

**G-1**

**GORDON**

**2<sup>ND</sup> REPLY COMMENTS  
(WITH REPLY FROM GAINES)**

Comments on Draft Comparison Studies Report  
September 3, 2002  
Dave Gordon

Page 1-1, I still believe that a version of Section 1.1 (Purpose) should be included in the main report (if it is not already). This Section gives some background and outlines why we analyzed this data so extensively. Much of this is in the other report -- though not in exactly the same wording. Will consider how to make sure this is included.

Pages 2-8 through 2-10, I still don't know the purpose of discussing this software if it was not used for most of our data. The discussion does not add anything, especially considering that on page 2-11 we state that the errors it generated made it unusable. Is this information that the reader needs? The software was used in analyzing the KA data (2 MM). Also, the program was a product of the research that can be used (if corrected) as an aid to the calibration process. Those are the reasons that it should be included. If we only show 3 separate (and differing) opinions on this entire effort as the output, there doesn't seem to be much improvement in our use of the micromodels. This program could result in improvements to the process and should be included somewhere as an output of the evaluation effort.

Page 3-61, Section 3.2.3., 1<sup>st</sup> sentence: change to "comparing" done

From Steve's Comments:

1. P 3-61- JB variance look reasonable when looking at cross-section plots. It is interesting that variance is about 1 grain size =  $(1 \text{ mm}/1000)(1200)(3.28\text{ft}/\text{m}) = 3.9 \text{ ft}$  and that the typical range from max to min of the 18 runs is about 2 grain diameters. State whether a constant flow was used in the actual JB model or this was just done for the evaluation? **Rob/Dave to respond – Constant flow was used throughout this study that is why it was also used for this evaluation** done. In the last pp of 3.2.2, the first line is a conclusion. I would agree that this agreement is good, but to be consistent, we need to put conclusions in main report. In the last sentence, I think I agree with what you are saying but could you expound slightly? **Rob/Dave to respond – How about the following: "There are a number of other factors that could also contribute to the amount of variance experienced in reach. These are reach specific factors such as channel alignment, width/depth ratio, influence of river training structures, overall reach stability, and sediment. For example, a shallow straight reach may experience less variability than a highly sinuous reach."** done
2. P 3-62- I think I understand how variance was calculated in JB model. I am sure I don't understand what was done in Dogtooth. Please describe what was done. **Rob/Dave to respond – Unlike the JB evaluation, there was no interpolation involved because the survey points were collected at the exact same location after each run. Rob used numerous base test runs from the WES model to compute variance.** done

3. Page 3-62- remove last sentence of 3.2.4. It is a conclusion that I don't agree with in KA. **Done – This conclusion was originally based upon the 2 Dogtooth models and the JB Bridge Model.**