

FEMA-2025-0278; OMB No. 1660-0131
{Docket ID FEMA-2025-0278}

The Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment / Stakeholder Preparedness Review (THIRA/SPR) serves as a process for assessing risks, understanding capability levels, and promoting coordination across jurisdictions and disciplines. By aggregating data across a region or state, the process provides a broad, collaborative view of preparedness that can help inform planning and investment decisions.

Related to the statutory requirements within the SPR to capture “(i) *an estimate of the amount of expenditures required to attain the preparedness priorities; and (ii) the extent to which the use of Federal assistance during the preceding fiscal year achieved the preparedness priorities.*” – while the current methodology contributes useful qualitative insights toward these areas, full alignment with these requirements in a consistent, measurable way remains challenging. In practice, jurisdictions often rely on a combination of available data and subject matter expert (SME) judgment, which can make it difficult to produce precise capability levels across a broad geographical area or clearly attribute outcomes to specific prior-year Federal investments.

Additionally, the process in current state is highly labor-intensive for local and state partners. Significant time and effort are required to gather inputs, coordinate across agencies, and develop capability assessments, yet the resulting outputs do not always translate into actionable or decision-ready information at the local level. This is particularly evident when attempting to define and quantify capability gaps (lost, built, and sustained in a year) for specific operational capabilities as defined by FEMA, such as a structure fire. This is often based on informed judgment of SMEs but is not structured in a way that would allow for a repeatable, analytical method.

Overall, while the THIRA/SPR process remains valuable for fostering collaboration and providing a structured approach to preparedness assessment, the current methodology does not consistently produce the level of outcomes it is intended to achieve, both in terms of fully supporting statutory expectations and delivering practical value to jurisdictions. There is a clear opportunity to strengthen the process so that it more effectively translates effort into actionable, decision-useful results. **Greater engagement with state, local, tribal, and territorial (SLTT) partners would be critical to this effort to help refine the methodology, reduce unnecessary burden, and ensure the process better addresses current limitations while enhancing its overall utility.**