

**Summary:  
NEHRP (PCWG and Secretariat) Responses  
to  
Subject Matter Expert Comments  
on  
January 2008 Draft Strategic Plan**



# General

- Numerous comments regarding program funding issues were made. Current draft plan attempts to address resourcing at a level of detail that is considered to be appropriate.



# Reviewer # 1

---

- Provided extensive hand-written comments on draft, approximately two comments per page.
- Comments varied from editorial to substantive.
- Recommended changing wording of Goal C from “Improve the earthquake resilience of communities nationwide” to read “Improve the programs and knowledge needed to achieve earthquake resilience of communities nationwide”. After discussion the PCWG decided to keep the original wording.
- Nearly all of the other recommendations were accepted, with edits made to address them.

## Reviewer #2

---

- Provided hand-written comments on draft.
- Recommended moving strategic priorities to a separate chapter following discussion of goals and objectives. Done.
- Recommended explicit reference to FEMA and ASCE guidelines and provisions. Done.
- Suggested a table linking strategic priorities to goals and objectives. Not incorporated in current draft – covered in narrative.
- Questioned including geotechnical research on soil conditions under Objective 2 which is focused on the “built environment”. PCWG decided to keep geotechnical research under Objective 2.
- Recommended rewording of discussion of Objective 8 and questioned used of the term “critical facility”. Edited to address this concern.

## Reviewer # 3

---

- Provided one page of comments in printed text.
- Suggested we “Make the exec summary more punchy” and informative. Tried to address this comment.
- Suggested rewording of three strategic priorities. Accepted one of these. Given the roles of the NEHRP agencies, it is difficult to add “state earthquake grant program through one or more NEHRP agencies”
- Added list of goals and objectives to executive summary, as recommended.
- Suggested wording changes to the discussions of several goals and objectives. PCWG considered these changes but did not act on many of them, considering them to be too specific – some of the issues raised should be addressed in the Management Plan.



## Reviewer # 4

---

- Provided two pages of printed text.
- Recommended rewording of Objective 3. Done
- Recommended extensive wording changes to the discussion of Objective 3. Most were incorporated in the revised text.



## Reviewer # 5

---

- Provided 1 ½ pages of printed text.
- Put goals and objectives before strategic priorities. Done.
- Explain how strategic priorities were selected. Done.
- Rename Chapter 2. Done. Show closer linkage between strategic planning and goals and objectives. Tried to do this.
- Emphasize multi-hazards. Expanded paragraph in Chapter 2.
- Discuss metrics and assessment procedures. Tried to address this in Summary chapter + some of the metrics issues will be addressed in the Management Plan. Annual report is cast in terms of goals and objectives to make to facilitate assessment of progress.



## Reviewer # 6

---

- Provided written comments on draft text and three pages of comments in printed text.
- Suggested revising mission statement. Done.
- Recommended cutting back on “NEHRP-ese”. Tried to follow recommendation.
- Suggested several (16) editorial and wording changes. Tried to accommodate nearly all of these.



## Reviewer # 7

---

- Provided several (17) hand written comments on draft text.
- Addressed most of these through revisions to narrative.
- Suggested re-wording of Objective 6. Tried to accommodate this suggestion – incorporated most of the suggested re-wording.



## Reviewer # 8

---

- Provided comments (8) in the form of printed text.
- Made changes to the text based on 6 of these comments.
- Recommended increased emphasis on ANSS in the text. Addressed thru editing of narrative.
- Recommended that HAZUS be open source code. Did not address the comment. Not deemed to be a Strategic Plan issue. ACEHR may wish to take up this issue in its deliberations.

## Reviewer # 9

---

- Provided numerous comments (19) in the form of marked-up text.
- Addressed most comments in the revised text.
- Commented that NIST will need geotechnical capability. Did not address this issue in strategic plan. Not deemed to be a Strategic Plan issue. ACEHR may wish to take up this issue in its deliberations.
- Commented on need to reassess USGS Circular 1242. PIMS narrative was edited to address this comment.
- Provided written comment: “Overall this plan is well done. It can be improved and some suggestions are provided as requested. However, if it is “revised” too much to address every issue, including those raised by me, it could lose focus and impact.”



## Reviewer # 10

---

- Provided handwritten comments suggesting areas of emphasis needed in discussion of three objectives (encouraging more comprehensive adoptions of model codes, promoting training of enforcement personnel, and encouraging development of practical guides for design, construction, and enforcement). Tried to address these concerns in the revision but may need to revisit.
- Provided a few editorial suggestions.
- Provided written comment: “I think the plan is very good and has captured the essential elements admirably.....”

# Reviewer # 11

---

- Provided 1 ½ pages of specific comments in printed text. Because of the specific nature and importance of many of these comments, ACEHR may want to give guidance on accepting them, or not.
- Stressed the need to emphasize in the introduction NEHRP successes in the Provisions as basis for IBC and ASCE seismic requirements. Edited to reflect this.
- Objective 5. Suggested a 12-year (vice 6-year) cycle for revising the seismic hazard maps. Kept 6-year cycle in text – potential issue for ACEHR discussion and recommendation.
- Objective 7. Suggested active control of structures is not effective and should not be supported. Kept reference in text – potential issue for ACEHR discussion and recommendation.
- Goal C: Recommended that NEHRP should no longer support development of model building codes and turn this mission over to ASCE. Kept reference in text – potential issue for ACEHR discussion and recommendation.
- Observed that cost-effective rehabilitation not possible. Kept reference in text – potential issue for ACEHR discussion and recommendation.
- Commented that collecting post-earthquake performance data from private property owners will never be accomplished. Kept reference in text – potential issue for ACEHR discussion and recommendation.

