

F-3

DAVINROY

**EMAIL RE: DOGTOOTH BEND
INSERT**

Gaines, Roger A MVM

From: Davinroy, Robert D MVS
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 12:44 PM
To: Gaines, Roger A MVM
Cc: Gordon, David MVS; Strauser, Claude N MVS
Subject: Dogtooth Bend Insert

Andy,

After letting several people here at the District review the Dogtooth Bend write-up besides Dave and myself, it has become clear to me that the submittal is self-explanatory, and additional write-up on the base test conditions are not necessary. You may reference the thesis concerning this, as discussed, in the same manner you have referenced some of your writings in this report when you did not have the time to go into other detail.

After re-reading revision 17, the optimum place to insert the Dogtooth Bend write-up is after the section on Franco describing WES models compared to the prototype. This would make the Dogtooth Bend Section "2.7.2"

In context with other pre-ceding and proceeding paragraphs in this section, the write-up should start out:

2.7.2 Davinroy (2002) describes how a recommended conceptual design from a WES model (Dogtooth Bend) was transferred to a final design and constructed in the river. Davinroy compares the resultant bed configuration after construction with the bed forms observed in the model study test. The following is a description:

"During the 1980's numerous collisions and groundings....."followed by the insertion of the rest of the write-up.

The write-up belongs in the section and is totally in context with what is being described in this section. In addition, the write-up lets the reader understand how other micro models in the report are being reviewed based upon the following lead-in paragraph that you wrote from revision-17:

"However, an important aspect of the second question is the consequence of the model being wrong. Each of the various uses of the micromodel will be evaluated from the standpoint of the consequence of the model being wrong. Coupled with the consequence of the model being wrong is the type of study being conducted. While environmental concerns and navigation are of equal importance, the required accuracy of navigation predictions is generally greater than environmental predictions. For example, environmental studies can be successful by showing the creation of diversity of depth and velocity even if the location is not properly simulated. Navigation studies generally need to be more precise in predicting location in order to achieve safe navigation".

Rob