

# Questions for Review Team For Each Attenuation Relation

- Is documentation sufficient for evaluation? If no, ...
  - What additional documentation is needed?
  - How would you recommend that we proceed realizing the we need to begin calculations shortly after the first of the year?

# Questions for Review Team For Each Attenuation Relation

- Assuming documentation is sufficient for evaluation...
  - Should the relation be used as presented?
  - Do you see minor issues that need to be resolved? If so, what?
  - Do you see major issues (unlikely to be resolved by the first of the year) that need to be resolved? If so, what? How should we proceed? How should revision be evaluated?

# Questions for Review Team For Each Attenuation Relation

- Assuming documentation is sufficient for evaluation...
  - Should this relationship be used in the National Maps for California?
  - For the Intermountain West?
  - For the Pacific Northwest?
  - What is your reasoning?

# Questions for Review Team For Each Attenuation Relation

- Assuming documentation is sufficient for evaluation...
  - How does the relationship address epistemic uncertainty?
  - What weight should be given to this relationship? Should its weighting be combined with another relationship? Which one(s) and why?
  - Other recommendations pertaining to this relationship?

# Questions for Review Team For Entire Set of Relations

- Does the set of NGA relations span the range of epistemic uncertainty? If not, how should we account for epistemic uncertainty?
- How should we treat directivity?
- Are the attenuation relations for different soil classes appropriate for use in design?
- Other recommendations?