

Chair Golden and Members of the Committee:

As a resident of rural southern Oregon, specifically in Jackson County, I know I can speak for almost everyone living in the vicinity in thanking this Committee for its efforts to address the growing frequency and severity of wildfires. We appreciate the commitment, too, of Governor Brown for raising the profile of the matter in a number of important ways, including with SB 1536. I support this bill and urge the support of members of this committee, as well.

I do have two issues I'd like to bring to your attention and request your consideration for inclusion in the bill:

1) **Section 8** directs the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) to “oversee and coordinate the development and maintenance of a comprehensive statewide map of wildfire risk.” While the precise risky features such a map would include are not specified in the bill, the fact that the focus of Sections 2-7 is solely on electric companies may imply the intent to limit the scope of mapping to just those risks associated with electrical transmission. I respectfully ask that you explore with the Governor her willingness to add language indicating that the minimal types of risks to be represented would be more expansive, e.g., “including electric lines and facilities, rail lines servicing trains transporting explosive or flammable materials, transmission pipelines carrying pressurized natural gas or other explosive or flammable materials, and other risks as may be known to exist in a locality.”

2) **Section 9** charges DLCD with adopting “rules consistent with statewide planning goals and guidelines regarding areas subject to natural hazards to establish minimum standards for city and county wildfire risk reduction planning and zoning and wildfire risk reduction.” While federal (Stafford Act) and state requirements for state and local hazard mitigation plans specify “natural” hazards as the mandatory focus, the thrust of this proposed legislation and other current efforts of the Executive and Legislative branches—not to mention what’s needed—appears more comprehensive. Certainly, the experience of California we are learning from, demonstrates that. I respectfully request that you explore with the Governor her willingness to amend Section 9 (1) by inserting “and appropriate technological” between “natural” and “hazards.” Alternatively, “manmade” could be substituted for “technological.” [If Stafford Act regulations have not been changed to exclude it, FEMA offers a Guide #7 “Integrating Manmade Hazards into Mitigation Planning,” that could assist cities and counties.]

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and for your work on this important issue.

Shirley Weathers, Ph.D.
1020 Butte Falls Highway
Eagle Point, OR 97524
Phone 541-690-7779