

Public Comments Invited: Due to SHA 10/14/25

You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including: (1) Whether the proposed collection is necessary for the FHWA's performance; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burdens; (3) ways for the FHWA to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the collected information; and (4) ways that the burden could be minimized, including the use of electronic technology, without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

Comments section 1:

The full intent of the question is unclear. If the intent of the question is whether FHWA needs information about damage sustained to roads or bridges during a natural disaster, before authorizing Emergency Relief funds, the answer is yes. If the question is asking whether the DDIR as described is the appropriate method to communicate this information, the answer would depend on how the information is currently gathered and communicated. The document is unclear on this. Is there a shortcoming or problem with the existing method(s)? If there is no current formal, standardized method to communicate this information to FHWA when applying for Emergency Relief, then the DDIR seems reasonable. Lastly, this DDIR should only be applicable to unusual natural disasters or emergencies and should not be a part of the National Bridge Inspection Standards or the Specifications for the National Bridge Inventory.

Comments section 2:

Two hours for the assessment is too low. To fully provide the information described, ensuring all the requirements and formatting is addressed, gathering photos, maps, providing cost estimates for repairs, and contracting methods – this takes more than 2 hours. Additionally, it is unclear whether the burden is intended to include all the preparation time of visiting the site, gathering the data, taking the photos, developing the cost estimates and repair plans. To do all of this could take weeks, or much more depending on the nature of the situation. If the intent of the burden is to exclude all of this work and simply prepare a report after all of the information is documented, then 4 to 6 hours may be more appropriate. The annual burden listed assumes 56 assessments. It is unclear where this number comes from. If the implication is that a state may see 56 natural disasters or emergencies in one year, it seems high. If the implication is that a natural disaster or emergency could damage multiple facilities, which could each require its own assessment, the number may be reasonable, but the document is unclear on this.

There needs to be more clarity about how much detail is to be provided for the cost estimate of the emergency repairs and permanent repairs. What level of detail is going to be required? Do they expect bid items since they request a proposed contracting method?

Comments section 3:

What type of evaluation or documentation is expected to be included in this report for the “potential for resilience improvements, ensuring compliance with federal requirements that promote cost-effective measures to minimize future damage and repair needs”? They appear to expect a lot of detail since the report is to be the “foundation for determining eligibility” for ER program.
No further comments.

Comments sections 4:

The number of hours to generate this report seems unrealistic, if it is to include all that is being requested.

Additional comments:

None.