	NFIP	CRS Level
Marion	Salem	City of Salem NHMP	X	3
Polk	Salem	City of Salem NHMP	X	3
Clackamas	Sandy	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Columbia	Scappoose	Columbia County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	9
Linn	Scio	Linn County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	10
Marion	Scotts Mills	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Clatsop	Seaside	Clatsop County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Jackson	Shady Cove		X	
Jackson	Shady Cove	Jackson County Multi-jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Yamhill	Sheridan	Yamhill County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	8
Sherman	Sherman County	Sherman County Multi-jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Washington	Sherwood	Washington County NHMP	X	
Lincoln	Siletz	Lincoln County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Marion	Silverton		X	
Deschutes	Sisters	Deschutes County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Linn	Sodaville	Linn County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP		
Wheeler	Spray	Wheeler County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lane	Springfield	Eugene-Springfield City	X	
Marion	St. Paul		X	
Umatilla	Stanfield	Umatilla County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	10
Marion	Stayton	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Columbia	St. Helens	Columbia County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Marion	Sublimity	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan		
Union	Summerville		X	
Baker	Sumpter		X	
Douglas	Sutherlin	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Linn	Sweet Home	City of Sweet Home NHMP	X	
Jackson	Talent	Jackson County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	8
Linn	Tangent	Linn County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Wasco	The Dalles	Wasco County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Washington	Tigard	Washington County NHMP	X	
Tillamook	Tillamook	Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP2023 Update	X	9
Tillamook	Tillamook County	Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP2023 Update	X	10
Lincoln	Toledo	Lincoln County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Multnomah	Troutdale	Multnomah County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	9
Washington	Tualatin	Washington County NHMP	X	
Washington	Tualatin Valley Water District	Washington County NHMP		

County Name	Community Name	Plan Title	NFIP	CRS Level
Marion	Turner	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Umatilla	Ukiah	Umatilla County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Umatilla	Umatilla County	Umatilla County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Union	Union County	Union County NHMP	X	
Malheur	Vale	Malheur County MJ NHMP	X	
Lane	Veneta	Lane County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Columbia	Vernonia	Columbia County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lincoln	Waldport	Lincoln County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Wallowa	Wallowa	Wallowa County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Wallowa	Wallowa County	Wallowa County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clatsop	Warrenton city	Clatsop County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Sherman	Wasco	Sherman County Multi-jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Wasco	Wasco County	Wasco County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Washington	Washington County	Washington County NHMP	X	
Linn	Waterloo	Linn County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lane	Westfir	Lane County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clackamas	West Linn	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Umatilla	Weston	Umatilla County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Tillamook	Wheeler	Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP2023 Update	X	
Wheeler	Wheeler County	Wheeler County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Yamhill	Willamina	Yamhill County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Clackamas	Wilsonville	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Washington	Wilsonville	Clackamas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Douglas	Winston	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Marion	Woodburn	Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Multnomah	Wood Village	Multnomah County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Lincoln	Yachats	Lincoln County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Yamhill	Yamhill	Yamhill County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Yamhill	Yamhill County	Yamhill County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	
Douglas	Yoncalla	Douglas County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP	X	

Source: Community status book report for state OR

Table 6.2.2-2: Tribes Participation in NFIP and CRS [October 2024]

Tribe	Plan Title	NFIP	CRS Level
Burns Paiute Tribe	Burns Paiute Tribal Mitigation Plan		
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians Multi-NHMP	X	
Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians	Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians Tribal Mitigation Plan	X	

Tribe	Plan Title	NFIP	CRS Level
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde	Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Tribal Mitigation Plan	X	
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation Tribal Mitigation Plan	X	
Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation	Warm Springs Tribal Mitigation Plan	X	
Coquille Indian Tribe	Coquille Indian Tribe NHMP	X	
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians	Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians All-Hazards Mitigation Plan	X	
Klamath Tribes		X	

6.2.2.3 Building Codes & Code Enforcement

The mission of the Building Codes Division is to work with Oregonians to ensure safe building construction while promoting a positive business climate (Building Codes Division : About us : State of Oregon). This mission is accomplished through: (a) adopting and administering uniform statewide building codes; (b) providing code and rule interpretation; (c) assisting local government building departments and facilitating dispute resolution; (d) enforcing license, code, and permit requirements; (e) certifying inspectors and licensing trade professionals; (f) facilitating economic development efforts around the state; and (g) conducting inspections where local entities do not.

Building codes have proven to be effective in hazard mitigation, establishing uniform standards for all residential and commercial buildings in Oregon. At the local level, all jurisdictions have building codes that they adopt and enforce. This allows cities and counties in Oregon to ensure that new construction is built to minimum standards. Certain provisions of the building code apply to the design and construction of buildings located in areas prone to natural hazards. For example, the city of Ashland adopted and administers the 2023 Oregon Residential Specialty Code and the 2022 Oregon Fire Code. However, Oregon's minimum and maximum requirements do not allow local jurisdictions to exceed maximum requirements in most cases. Refer to the state capability assessment for Oregon State building codes related to hazard resilience.

6.2.2.4 Administrative & Technical

Local governments with the capability to seek funding and enforce codes have clear advantages in pursuing mitigation actions. Some jurisdictions lack a full-time emergency manager and staff, a clear deficiency for seeking and managing grants and ensuring code compliance. All 36 Oregon counties have Emergency Managers, whether full- or part-time, and cities over 85,000 can access the Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) to help pay for Emergency Managers. Twenty-seven cities have full- or part-time Emergency Management positions, as do METRO, the Port of Portland, and the Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization (RDPO).

Emergency Managers consider resources such as staffing, access to technical experts, and funding to implement mitigation actions; whether the local government has the capacity not only to take, but also to maintain, a mitigation project; whether the local government has the capacity to accomplish a mitigation

project in a timely manner; whether the mitigation project is a short- or long-term fix; and the potential impacts to infrastructure or systems not directly related to the mitigation action.

Oregon's cities employ one of four forms of government that vary by administrative roles: (a) council/manager or administrator; (b) commission; (c) mayor/council; and (d) strong mayor. Most Oregon cities with populations over 2,500 use the council/manager or council/administrator form.

Twenty-eight counties are governed by a board of commissioners comprised of three to five elected members. The other eight are governed by a county court consisting of a county judge and two commissioners.

6.2.2.5 Financial

Many cities implement Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs) with great success in providing services to their communities within their budget. CIPs are effective at addressing mitigation actions through specific budgeting, especially when integrated into other plans and polices. For example, the City of Salem provides a comprehensive mapping of projects by category that allows citizens to see where infrastructure projects are occurring.

The property tax system in Oregon is heavily influenced by Measures 5 and 50, both of which limit the amount of tax that can be levied. These fixed tax rates, set at the 1997 level, limit potential growth in revenue for local governments and fail to reflect changes in community dynamics (https://www.oregon.gov/DOR/programs/gov-research/Documents/303-405-1.pdf). Property tax systems based on a fixed assessed value as opposed to market values severely limit a local government's ability to improve their financial situation(FAQ on Measures 5 and 50). Financial capabilities are tied to administration insofar as setting up fees, grant writing and administration, and other sources that could support CIPs. Having the appropriate staff to seek and manage funding is an essential capability for local governments.

6.2.2.6 Educational Outreach, Groups, and Organizations

Considered people-powered capabilities, grassroots movements involve people at their core directly serving locals, people with acute needs, and disadvantaged communities that cross jurisdictional boundaries. These capabilities are the most direct, on-the-ground resources for smaller communities, especially impacting underserved communities. They have the power to cross cultural or political barriers to serve, inform, and educate a broader range of people about disaster resilience and mitigation. Social cohesion, in the form of resilience hubs (such as community centers, general stores, town halls etc.), gives people not only a place to gather, shelter, and share information but also provides the foundation for a community response system during hazard events.

Part of education and outreach involves a local government's ability to work with and empower local organizations, groups, and institutions to work with residents to be prepared for natural hazard events. Strengthening neighborly relationships, knowing who and where your emergency operation contacts are, and providing community courses and training are all examples of increasing local capabilities in the event major social infrastructure is impeded. Local governments can help with spotlighting these resources as well as identifying appropriate resilience hub locations. Neighborhood associations, for example, have the potential for door-to-door outreach for community education pre-disaster and localized operations in post-

hazard scenarios. Another example is the Nehalem Bay Emergency Volunteer Corps (NBEVC), a non-profit that hosts a wealth of online knowledge about preparation, events, training, and other resources for the numerous natural hazard events that could affect the local area. The state has a responsibility to aid local governments' ability in outreach to these entities.

It's important that community members view their city's, county's, special district's, and Tribe's Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan capability section to see how they assess their abilities to coordinate local programs on a scale that meets community members' needs.

Numerous county plans in Eastern Oregon do an excellent job of listing the wealth of social connectivity entities in their areas, making their NHMP an active resource for the community.

6.2.3 Tribal Capability

The tribal capability assessment provides a general description of tribal mitigation capabilities in Oregon, including examples of successful policies and programs, followed by an analysis of the effectiveness of these capabilities. The assessment concludes with a discussion of opportunities and obstacles to implementing and strengthening tribal capabilities.

Table 6.2.3-1 lists the nine federally recognized Tribes in Oregon and their NHMP status. Tribes may work directly with FEMA or access assistance through the state. Those in bold have accessed state assistance to some degree.

Table 6.2.3-1: Federally Recognized Tribes' NHMP Status as of February 2025

Tribal Nation	Expiration Date	Status
Burns Paiute Tribe	7/20/2026	Approved
Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw	8/13/2029	Approved
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	4/19/2020	Expired. Update in process.
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon	1/27/2025	Expired. Update in process.
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	1/31/2027	Approved
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon	9/19/2021	Expired. Update in process.
Coquille Indian Tribe	6/11/2023	Approved pending adoption
Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe	8/1/2029	Approved
Klamath Tribes	9/6/2022	Expired

Source: FEMA

Similar to local rural governments' capabilities, much of tribal capacity rests in a tribal government's ability to operationalize their governance and administration through staffing. The ability to apply and process grants, securing staff through competitive pay, and the development of master plans and regulatory documents provide similar effectiveness and limitations as local jurisdictions. For example, the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, & Siuslaw Indians (CTCLUSI) provides a comprehensive assessment of their planning, administrative, financial, and education capabilities and how they relate to hazard planning. Similarly, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) provides a complete governmental organization structure within their NHMP.

Currently, four of the nine federally recognized tribes have current, FEMA-approved NHMPs. One will be approved once the Tribal government adopts it. Three plans are in the process of being updated. DLCD began assisting with tribal mitigation planning in 2020. Some tribes seem better equipped than others to plan, implement mitigation actions, pursue and manage grants, and more.

Many state agencies have government-to-government relations policies in place with the intent of recognizing tribal autonomy and bolstering communication. DLCD and OEM could initiate more outreach to coordinate with the Tribes and assist with mitigation-related needs or activities to the extent they desire. This could include assistance with data-gathering, mapping, setting up regular coordination meetings, and other initiatives that would potentially increase capacity.

6.2.4 Challenges and Obstacles

Low-capacity jurisdictions already struggling with overburdened staff and tight budgets are often unable to use or are unaware of mitigation capabilities. In plan development, some jurisdictions assess capabilities in an explicit section, others in the community profile. Conducting a thorough examination of available resources and capabilities and writing clearly about them in the plan will help development of mitigation strategies.

One such significant obstacle for low-capacity jurisdictions is the cost-share required for FEMA grants. For already financially constrained jurisdictions, a grant's cost share requirement is a deterrent, preventing them from applying. This is often seen with federal Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) grants, including the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP), Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) and Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) programs, where the required non-federal cost share is 25%. Though the state legislature provided funding through House Bill 5006 (2021) to cover the cost share requirement for one FEMA grant in full, many low-capacity jurisdictions are still applying much less often than higher-capacity jurisdictions.

Other obstacles involve staffing, managing grant funding, and adhering to the administrative requirements of a grant. Many jurisdictions are without grant writers or administrators, and some maintain part-time Emergency Managers. Even if successful at applying for and receiving a grant, low-capacity jurisdictions often cannot see large projects through. Larger communities are generally able to obtain grants to implement mitigation actions but managing them can still be an obstacle. However, since the 2021 legislative session, OEM has more than doubled the number of its full-time staff positions, potentially lending more resources for local governments across the state. The OEM Mitigation and Recovery Regional Coordinators provide the local governments in their regions with technical assistance and coordination in pursuing mitigation grant opportunities. They may also assist the local governments in effectively leveraging state and federal dollars to maximize risk reduction and better position their communities to recover from disasters.

For a local Emergency Manager, finding the appropriate resources and agency to support efforts may also present a challenge. Each agency within the State IHMT offers support in a different facet of hazard mitigation, and jurisdictions can sometimes find the information they're looking for elusive. Agency regions and coordinating offices are very inconsistent across sectors. Difficulty in accessing reliable data to inform decision-making and prioritize mitigation efforts for these communities drain administrative capacity, unnecessarily extend timelines, and may potentially be a deterrent when making implementation choices.

Most importantly, building trust between community members and local authorities and encouraging active participation from underserved communities will build resilience and support mitigation efforts.

6.2.4.1 Underrepresented Communities

Underrepresented communities – those with lower incomes, longer travel times to services, limited safe routes, limited essential services and lifelines, often located in rural areas – generally have fewer resources available to them. This makes community organizing, "word of mouth" communications, integrating social systems, and social capital even more important.

Inversely, communicating with underrepresented communities in urban areas where messages are generally more accessible can also be an issue. The City of Salem approaches this issue by engaging faith communities, social service agencies, nonprofits, and neighborhood associations in building community resilience (Salem's Action Item #12).

Communities should prioritize meeting the needs of vulnerable populations – people who are elderly, children, disabled, homeless, have limited English proficiency, or are living in poverty, among other factors – through mitigation actions. Locating service centers, schools, hospitals, and more near these populations will reduce their vulnerability.

Social organizations that represent people of color, people with mental or physical disabilities, veterans, and other vulnerable populations should be included in mitigation planning processes to ensure their issues are addressed.

Economic constraints in rural areas may limit the ability to implement costly climate adaptation measures. Dependence on agriculture or other climate-sensitive industries may exacerbate the economic impacts of climate-related natural hazard events.

6.2.4.2 Climate Change

As climate change continues to shape the frequency, intensity, and location of natural hazard events, local governments will have to be more proactive in anticipating such impacts and designing mitigation actions that account for these changes. The increased frequency and intensity of natural hazard events could exacerbate impacts on already constrained budgets and finite resources.

A lack of awareness and understanding of the local impacts of climate change may result in a lack of urgency or prioritization in adaptation efforts, as well as insufficient knowledge about the specific vulnerabilities of the community to climate change. Aging or inadequate infrastructure may be more vulnerable to climate-related events, increasing the community's overall susceptibility.

Lastly, resistance or lack of buy-in from community members or local authorities may impede the adoption of climate-resilient practices and policies. Balancing short-term priorities with long-term climate mitigation and adaptation goals can be challenging.

6.2.4.3 Private Dams

In general, tribes and local governments' ability to reduce risk from potential dam failures is fairly low, unless the local government owns the dam. A notable exception is dams that are eligible for funding from FEMA's High Hazard Potential Dam program. Also, some local governments have participated in exercises to test their emergency action plans. Few local governments have used inundation maps to develop evacuation maps.

Inundation maps are only required for dams rated high hazard. Inundation maps for state regulated dams in Oregon are public information; however, there is no mechanism to get this information to people at risk from high hazard potential dams in unsatisfactory or poor condition. Residents below dams are usually unaware of the risk. The issue is mostly due to past developments below dams. Oregon land use regulations are fairly effective at limiting new development in areas below dams.

6.2.5 Potential Solutions

The State of Oregon has many resources and the capacity to hone those resources to better meet the multitude of needs across counties, cities, special districts and tribes. In general, assessing local capabilities could be bolstered by using FEMA's recommended capability assessment worksheet.

Already a direct liaison with a wealth of understanding, the Regional Coordinators at OEM can provide more direct technical assistance in plan monitoring and maintenance throughout the development of NHMPs to ensure that local capabilities support potential mitigation actions.

The Governor's Regional Solutions Team works to provide collaborative governance and facilitation and could assist in linking adjacent counties and cities' capacity to increase resilience. The Regional Solutions Team could take a more proactive approach in emphasizing hazard mitigation actions with local Emergency Managers. A multi-agency collaboration to identify funds to help cover the 25% non-federal cost share required by FEMA grants would lessen the financial burden on subapplicants.

One way to potentially address the non-federal cost share and reliance on FEMA's onerous grant review and approval timelines is to develop a state-driven funding and plan maintenance coverage program for which local jurisdictions and tribes can compete. This potential funding program would not only directly meet the state's mitigation actions #14 & #31 but would also call for stronger action concerning Goal 7. Aligning local NHMPs with local communities' housing production strategies is a DLCD priority for protecting our built environment. The Governor's Regional Solutions Teams and OEM's Regional Coordinators Program could play a part in coordinating a more robust technical assistance and outreach program to synchronize multi-jurisdictional mitigation strategies, potentially increasing resilience while reducing the cost-share burden on each jurisdiction.

With a robust building code inventory at the state level and a proven track record at improving disaster resilience, ensuring each county's Building Official has the appropriate support for implementation and enforcement would provide a strong measure of effectiveness and coordination.

The Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) makes grants to states to assist jurisdictions in preparing for hazards. One of the objectives of the funds is to build continuity capabilities to ensure resilience of essential government functions and services. OEM applies for this grant on behalf of jurisdictions and Tribes as the eligible entity. Increasing awareness that OEM can provide technical support may help to increase the quantity of grant applications.

The biggest opportunity to reduce risks from high hazard potential dams would be to create a process to share information with residents and property owners at risk. This information is sometimes contained in floodplain management plans within NHMPs. The Oregon Dam Safety Program has drafted sample sections to add this information to NHMPs.

6.3 State and Local Planning Coordination

The State of Oregon has a strong history of working with local governments to reduce their risk from natural hazards. Maintaining this relationship is a top priority.

Considering the breadth of agencies and departments associated with hazard mitigation planning at the state level, it's imperative that their resources are available at the several scales needed to support all of Oregon's counties, cities, special districts, and tribes in natural hazards mitigation. This requires clear coordination and communication among state agencies and a willingness to collaborate and build local capacity.

Success of local mitigation efforts is one measure of the state's achievement of its mitigation goals. Likewise, local governments should take into account the resources the state can provide when determining its mitigation goals and actions. The better informed of and aligned with each others' mitigation priorities, the more easily both levels of government can collaborate in advancing resilience.

Local NHMPs provide the clearest insight into the success of mitigation efforts, allocation of resources, and overall community buy-in. This section describes the state's policies and processes for assisting local governments with hazard mitigation planning and projects, including funding opportunities, technical assistance, and training.

6.3.1 Technical Assistance

DLCD, DOGAMI, the Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience (OPDR), and the Oregon Climate Change Research Institute (OCCRI) provide direct state technical planning assistance for developing and updating local and tribal NHMPs. Funded through FEMA grants with a non-federal cost share of 25%, DLCD's staff and OPDR's staff and students support local government leaders throughout the mitigation planning process, ensuring a robust public process; that NHMPs are based on the best information available; and that they are approvable by FEMA. DLCD and OPDR assist local governments in the same way with developing or updating Community Wildfire Protection Plans that local governments can then integrate with their NHMPs.

DOGAMI provides county-level risk assessments and OCCRI provides county-level future projection reports that directly inform the natural hazards mitigation planning process. Staff also provide technical assistance indirectly, in the form of education and access to products and information on state and federal websites. Councils of Government and private sector consultants provide similar technical assistance.

At OEM, the State Hazard Mitigation Officer (SHMO) and two Deputy SHMOs lead teams which assist with mitigation project development, execution, and grant compliance. The Special Projects Coordinator leads mitigation plans; public information and outreach, particularly for earthquake and tsunami hazards; and tsunami evacuation planning.

Since 2021, OEM has added 15 new staff members to assist in HMA grant assistance, RiskMAP coordination, administration, and general technical assistance. Though this increase in capacity has resulted in new support for local governments it has also increased administrative and reporting responsibilities.

DLCD's Ocean and Coastal Management Program (OCMP) staff provide local governments on the Oregon Coast assistance in complying with Statewide Planning Goal 7 which requires planning for natural hazards. Also frequently working cooperatively with DOGAMI, OCMP staff assist with planning for a Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake and tsunami, sea level rise, coastal erosion, and other hazards unique to the coast. Goal 7 encourages implementing the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) minimum and higher standards. In 2015, DLCD staff began assisting local jurisdictions with updating and developing new NHMPs. DOGAMI continues to develop local risk assessments that underpin local NHMPs through FEMA's Cooperating Technical Partners (CTP) program and partnering with the Risk MAP (Mapping, Assessment and Planning) Program.

Together, OEM and DLCD provide technical assistance to property owners, local governments, and tribes for mitigating repetitive loss (RL) and severe repetitive loss (SRL) properties. DLCD and OEM provide notification and information about mitigation grants to state agencies, tribes, counties, cities, and special districts. OEM provides assistance, to the degree possible, to communities to help them prepare grant subapplications. The state and local governments must have an information sharing agreement with FEMA to obtain RL and SRL data. Since the state does not have such an agreement and is therefore unable to share RL and SRL data with local governments, DLCD advises them to request the data from FEMA and execute the data sharing agreement. Once the local governments have obtained the data, DLCD will work with them to identify mitigation options and prioritize mitigation projects for RL and SRL properties.

DOGAMI

In addition to the RiskMAP Program's natural hazard data products, specific hazard information, risk, and vulnerability assessment products are provided by DOGAMI on a funding-contingent basis. When State funding is involved, it may come through DOGAMI itself or from other State agencies. One example is DOGAMI's initial study of statewide channel migration zone susceptibility which was fully supported with State funds. This is an important step forward in understanding the state's flood risk and is expected to pave the way for further state and federal funding to support detailed channel migration zone delineations. Ultimately, these non-regulatory, informational products can help save lives and reduce property damage from flooding. Another example is DOGAMI's recently launched flood hazard webpage, http://www.oregongeology.org/flood/default.htm.

Numerous other agencies — federal (e.g., FEMA, USGS, USACE), state (e.g., ODF, ODOT, OHA) and local (counties, cities, councils of governments, and special districts) also contribute valuable technical information and support to local mitigation planning efforts. The Oregon Department of Forestry, as an example, provides assistance protecting against insect and disease infestation. The Oregon Health Authority manages Oregon's Health Security, Preparedness, and Response (HSPR) Program in collaboration with OEM to provide resources in the event of health emergencies and natural hazard events.

In addition to contributions by state, federal, and local agencies, other entities contribute critical technical assistance to the hazard mitigation planning and include the Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience (OPDR) and Oregon Climate Change Research Institute (OCCRI).

OPDR

A critical source of technical hazard mitigation planning assistance in Oregon, the Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience (OPDR), part of the Institute for Policy Research and Engagement at the University of Oregon, assists local jurisdictions with grant writing, local NHMP development or updates, process facilitation, stakeholder engagement, public outreach, and hazard research services and serves as a liaison between tribes and local governments and state, federal and NGO partners during the mitigation planning process. OPDR strives to ensure that tribes and local communities:

- Receive the tools and resources to successfully facilitate and document plan development or plan update processes;
- Establish regional partnerships to discuss collaborative projects and implementation strategies; and
- Engage with a variety of state and local agencies and organizations that can assist with local risk reduction strategies.

OCCRI

Oregon Climate Change Research Institute (OCCRI), created under HB 3543 (2007), also plays a critical role, providing technical assistance to local jurisdictions and the state by analyzing the influence of climate change on natural hazards. OCCRI is a network of dozens of researchers and professionals at Oregon State University, Portland State University, University of Oregon, and other universities, agencies, and organizations. Among OCCRI's charges from the Legislature is assessment of "the state of climate change science, including biological, physical and social science, as it relates to Oregon and the likely effects of climate change on the state." According to OCCRI, to meet its charges from the Legislature, the institute serves roles that include the following:

- Facilitate research on climate change and its effects on natural and human systems in Oregon.
- Serve as a clearinghouse for climate change information.
- Provide climate change information to the public in integrated and accessible formats.
- Provide technical assistance to local governments in developing climate change policies, practices, and programs.
- Produce a biennial assessment on the state of the science of climate change as it applies to Oregon and the likely effects of climate change on the state.

Resource Assistance for Rural Environments (RARE) is an AmeriCorps program also housed at the University of Oregon's Institute for Policy Research and Engagement. Its mission is "to increase the capacity of rural communities to improve their economic, social, and environmental conditions, through the assistance of trained graduate-level members who live and work in communities for 11 months." The RARE program has successfully provided natural hazards mitigation planning assistance to rural communities and the state could potentially create a relationship with the program to provide ongoing mitigation planning assistance in rural communities.

Technical assistance provided by DLCD's Oregon Coastal Management Program (OCMP) during the life of the 2020 Oregon NHMP resulted in these accomplishments:

- The Oregon Coastal Management Program created a collection of tools to assist communities in planning for sea level rise impacts specific to the Oregon coast both within estuaries and along the outer coast. The three resources in this kit support data acquisition, vulnerability assessment, and adaptation planning.
- The Sea Level Rise Impact Explorer assists communities and planners in accessing and exploring community data sets with respect to sea level rise impacts so they can understand the risks and plan accordingly.
- The Sea Level Rise Impact Assessment Tool is a digital workbook designed to help users inventory what activities take place within areas affected by sea level rise, assess vulnerability to harm, and prioritize further investigation into remedial and adaptive actions.
- The Sea Level Rise Planning Guide for Coastal Oregon is a document that provides a suggested approach to evaluating the assets and populations at risk from the impacts of sea level rise.
- DLCD worked with a NOAA Coastal Management Fellow to complete a sea level rise vulnerability assessment for Clatsop County. The Fellow led community workshops in which community assets at risk from sea level rise were identified; completed a Sea Level Rise Impact Assessment; developed Inundation Mitigation and Adaptation Action Plans for project implementation; and created a Sea Level Rise Community Engagement Guide for other communities to carry out similar work.
- DLCD has contracted DOGAMI to update the previously used 1975 Beach and Dune Inventory maps for the whole coast, starting with a pilot project in Tillamook County. DLCD has worked with Tillamook County, Coos County, and the City of Bandon to adopt these new inventory maps into their comprehensive plans and to update their Beaches and Dunes sections of their comprehensive plans, policies, and codes. DLCD is also working with Clatsop County to do the same as they update their comprehensive plan for Goals 16, 17, and 18. Adopting these maps and updating accompanying Goal 18 policies can limit hazards to people and property along the ocean shore and minimize impact to the natural beach and dune environments.
- The OCMP also assists with addressing hazards to promote community resilience through the ongoing King Tides Project. This project is co-coordinated with Coast Watch, a nonprofit group housed within Oregon Shores. The project asks community volunteers to take and submit photographs of king tide impacts such as storm surge, coastal flooding, and erosion. Photos taken during king tides can show the impact of higher sea levels and storms on those sites. This information can help raise awareness of possible impacts from sea level rise and inform planning for coastal inundation. Staff for the King Tides Project created a new website and are improving the image by tagging and sharing efforts, conducting outreach events, and spreading awareness through press interviews and social media.

6.3.2 Funding Assistance

Funding for the State's Hazard Mitigation Planning Program comes primarily from FEMA's non-disaster grant program, Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC), and from the post-disaster Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP). These grants are supplemented by state and local general funds, University of Oregon in-kind cost share, and other in-kind cost share sources (e.g., local stakeholder cost share).

6.3.2.1 Land Use Planning Grants

The Land Conservation and Development Commission oversees a grant program through which each biennium local government is awarded general funds for purposes that support the statewide land use planning program. One of the grants in the program is the Technical Assistance (TA) Grant. It is a competitive grant that has the following five priorities, in order:

1. Promote economic development.
2. Plan for resilience to natural hazards and climate change
3. Plan for resolution of a local planning issue, challenges in integrating conflicting statewide planning goals, or problem of statewide concern that can provide a framework, solutions, or guidance for similar programs to be implemented by other local governments around the state.
4. Provide infrastructure financing plans for urbanizing areas.
5. Update comprehensive plans and implementing codes to respond to changes in state law, regulatory streamlining, or significantly changed local conditions since the last plan update.

In the 2023-25 biennium, the descriptive language for Priority #2 acknowledges the need to plan for resilience to natural hazards and climate change and provides assistance with (a) creating or updating local natural hazards mitigation, climate adaptation, pre-disaster recovery, and planning to reduce climate pollution; (b) other studies and activities supporting local resilience to natural hazards, climate adaptation, pre-disaster recovery, and climate mitigation; (c) incorporating new natural hazards, climate adaptation, climate pollution reduction, and pre-disaster recovery data and policies, and related state goals, policies, and regulations, into comprehensive plans, land use and zoning regulations.

The legislature reduced the amount of funding allocated to this program in response to the 2009 great recession and has not restored previous levels of funding since then, despite DLCD's requests to do so. One bright spot since then – the legislature has increased technical assistance funding since 2018 for local government work on housing issues, thus allowing use of the technical assistance funding for other types of projects, which may include projects addressing natural hazards.

DLCD and OEM have continued to request new funding to support hazard mitigation-related staff positions in their respective agencies. New positions would increase the state's capacity to develop data useful for local hazard mitigation planning; provide access for local jurisdictions and tribes to that data; provide technical assistance to local jurisdictions for mitigation planning, projects, and integrating local NHMPs with comprehensive plans, implementing programs and regulations.

6.3.2.2 Mitigation Program Regional Representatives

The Regional Coordinators Program at OEM employs specialized field staff members to support local and Tribal emergency management partners through all areas of emergencies and disasters. Regional Coordinators provide service to all 36 counties in Oregon. The OEM Tribal Liaison, who helps coordinate emergency management initiatives for the nine federally recognized Tribes of Oregon, provides additional support to the Regional Coordinators Program. The Regional Coordinators Program is structured into two teams: Preparedness and Response Coordination Team and Mitigation and Recovery Coordination Team.

6.3.3 Training

Oregon delivers a robust calendar of training classes and events each year that support mitigation planning, project development and implementation, and risk reduction. Oregon also delivers the *Oregon Prepared* Conference in the spring of each year which brings together emergency managers and others for a few days of training and networking.

OEM Mitigation Planning staff will provide periodic training, in partnership with FEMA, on how to develop and implement natural hazard mitigation plans. OEM will use:

- The FEMA "318" series of classes (G-318, etc.)
- Webinars
- Individual technical assistance

Table 6.3.3-1: State NFIP Trainings by DLCD Staff

Training	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020
Oregon Private Land Surveyors of Oregon Conference Salem, Or.					
Elevation Certificates		x	x		x
Floodplain Management for Surveyors		x			
L0273: Managing Floodplain Development Through the NFIP June 5-8, 2023 Eugene, Or.		x			
L0273: Managing Floodplain Development Through the NFIP May 6-9, 2024 Newport, Or.	x				
Northwest Regional Floodplain Management Association Conference					
Silver Jackets Update		x		x	
Oregon Biological Opinion Update	x	x			
Oregon State Breakout Discussion	x	x		x	
Federal Flood Risk Management Standard Webinar Dec. 2024	x				
Oregon Dept. of Insurance Commission Floodplain Training	x				
DLCD trainings					
Hazard Happenings - Post Disaster Floodplain Management				x	
Buildable Lands Inventory TAC	x				
Hazards Work Group BiOp Update	x				
Oregon Coastal Planners Network	x				
All-Staff Meeting March 2024	x				
The Seminar Group - Basic Floodplain Management	x				
Oregon Floodplain Manager Group Quarterly Meetings					
NOAA-NMFS Biological Opinion (BiOp) Update Oct. 2024	x				
Oregon Silver Jackets Update March 2024	x				
Oregon Silver Jackets					
Inundation Mapping National Presentation	x				
Substantial Damage Training			x		x
Oregon Realtor Association Conference Presentation				x	

Training	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020
Flood Preparedness Webinar			x		
Insurance Workshops DLCD & FEMA					x
ASFPM Presentation - Post Wildfire Floodplain Management				x	
Fish Enhancement Policy Rescission Presentation				x	
NFIP and Floodplain Management in Oregon				x	

Table 6.3.3-2: Geological Hazard Trainings by OEM - 2020-2024

Year	Training Number	Description
2024	FEMA P-2055, ATC-20	In this training, participants learn how to evaluate the safety of buildings following earthquakes. Trainees learn how to perform seismic inspections and safety evaluations of buildings, and to post appropriate safety-status placards. These evaluations and placards can be used in planning and executing evacuation, re-entry, and rebuilding strategies. Under NETAP, ATC-20 training can only be obtained if conducted in conjunction with FEMA P-154 or FEMA P-2055.
2023	FEMA P-1100	Wood light-frame residential buildings represent the most common type of dwelling in the United States. Although this type of construction in one- and two-family configurations has generally provided good performance in past earthquakes, there are well-known vulnerabilities that have led to large numbers of homes being rendered uninhabitable or even unrepairable following an earthquake. Improved seismic design and seismic retrofitting of these structures will increase the probability that homes are available to provide shelter immediately following moderate to large seismic events. FEMA P-1100, prepared by ATC for the California Earthquake Authority (CEA) and FEMA, provides a methodology to identify and retrofit specific vulnerabilities in wood light-frame dwellings.
2023	FEMA P-2055, ATC-20	In this training, participants learn how to evaluate the safety of buildings following earthquakes. Trainees learn how to perform seismic inspections and safety evaluations of buildings, and to post appropriate safety-status placards. These evaluations and placards can be used in planning and executing evacuation, re-entry, and rebuilding strategies. Under NETAP, ATC-20 training can only be obtained if conducted in conjunction with FEMA P-154 or FEMA P-2055.
2023	FEMA P-2055, ATC-20	In this training, participants learn how to evaluate the safety of buildings following earthquakes. Trainees learn how to perform seismic inspections and safety evaluations of buildings, and to post appropriate safety-status placards. These evaluations and placards can be used in planning and executing evacuation, re-entry, and rebuilding strategies. Under NETAP, ATC-20 training can only be obtained if conducted in conjunction with FEMA P-154 or FEMA P-2055.

Table 6.3.3-3: Trainings conducted by OEM

Date	Location	Topic	Hours	Lead Dept.
April 2021	remote	HMGP and Mitigation Planning for SDAO	~80	OEM
Jan. 2022	remote	Hazard Mitigation Planning 101	~10	OEM
Feb. 2022	remote	Natural Hazards Mitigation Planning for Special Districts	~50	OEM
Feb. 2022	remote	Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) for Special Districts	~50	OEM
Oct. 2022	Eugene	Hazard Mitigation Planning 101	~60	OEM
Dec. 2022	remote	Hazard Mitigation Planning 101	~5	OEM
July 2023	remote	Oregon NHMP and SRAUP	~25	DLCD/OEM
Sept. 2023	remote	FEMA P-1100, Vulnerability-Based Seismic Assessment and Retrofit of One- and Two-Family Dwellings	unknown	NETAP
Oct. 2023	Tigard	FEMA P-2055, ATC-20, Post Earthquake Safety Evaluation of Buildings	unknown	SEAO
May 2024	Bend and remote	Local and Tribal Hazard Mitigation Planning Training	18	OEM
June 2024	Salem and remote	Local and Tribal Hazard Mitigation Planning Training	18	OEM
Nov. 2024	Medford	FEMA P-2055, ATC-20, Post Earthquake Safety Evaluation of Buildings	unknown	SOCICC
Nov. 2024	remote	Hazard Mitigation Planning 101	~10	OEM

6.3.4 Funding and Technical Assistance Process

The State of Oregon strives to build local capacity in developing and implementing risk reduction strategies through NHMP development support, resource sharing, and technical assistance. Local mitigation planning continues to be accomplished in great measure through the planning set-aside associated with the HMGP or via BRIC subgrants which provide funding and technical assistance to tribal or local governments for the purpose of developing or updating existing local natural hazards mitigation plans. The goal is to ensure that each county and municipality in the State of Oregon maintains a FEMA-approved natural hazards mitigation plan.

Because local mitigation plans lose their FEMA approval after five years, the state's strategy is to assist local jurisdictions with plan updates and new plan development on a five-year rotational basis.

DLCD and OEM track (with the assistance of FEMA's weekly plan status updates and communication among the assisting partners) which jurisdictions to target for mitigation planning assistance. Normally we find ourselves ahead of the jurisdictions, preparing to apply for grant funding earlier than they expect because of the long grant processing timelines. After discussion, those interested are asked to provide a letter of interest with all the information necessary to support the grant subapplication.

One of the issues we find is that even the more resource-rich jurisdictions have capacity- and priority-balancing issues. They cannot ask the same stakeholders to be involved in multiple planning projects simultaneously so they must decide which to delay. Others simply don't foresee that they would ever need to apply for mitigation grants and prefer to put their limited capacity to use in other ways.

It has long been the state's goal that at least 90% of Oregon's population is covered by current, effective NHMPs. Currently, 76% of the population is covered, down from 88% in 2020. Potential factors include: (a) an increasing number of NHMPs need to be updated as many special districts have chosen to plan since 2018; (b) the slow pace with which FEMA approves HMGP and BRIC subgrants, key funding sources for local NHMP updates; and (c) the more complex planning standards required by the updated Local Mitigation Planning Policy Guide effective April 19, 2023.

It is important to build capacity in tribal and local governments – and especially among planning consultants – for developing and updating NHMPs. Training is one way to do this. The state should focus on providing more mitigation planning classes. In addition, the state and FEMA have been collaborating on creative ways to deliver the mitigation planning courses that will reach the greatest number of jurisdictions and stakeholders.

One key is capacity building is to train planning consultants in mitigation planning, creating a pool of talent and expertise from which tribal local governments can draw support.

One way to address the lack of vision and the issue of competing priorities is to develop a risk communication and outreach program that clearly demonstrates to local governments and stakeholders the risks and potential consequences of natural hazards events and the value of mitigation planning. The goal of the program would be for local governments with plans (expired or not) to commit to keeping their plans current and using them. Another goal would be to continue to expand NHMP coverage by encouraging cities and special districts without their developing plans. DLCD has been working to do this regularly since the last state update.

On the issue of the divergence of FEMA's and the State's RiskMAP priorities, communication is the key. The State is very grateful that FEMA has funded multi-hazard risk assessments through the CTP program and has found that these risk assessments are vital elements of NHMP updates. If FEMA will continue to support the development of these risk assessments underpinning NHMP updates and new NHMPs, the issue is to agree on the communities for which they will be developed and when. Local communities have expressed confusion in the lack of coordination between RiskMAP and NHMP updates. Continuous and effective communication between the state agencies involved and FEMA is the answer.

6.3.5 Prioritizing Applications for Natural Hazard Mitigation Grants

Each grant program has eligibility requirements, and most have criteria for prioritizing proposals. Once the grant-specific criteria are met, the granting agency may need additional criteria to prioritize proposals. The following criteria are to be used for that additional prioritization, and more generally as a touchstone to ensure the state's priorities are considered in grant decisions.

These criteria could be used for a broad range of applicants including Tribes, counties, cities, special districts, non-profit organizations, and privately owned utilities.

I. Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan

A. The applicant or subapplicant is in the process of developing or updating its natural hazard mitigation plan.

II. Degree of Impact

B. The proposal addresses a low-probability, high-impact natural hazard.

C. The applicant or subapplicant was impacted by a natural disaster, including impacts that were not severe enough to receive a federal major disaster declaration or presidential disaster declaration.

III. Benefits of Risk Reduction

D. The proposal is in an area at the highest risk on FEMA's National Risk Index or the Oregon Natural Hazard Risk Assessment, or an area of underserved cultures, underserved communities, or socially vulnerable populations.

E. The proposal maximizes benefits to a high degree by addressing multiple hazards, adapting to climate change, leveraging other funding, or addressing other priorities. For example, the proposal includes green infrastructure or resilient energy sources.

F. The proposal would reduce risk to a high degree. For example, it would reduce vulnerability to structures, critical facilities, lifelines, or socially vulnerable populations.

G. The proposal considers not only the benefits to the property and property owner, but also the impacts and benefits to surrounding areas. For example, it considers watershed health, ecology, economy, housing, or infrastructure.

H. The proposal anticipates future natural hazards through mitigation actions such as defensible space, engineering for increased snow load or wind speeds, or adopting higher standards for floodplain management.

I. The proposal links climate change adaptation to a risk identified in the Oregon Natural Hazard Risk Assessment, a tribal risk assessment, or a local risk assessment.

IV. Disaster Resilience

J. The proposal would increase community resilience to a high degree. For example, it would raise community awareness, bring the community closer together, or increase trust between government and residents.

K. The proposal includes communicating its benefits to the community.

L. The applicant is an "Economically Disadvantaged Rural Community."

M. The proposal is in a "Community Disaster Resilience Zone."

N. The proposal would integrate a tribal or local natural hazard mitigation plan with a comprehensive plan.

O. The proposal supports energy resilience for critical public service facilities or households. For example, it would diversify fuels, increase energy storage, improve grid resilience, or add alternative energy generation.

V. Managing Development

P. The proposal is in an area under intense development pressure.

Q. The proposal would remove people, structures, critical facilities, or lifelines from a hazard area rather than mitigating risk within the hazard area.

VI. Repetitive or Severe Repetitive Flood Loss

R. The proposal would mitigate a high-risk property, a group of high-risk properties, a repetitive flood loss structure, or a severe repetitive flood loss structure.

S. The proposal would protect historical or current salmonid habitat in an area with no, low, or moderate repeat flood damage.

VII. Dam Safety

T. The semi-quantitative or other risk assessment that meets FEMA criteria is complete.
U. The deterministic analysis of work needed to rehabilitate or remove the dam is complete.
V. The designs and permits are ready.
W. The project has public benefits.
X. The dam is needed for municipal water supply, livelihood, or employment.
Y. The dam owner can provide significant funding and implement the project.

See *Chapter 3, Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment*, Section 3.3.6.15 for information on high hazard potential dam funding.

6.3.6 Local Mitigation Plan Review Process

OEM is responsible for reviewing local jurisdictions' NHMPs prior to submittal to FEMA for review and approval. Once a local jurisdiction has completed a draft plan, it submits the plan to the OEM for review. OEM has set a goal of completing its first review within 30 days and often completes the review more quickly. If OEM finds that the draft plan does not meet all FEMA requirements, it returns the draft to the local jurisdiction for revision. This may happen more than once, and OEM's full review timeline is dependent not only on how long OEM's review takes, but also how long the jurisdiction takes to make any necessary revisions to OEM's satisfaction. Once OEM is satisfied that the draft plan is approvable, it forwards the draft to FEMA for review.

By statute, FEMA is limited to 45 days for its initial review. If FEMA finds deficiencies, it returns the draft to OEM which in turn returns it to the jurisdiction for revision. Again, the full FEMA review timeline is dependent on how quickly FEMA completes its review, how long the jurisdiction takes to make satisfactory revisions, and how long OEM takes to send the draft plan back and forth. OEM is very prompt in managing these handoffs. Once OEM and FEMA are satisfied that the draft is approvable, FEMA issues *Approvable Pending Adoption* (APA) status by letter to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer (SHMO). At this point, the local jurisdiction adopts its NHMP, usually by resolution, and sends a copy of the signed resolution and adopted NHMP to OEM. OEM verifies that the NHMP has not changed substantively since APA status was conferred and forwards the adopted NHMP and resolution to FEMA. Upon receipt and verification that the NHMP has not changed substantively, FEMA issues final approval by letter to the highest elected official of the local jurisdiction. This entire process can take, in general, between four and six months.

In many cases, two or more local jurisdictions collaborate to develop a multi-jurisdictional NHMP. Most often this collaboration is among a county and some or all of its cities, and often some of its special districts. In these cases, the county plan is primary, and the cities and special district plans are addenda to the county plan. The same process is followed, but the county usually adopts and receives final approval from FEMA first, then the cities and special districts follow suit. All jurisdictions that are parties to the plan receive the same effective date as the first jurisdiction to receive FEMA approval.

6.3.6.1 Linking State and Local NHMPs

DLCD works with many tribes, counties, cities and special districts to create or update an NHMP. OPDR creates and updates other NHMPs. OEM assists with and reviews all NHMPs within Oregon. In addition, some local governments develop and update their plans in-house. Occasionally a council of governments

assists, and occasionally a consultant or consulting firm is retained. Approach, data availability, and planning and analytical expertise vary widely. Gathering, analyzing, and coalescing this disparate collection of risk assessments, goals, and mitigation actions into a coherent statewide mitigation strategy embodied by the Oregon NHMP is a challenge indeed, and the State has begun advancing toward this goal.

Counties usually do review the state's goals to inform their own. However, county NHMPs do not consistently reference their review of the State goals in an explicit manner. In some cases, two or more state goals are combined into one local goal.

As an example, Washington County's 2023 NHMP explicitly reviews local jurisdictional mitigation goals along with the 2020 state plan to create seven overarching goals to inform their actions. Similarly, The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation's 2021 mitigation strategies list both internal and external coordinating partners on executing implementation. Listing coordinating partners expresses an actionable understanding of state and local mitigation goals and actions.

Further, during a previous Oregon NHMP update, the state found that about half of the state's goals were reflected in local goals, and that several goals that appeared in a number of local NHMPs were not reflected in the state's NHMP. The state added three goals to enhance coordination.

As a result, when assisting local governments with NHMPs, DLCD, OPDR, and OEM have made it a point to review not only the Oregon NHMP's goals, but also mitigation actions and other information for incorporation into local plans to accomplish overall state mitigation strategies.

Technical assistance staff at DLCD, OEM, and other regional coordinators should continue working iteratively and holistically to link state and local mitigation strategies. OEM's goal for the next five years is to work directly with local governments to identify projects to fund to implement the local NHMP.

OEM Mitigation Planning staff will continue to review NHMPs as they are updated and provide comments and guidance to local jurisdictions and tribes in editing their plans in preparation for FEMA review. Staff will also work with FEMA, local jurisdictions, and tribes through the review and adoption process.

6.3.6.2 Tracking & Implementing Mitigation Actions

Most jurisdictions in Oregon use data available from state and federal agencies and in some cases universities as well as any local data sources for their risk assessments. In recent years, FEMA has supported development of local risk assessments of the seven mapped hazards (coastal erosion, earthquakes, floods, landslides, tsunamis, volcanic hazards, and wildfires) through a portion of planning grants awarded through the HMA program and through the Risk MAP Program. The state has been somewhat successful in coordinating the grant funding cycles and preliminary studies to be able to have the risk assessments done for the jurisdictions next in line for NHMP updates and ready at or near the beginning of the mitigation planning process. This work is foundational for these jurisdictions' risk assessments providing a level of data and analysis that is otherwise unavailable. The state's vision is for this partnership to continue in a manner similar to the NHMP update cycle, so that over time all local jurisdictions have the benefit of this work for their NHMP updates. Then the cycle would renew and continue, bringing new and enhanced data to each update.

Similarly, the state has been using a small portion of FEMA planning grants to contract with OCCRI to provide assessments of the impacts of climate change on natural hazards at the county level for local

NHMPs. This work has been very well received by local NHMP steering committee members and has been valuable in assessing changing future conditions. Because the climate change assessments are more easily tailored to each county, they address not only the seven mapped hazards but others as well. Again, the state's vision is for this partnership to endure, continuing to enhance our understanding of the effects of climate change on the frequency, intensity, and emergence of natural hazards.

To coordinate and integrate local risk assessments into the state risk assessment, especially as the state continues to advance its risk assessment methodology and fill data gaps, is complex. FEMA continuing to support the state's production of local risk assessments through the RiskMAP program is key because the data sources and methodology used are the same as or closely aligned with those available for the state's risk assessment. Right now, there are not enough state-produced local risk assessments to meaningfully inform the state risk assessment, but as more and more of them are produced, we will be able to create a statewide picture of risk at a fine-grained local scale.

The first step is to collect all local NHMPs with their existing state-produced and locally produced risk assessments. DOGAMI is in possession of the state-produced risk assessments. The locally produced risk assessments need to be analyzed for data sources, methodology, and compatibility with each other and with the state's data sources and methodology to determine how best to incorporate them into the state risk assessment.

Collecting the latest NHMPs, finalizing them with a cover, effective dates, and approval letters, storing them in a repository where they will be readily available to the public is a project the state is anticipating returning to and completing during calendar year 2026.

Completed NHMPs and state-produced risk assessments will be collected quarterly in conjunction with the plan maintenance process described in Section 4.3.2; tracked by OEM and DLCD; and analyzed by DLCD with assistance from other State IHMT members. As the state further develops its risk assessment methodology, we will determine how best to incorporate the locally produced risk assessment information. The goal is to have an improved state risk assessment methodology incorporating all state-produced local risk assessments and the information that can be incorporated from locally produced risk assessments at the three-year mark in the life of the 2020 Oregon NHMP. We will begin the 2030 update with this information.

As NHMPs are collected, the mitigation goals along with attributes (to be determined) will be entered in a database. The database will be available to local governments and will yield useful information about characteristics and trends of local NHMP goals statewide. This will help the State IHMT determine whether local mitigation goals are connected to local risk assessments; the degree of similarity or disparity among them; and the degree of alignment with state mitigation goals. That information can be used to work with local governments to improve local NHMPs as well as more closely connecting state and local mitigation goals.

It has long been the state's desire to develop a mitigation action tracker for use by state and local governments to better coordinate mitigation planning and management of HMA grants. With the systematic collection of NHMPs, a database of mitigation actions can become a reality. With access to the database, local governments can glean ideas for actions; coordinate their local actions with the state's actions; or identify potential intergovernmental partnerships. The state can gain an understanding of local governments' mitigation priorities and more closely connect local and state mitigation activities. This would also be a way to identify potential mitigation projects for grant subapplications.

Further, the mitigation action database could be designed to include relevant information from related programs and projects, for example the Climate Change Adaptation Framework, advancing integration with statewide plans and initiatives, encouraging local integration as well, and supporting the state's eventual return to enhanced plan status.

6.4 References

League of Oregon Cities. (2023). *FAQ on Measures 5 & 50*. https://www.orcities.org/application/files/2216/8685/9599/FAQonMeasures5and_50-updated5-23.pdf.

Oregon Department of Revenue. (2009). *A brief history of Oregon property taxation*. https://www.oregon.gov/DOR/programs/gov-research/Documents/303-405-1.pdf.

STAPLEE descriptions and guiding questions. (n.d.). https://toolkit.climate.gov/sites/default/files/PG_Resource_5.3_V2.pdf.

State of Oregon. (n.d.). *About Us - Building Codes Division*. Building Codes Division. https://www.oregon.gov/bcd/pages/about-us.aspx.