



**Stanford** | DOERR SCHOOL OF SUSTAINABILITY  
Precourt Institute for Energy

# Issue Brief:

## **Wildfire Resilience in the West**

Utility and Community Collaboration

August 2026

Prepared by Stanford University 2026 Shultz Energy Fellows:  
Sophie Molins and Elli Rowley

# Table of Contents

|                                                     |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1. Summary .....</b>                             | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>2. About this Issue Brief .....</b>              | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>3. Introduction.....</b>                         | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>4. WMPs and CWPPs: Planning Frameworks .....</b> | <b>2</b>  |
| 4.1 Importance.....                                 | 2         |
| Figure 1: WMP and CWPP Key Information.....         | 3         |
| 4.2 WMPs .....                                      | 3         |
| 4.3 CWPPs .....                                     | 4         |
| <b>5. Collaboration within WMPs .....</b>           | <b>5</b>  |
| 5.1 Collaboration in WMP Requirements .....         | 5         |
| 5.2 Collaboration in WMP Documents .....            | 5         |
| 5.3 Key Findings .....                              | 6         |
| <b>6. Collaboration within CWPPs.....</b>           | <b>6</b>  |
| 6.1 Collaboration.....                              | 6         |
| 6.2 Challenges .....                                | 6         |
| 6.3 Benefits of Greater Collaboration .....         | 7         |
| 6.4 Key Findings .....                              | 7         |
| <b>7. Recommendations .....</b>                     | <b>8</b>  |
| 7.1 Public utilities commissions .....              | 8         |
| 7.2 Utility companies .....                         | 8         |
| 7.3 Community members/partners .....                | 8         |
| 7.4 Energy/governors' offices .....                 | 8         |
| <b>8. Conclusions .....</b>                         | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Appendix A: Additional Information .....</b>     | <b>9</b>  |
| A.1 About the Shultz Energy Fellowship .....        | 9         |
| A.2 About the Western Interstate Energy Board.....  | 9         |
| A.3 About the Authors .....                         | 9         |
| A.4 Acknowledgements .....                          | 9         |
| A.5 Interviewee Information.....                    | 10        |
| <b>Appendix B: Figure 2 .....</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| Figure 2: State WMP Legislation .....               | 11        |

# 1. Summary

Wildfires are increasing in severity and frequency throughout the West. As wildfire risk grows, energy infrastructure and operations face increasing exposure, raising the stakes for utilities and communities alike. Risk mitigation and resilience planning are essential components of addressing the problem. Two prominent examples of such planning efforts are utility Wildfire Mitigation Plans (WMPs) and Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs). WMPs generally focus on utility infrastructure and operations, while CWPPs establish community priorities for wildfire preparedness and risk reduction. States and provinces want to ensure that their communities are adequately equipped to manage wildfire risk, and both utilities and communities have important roles in accomplishing this.

This brief examines how WMPs and CWPPs currently support coordination between utilities and communities. The research found that WMP requirements generally provide limited direction for collaboration with communities or alignment with CWPPs. Although some utility plans reference CWPPs, these references do not necessarily indicate active coordination. CWPPs offer a more flexible opportunity for utility participation, but utility involvement in their development and implementation remains inconsistent.

There is a significant opportunity for greater collaboration between utilities and communities in developing WMPs and CWPPs. Stronger coordination does not necessarily require creating a new planning process. States, utilities, and communities can build on existing WMP and CWPP processes by establishing clearer roles, creating routine opportunities for engagement, and better connecting utility mitigation investments with community priorities. Public utility commissions can encourage utilities to describe how relevant CWPP priorities informed their WMPs; utilities can participate more consistently in CWPP development and implementation; and community planning partners can engage utilities early and identify projects where coordinated action would provide mutual benefits. Improved communication and alignment between these plans can advance wildfire preparedness, reduce duplication of efforts, and ensure that utility and community actions support one another.

## 2. About this Issue Brief

This issue brief was developed by Sophie Molins and Elli Rowley, students participating in Stanford University's Shultz Energy Fellowship placed at the Western Interstate Energy Board during the summer of 2026. The brief examines the western states and provinces to identify the regulations governing WMPs and CWPPs, analyze the collaboration required and included in the plans, and assess the potential for greater collaboration. Wildfire risk mitigation comes in many forms, and this brief focuses on WMPs and CWPPs. Using information obtained from research and stakeholder interviews, this brief identifies challenges and opportunities associated with community planning and provides recommendations that states and provinces can consider to enhance collaboration between utilities and communities, which would improve wildfire mitigation and resilience planning efforts. The information provided in this brief was presented on public webinar available [HERE](#).

### 3. Introduction

North America, especially the West, has experienced a dramatic increase in wildfire frequency in recent years. Nationally, 77,850 wildfires burned across the United States in 2025, which is significantly above the 10-year average.<sup>1</sup> The severity of wildfires has also grown, with fires burning more acreage at a faster rate than was previously typical.<sup>2</sup> Risk mitigation and resilience planning are critical in addressing the problem, and these efforts encompass physical management, system operations, human factors, and learning and adaptation. WMPs are mandated in most western states with specific requirements and are created and implemented by utilities. WMPs primarily focus on risk assessment, preventative measures, operational protocols, and monitoring programs for utility infrastructure and operations. Authorized by the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA) of 2003, CWPPs are voluntary plans focused on community preparedness and wildfire resilience, developed and implemented by communities and counties.<sup>3</sup>

Utilities are making substantial investments in wildfire mitigation efforts, amounting to hundreds of millions, even billions, of dollars. This spending can take many forms, including asset inventory and assessment, enhanced powerline safety settings, and undergrounding.<sup>4</sup> Because these costs are typically recovered through customers' rates, customers bear the costs of these investments directly. Greater community support for these utility initiatives could improve the efficiency of these investments, making the benefits even more tangible for customers. This support could take the form of greater collaboration between WMPs and CWPPs.

## 4. WMPs and CWPPs: Planning Frameworks

### 4.1 Importance

Planning is a crucial component of wildfire mitigation and resilience. Plans are especially important for problems as large and dynamic as wildfires because they establish the foundation for how the problem will be addressed. For example, they can identify high-risk zones, set project priorities, develop systematic approaches to mitigate fire risk, clarify accountability, and bring stakeholders together, all of which are essential to protecting lives, property, and infrastructure. WMPs and CWPPs are both forms of wildfire planning, but they operate under different regulations, have different priorities, and serve different stakeholders.

---

<sup>1</sup> The National Interagency Fire Center. (2025). *National Interagency Coordination Center Wildland Fire Summary and Statistics Annual Report 2025*. Accessed August 2, 2026. [https://www.nifc.gov/sites/default/files/NICC/2-Predictive%20Services/Intelligence/Annual%20Reports/2025/annual\\_report\\_2025\\_0.pdf](https://www.nifc.gov/sites/default/files/NICC/2-Predictive%20Services/Intelligence/Annual%20Reports/2025/annual_report_2025_0.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Hewitt, Alison. (2026, June 22). "High-severity fires burn 30 times more acreage than 40 years ago, researchers find." *UCLA Newsroom*. Accessed August 20, 2026. <https://newsroom.ucla.edu/releases/high-severity-fires-burn-30-times-more-area-than-40-years-ago-researchers-find>.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Congress, House. (2003). *Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003, H.R. 1904, 108th Cong.* Accessed August 20, 2026. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/108th-congress/house-bill/1904>.

<sup>4</sup> Barlow J.T., D.W. Powell, J.B. Kincaid, K.G. Abernethy Cannella, and D.S. Boff. "Utility wildfire industry trends review." Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, 2025. PNNLSA-211619.

**Figure 1: WMP and CWPP Key Information**

|                               | Wildfire Mitigation Plans                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Community Wildfire Protection Plans                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Legislation/Authority</b>  | Typically mandated by state legislation and implemented through state public utility commission rules and requirements.                                                                                                      | Authorized under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003                                                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Requirements</b>           | Vary by state                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Three minimum requirements: collaboration, prioritized fuel reduction, treatment of structural ignitability*                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Main Function</b>          | Focused on risk assessment, preventative measures, operational protocols, and monitoring programs related to utility infrastructure and operations                                                                           | Voluntary, collaborative community preparedness and wildfire resilience plans                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>Plan's Focus</b>           | Utilities                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Communities and counties                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Common Plan Components</b> | Identification of geographical areas with heightened wildfire risk; infrastructure inspection; de-energizing protocols; vegetation management; system restoration statements and procedures; participation of other entities | Identification of core decision-making team; Community base map; community risk assessment; community hazard reduction priorities and recommendations to reduce structural ignitability; action plan and assessment strategy |

*\*Several states have developed additional CWPP requirements or guidelines, including Arizona, California, Colorado, and New Mexico.*

## **4.2 WMPs**

Under SB 901 in 2018, California became the first state to mandate WMPs for its investor-owned utilities.<sup>5</sup> In the years since, many western states have enacted legislation requiring utilities to have WMPs. To date, nine WIEB member states have enacted WMP requirements: California, Arizona, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Four WIEB members do not have WMP requirements: Alberta, British Columbia, Colorado, and New Mexico. While these states do not currently have statutes or generally applicable Public Utility Commission requirements for WMPs, many utilities in these states still develop and implement plans, often going through thorough review processes with their respective commissions. The legislation that governs WMPs continues to evolve as states adjust their approaches to wildfires. For example, in 2025, legislation requiring WMPs for electric cooperatives

<sup>5</sup> California Earthquake Authority. (2026). "Enhancing California's resiliency to natural catastrophes: Senate Bill 254 (2025) study report." Accessed August 20, 2026. <https://www.cawildfirefund.com/sites/wildfire/files/documents/2026/sb-254-natcatresiliencyreport4-7-26.pdf>.

was introduced in New Mexico, but it did not pass.<sup>6</sup> The Colorado Public Utility Commission is currently in the process of developing proposed rules governing WMPs for electric utilities in their jurisdiction.

The state-level WMP legislation means that requirements vary across states. States require different plan content and differ in the entities they apply to, including public utilities, electric cooperatives, investor-owned utilities, consumer-owned utilities, or combinations of these entities. Some common required plan components include identification of geographical areas with heightened wildfire risk, infrastructure inspection, de-energizing protocols, vegetation management, system restoration statements and procedures, and participation of other entities.

Having a WMP often allows utilities to seek Commission approval for wildfire risk mitigation actions and associated cost recovery, which typically occurs through customer electric rates.<sup>7</sup> In some states, having a WMP and complying with the approved plan can reduce an electric utility's legal and/or financial liability in the case of a wildfire. Legislation that reduces utilities' legal liability has been introduced in numerous states, such as Wyoming, but many states do not have such legislation.<sup>8</sup>

### **4.3 CWPPs**

The CWPP framework was first developed in 2002 by the Applegate community in Oregon as a collaborative approach to addressing wildfire risk.<sup>9</sup> The success of this plan helped establish a model for community-led wildfire planning adopted nationally in HFRA of 2003. HFRA established three minimum requirements for CWPPs: developed collaboratively, identify and prioritize areas for hazardous fuel reduction treatments, and recommend treatment of structural ignitability for homeowners and communities. HFRA requires mutual agreement among the local government, local fire departments, and the state entity responsible for forest management on the final CWPP. Several states, namely Arizona, California, Colorado, and New Mexico, have additional CWPP guidelines and requirements.

According to the U.S. Fire Administration and FEMA CWPP Guidelines, CWPPs typically identify a core decision-making team, as well as key stakeholders and constituencies involved in plan development and implementation. Key components of the plan often include a community base map, an assessment of fuel-hazard risks, an evaluation of wildfire likelihood, and the identification of homes, businesses, essential infrastructure, and community values at risk. Additionally, the plan may outline local preparedness and firefighting capabilities, establish community hazard-reduction priorities and

---

<sup>6</sup> "Wildfire Mitigation: Wildfire Mitigation Plans, State Funding Pools and Public Safety Power Shutoffs." National Conference of State Legislatures. <https://www.ncsl.org/energy/wildfire-mitigation-wildfire-mitigation-plans-state-funding-pools-and-public-safety-power-shutoffs>.

<sup>7</sup> "Wildfire Mitigation Plans." Colorado Department of Regulatory Agencies Public Utilities Commission. Accessed August 18, 2026. <https://puc.colorado.gov/puc-home/energy-and-water/wildfire-mitigation-plans>.

<sup>8</sup> Macomber, Eric. (2025, August 29) "The Laws That Hold Utilities Liable for Wildfires are Changing." Stanford Law School. Accessed August 4, 2026. <https://law.stanford.edu/2025/08/29/the-laws-that-hold-utilities-liable-for-wildfires-are-changing/>.

<sup>9</sup> Applegate Partnership and Watershed Council. "Community Wildfire Protection Plan." Accessed August 20, 2026. <https://www.applegatepartnership.org/cwpp>.

recommendations aimed at reducing structural ignitability, and provide an action plan with an assessment strategy.<sup>10</sup>

The US Forest Service's Community Wildfire Defense Grant (CWDG), authorized by the 2021 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, is a large source of funding for CWPPs. This grant can be used to develop or revise CWPPs and to carry out projects described in CWPPs that are less than 10 years old.<sup>11</sup> However, demand for the CWDG program has grown significantly since 2021 while annual funding has remained fairly constant at around \$200 million per cycle, so securing CWDG funding can be a challenge.<sup>12</sup> FEMA mitigation planning grant funding can also be used for CWPPs when included in Natural Hazards Mitigation Plans, which is not uncommon.<sup>13</sup> Some states also have grant programs that can provide funding for CWPPs.

## 5. Collaboration within WMPs

### **5.1 Collaboration in WMP Requirements**

Collaboration is addressed in two main ways within the WMP requirements across the nine states. The first involves the potential participation of utilities in state or local wildfire protection efforts and plans, leaving much discretion over the extent of the collaboration up to utilities. The second focuses on outreach and engagement with officials and agencies, as well as communication strategies with the public. Overall, these collaboration requirements are vague, and there are no strict WMP requirements for working with CWPPs.

### **5.2 Collaboration in WMP Documents**

In WMP documents themselves, collaboration with CWPPs is primarily mentioned in three sections: existing wildfire planning efforts; collaboration, communication, and outreach; and risk assessment. Sections on existing wildfire planning efforts discuss CWPPs and other relevant plans within the utility's operational area. The collaboration, communication, and outreach sections detail plans to collaborate with local governments, agencies, and community groups. Risk assessment sections tend to reference the risks identified and discussed in local CWPPs.

These three WMP sections demonstrate that some WMPs reference and discuss CWPPs directly. However, it remains unclear whether individuals involved in the development and implementation of CWPPs were consulted or if the plans were just reviewed.

---

<sup>10</sup> U.S. Fire Administration and FEMA. (2025, May). *Creating a Community Wildfire Protection Plan*. Accessed August 3, 2026. [https://www.usfa.fema.gov/downloads/pdf/publications/creating\\_a\\_cwpp.pdf](https://www.usfa.fema.gov/downloads/pdf/publications/creating_a_cwpp.pdf).

<sup>11</sup> U.S. Forest Service. (2025). *Community Wildfire Defense Grant Program*. Accessed August 20, 2026. <https://www.fs.usda.gov/managing-land/fire/grants/cwdg>.

<sup>12</sup> Pohl, Kelly. (2026, March 30). "Community Wildfire Defense Grants fill a critical gap for rural communities." *Headwaters Economics*. Accessed August 18, 2026. <https://headwaterseconomics.org/natural-hazards/wildfire/community-wildfire-defense-grants-fill-a-critical-gap-for-rural-communities/>.

<sup>13</sup> "Integrating Community Wildfire Protection Plans and Natural Hazards Mitigation Plans." FEMA. Accessed August 18, 2026. <https://mil.wa.gov/asset/5ba4211239e1e>.

### 5.3 Key Findings

**There is minimal, if any, collaboration with communities and CWPPs in the development of WMPs.** There appears to be more barriers to flexibility and collaboration in WMPs due to a variety of factors, including:

- utility priorities focused on operational risk reduction and asset protection;
- internal silos within utility companies that can limit collaboration across departments and with external partners; and
- the prescriptive or compliance-oriented nature of many WMP requirements, and a lack of strict legal requirements for such collaboration.



**There is  
minimal, if any,  
collaboration  
with communities  
and CWPPs in the  
development of  
WMPs.**

## 6. Collaboration within CWPPs

### 6.1 Collaboration

As previously mentioned, one of the federal requirements for CWPPs is collaboration. HFRA identifies local and state government representatives and those in federal agencies as collaborators, as well as other interested parties.<sup>14</sup> Interested parties can include a wide range of stakeholders, allowing collaboration to be open to everyone.

### 6.2 Challenges

CWPPs offer much more flexibility than WMPs due to the nature of the requirements that govern them. While this flexibility can help ensure the plans serve the communities they encompass, there are significant challenges and barriers that may impede the development and implementation of the plans. First, securing funding can be a hurdle for communities, and even if funding for CWPP development is obtained, maintaining funding for implementation and maintenance can still pose challenges. Defining and tracking meaningful measures of success can also be hard and may contribute to problems in securing funding. Additionally, competing priorities and limited stakeholder interest can hinder participation and progress, especially in plan development, and limited staffing, technical expertise, and organizational capacity may constrain effective implementation. Even if CWPPs are developed, they may not be actively implemented or maintained, and they may end up “sitting on the shelf.” This issue may be due to the long updating cycle for the plans, which can be up to 10 years, and staff turnover, which can disrupt relationships, institutional knowledge, and long-term implementation.

---

<sup>14</sup> U.S. Congress, House. (2003). *Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003, H.R. 1904, 108th Cong.* Accessed August 20, 2026. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/108th-congress/house-bill/1904>.

### 6.3 Benefits of Greater Collaboration

Greater collaboration between utilities and communities offers numerous advantages. It builds trust among utilities, communities, and other stakeholders while promoting transparency throughout the planning and implementation processes. It also helps reduce duplication of wildfire mitigation efforts, enabling investments in additional projects that support greater progress. Furthermore, it acknowledges that local communities are best equipped to understand their own risk, vulnerabilities, and priorities. This understanding enhances prevention efforts and enables more effective identification of local vulnerabilities.

### 6.4 Key Findings

**There is significant opportunity for collaboration with utilities during the development of CWPPs.**

The CWPP process is flexible and can be tailored to the needs and priorities of community partners, so collaboration can determine the scope, priorities, and implementation of plans.

**There are currently few formal requirements or incentives for utilities to participate in community-led CWPP efforts, so there is considerable room for greater collaboration.** CWPPs can vary widely due to their flexible requirements and each community's differing needs and priorities. It is recommended that core planning teams for these plans include representatives from various local and state organizations. The handbook *Preparing a Community Wildfire Protection Plan* suggests core team members include individuals from the community's existing collaborative forest management groups, City Council, Resource Advisory Committees, Homeowners Associations, Division of Wildlife/Fish and Game, Department of Transportation, emergency management agencies, and utilities, among other groups.<sup>15</sup> While it is becoming more common for utility representatives to be on these core planning teams, it is not standard practice.



<sup>15</sup> Communities Committee, National Association of Counties, National Association of State Foresters Society of American Foresters, and Western Governors' Association. (March 2004). *Preparing a Community Wildfire Protection Plan A Handbook for Wildland-Urban Interface Communities*. Accessed August 2, 2026. <http://www.communitiescommittee.org/pdfs/cwpphandbook.pdf>.

## 7. Recommendations

### 7.1 Public utilities commissions

- Assess the current collaboration between utilities and community planning efforts.
- Encourage utility participation in local CWPP development and implementation.

### 7.2 Utility companies

- Assign dedicated representatives to participate in local CWPP efforts.
- Integrate CWPP priorities into WMP updates and prioritize collaboration across activities, such as vegetation management and community fuel reduction projects.

### 7.3 Community members/partners

- Formally invite utility representatives to participate in the development and implementation of CWPPs.
- Review utility WMPs during CWPP planning and align projects.

### 7.4 Energy/governors' offices

- Facilitate cross-agency collaboration on CWPP development and implementation, possibly by convening relevant state agencies, utilities, and local governments.
- Establish or advocate for state funding mechanisms to support CWPP updates and implementation.
- Where state funding is unavailable, support the pursuit of federal funding opportunities to ensure communities have the necessary resources.

## 8. Conclusions

Wildfires are a dynamic problem. Changing conditions require adaptability and strong incentives to continue pushing against institutional challenges and barriers. Addressing this requires collective responsibility and coordinated action across multiple stakeholders working together to implement effective solutions.

There is opportunity for greater collaboration in wildfire mitigation and resilience efforts, especially in CWPP development and implementation. Improved collaboration will enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of wildfire resilience activities and support confidence in investment decisions.

Collaboration can be fostered in many ways. According to the interviews and research conducted, some states find mandates to be most effective, while others find incentives or shared initiatives to work well. Collaboration offers mutual benefits to both utilities and communities.

## **Appendix A: Additional Information**

### **A.1 About the Shultz Energy Fellowship**

The Shultz Energy Fellowships Program connects Stanford University students with government and public-sector organizations addressing energy and climate challenges across the western United States. Through paid summer fellowships, students gain hands-on experience in energy policy and public service while supporting efforts to advance reliable, affordable, and sustainable energy solutions.<sup>16</sup>

### **A.2 About the Western Interstate Energy Board**

The Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB) is an organization of 11 western states and two western Canadian provinces. Its purpose is to provide the instruments and framework for cooperative efforts to “enhance the economy of the West and contribute to the well-being of the region’s people,” and it seeks to achieve this by promoting energy policy developed cooperatively among member states and provinces and with the federal government.<sup>17</sup>

### **A.3 About the Authors**

Sophie Molins is a Master of Public Policy student at Stanford University, where she also earned her bachelor’s degree in Economics with a minor in History. Elli Rowley earned her bachelor’s degree in Earth Systems Science with a concentration in Human Environmental Systems from Stanford University.

### **A.4 Acknowledgements**

We want to thank the WIEB staff for hosting us this summer, especially our mentors Eric Baran and Marissa Moers, who supported us throughout this project and offered guidance each step of the way. We would also like to thank everyone who participated in our interviews and dedicated their time to share their experiences and knowledge with us. Lastly, thank you to the Shultz Fellowship and those who organize and coordinate the program, especially Clare Johnson and Felicia Marcus. This project would not have been possible without the support we received throughout the summer.

---

<sup>16</sup> Stanford University Explore Energy. “Shultz Energy Fellowships.” Accessed August 20, 2026. <https://explore-energy.stanford.edu/internships-jobs/shultz>.

<sup>17</sup> Western Interstate Energy Board. “WIEB – Western Interstate Energy Board.” Accessed August 20, 2026. <https://www.westernenergyboard.org/western-interstate-energy-board/>.

## **A.5 Interviewee Information**

We interviewed over 30 people working across wildfire mitigation and resilience in the West, including individuals at Public Utilities Commissions, utility companies, consulting firms, state agencies, and nonprofits.

The following is a list of organizations that the interviewees are affiliated with.

- Alberta Utilities Commission
- Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management
- BC Wildfire Service
- CAL FIRE Butte Unit
- California Energy Commission
- Charles River Associates
- Community Energy Project
- Fire Adapted Communities Learning Network
- Flathead Cooperative
- FortisBC
- Nevada Division of Forestry
- New Mexico Public Regulation Commission
- NW Energy Coalition
- Oregon Citizens' Utility Board
- Oregon Public Utility Commission
- Ravalli County, MT Office of Emergency Management
- SWCA Environmental Consultants
- Tri-County Firesafe Working Group
- Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands
- Washington Department of Natural Resources
- Washington Fire Adapted Communities Learning Network
- Washington Resource Conservation and Development Council
- Western Electricity Coordinating Council

## Appendix B: Figure 2

**Figure 2: State WMP Legislation**

| State             | Legal Basis                     | Covered Entities                                                                          | Approval/Enforcement Authority                                                                                                                                                                                              | WMP Update Frequency                                                                                                |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Arizona</b>    | HB 2201 (2025)                  | Public power entities; electric utilities; electric cooperatives*                         | Public power entities: governing bodies, then by the State Forester; electric utilities: State Forester                                                                                                                     | Biennially                                                                                                          |
| <b>California</b> | SB 901 (2018)<br>AB 1054 (2019) | Electrical corporations; local publicly owned electric utilities; electrical cooperatives | Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety (Energy Safety)** and the California Public Utilities Commission                                                                                                                     | Annually                                                                                                            |
| <b>Idaho</b>      | SB 1183 (2025)                  | Electric corporations***                                                                  | Idaho Public Utilities Commission                                                                                                                                                                                           | Annually                                                                                                            |
| <b>Montana</b>    | HB 490 (2025)                   | Electric facilities providers                                                             | Regulated utilities: commission; electric cooperatives: board of trustees; municipal utilities: city council or city commission; other electric facilities providers: appropriate body responsible for corporate governance | Every 3 years                                                                                                       |
| <b>Nevada</b>     | SB 329 (2019)                   | Electric utilities                                                                        | Public Utilities Commission of Nevada                                                                                                                                                                                       | Every 3 years                                                                                                       |
| <b>Oregon</b>     | SB 762 (2021)                   | All electric utilities except municipal electric utilities                                | Investor-owned utilities: Oregon Public Utility Commission; consumer-owned utilities: governing body of utility                                                                                                             | Investor-owned utilities: on a schedule determined by the commission; consumer-owned utilities: no required cadence |

| State             | Legal Basis        | Covered Entities                                                            | Approval/Enforcement Authority                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | WMP Update Frequency |
|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Utah</b>       | HB 66 (2020)       | Qualified utilities; electric cooperatives                                  | Qualified utilities: Public Service Commission; electric cooperatives: governing authority                                                                                                                                                                               | Every 3 years        |
| <b>Washington</b> | HB1032 (2023-2024) | Investor-owned utilities; consumer-owned utilities                          | Investor-owned utilities: utilities and transportation commission review and confirmation; consumer-owned utilities: governing board review. Both include local fire protection district input and submission to the utility wildland fire prevention advisory committee | Every 3 years        |
| <b>Wyoming</b>    | HB 0192 (2025)     | All electric utilities, excluding those owned or operated by a city or town | Wyoming Public Service Commission                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Every 5 years        |

\*Smaller entities in Arizona have optional submission provisions

\*\*WMPs were previously approved by the California Wildfire Safety Advisory Board; In 2021, the Wildfire Safety Division transitioned to the Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety

\*\*\*Optional for electric corporations in Idaho that are not a public utility

Note: Some states also require utilities to submit annual compliance reports relating to their WMPs.