

G-4

GORDON

COMMENTS ON REPORT

Comments on Draft Comparison Studies Report
August 20, 2002
Dave Gordon

Please see the notes made on Steve's comments dated 8 Aug 02.

1. Page 1-1, It seems like a version of Section 1.1 (Purpose) should be included in the main report. This Section gives some background and outlines why we analyzed this data. *will consider*
2. Page 1-1, 1st pp, 2nd sentence: Long sentence, difficult to follow. — *Noted - no change*
3. Page 1-6, 1st pp, last sentence: confusing sentence about thalweg position. *Noted*
4. Page 1.7, 1st sentence: Was the model discharge available for each WES model? *Not available*
5. Page 2-1: Mention that the typical top of bank elevation is about +30 feet LWRP. *reports - G*
6. Page 2-1, 1st pp: The sentence, "The advantage ..." is confusing. — *Noted was in previous reports*
7. Page 2-4, top of page: Also mention the WES Kate Aubrey model. — *p 3-4 talks about*
8. Page 2-6, 1st pp, last sentence: Model data was not usually collected along these survey lines.
9. Page 2-6, 2nd pp. I don't understand the last sentence.
10. Page 2-6, 3rd pp: ref to Section 3.2 not found & add "Lower" Mississippi River in last sentence.
11. Page 2-8, 2nd & 3rd pp: Remove these paragraphs. We eventually did not use this paragraph to extract our final data sets. *SL*
12. Page 2-9, Fig 2-3: Remove for above reasons.
13. Page 2-10, 1st pp & Fig 2-4: Remove for above reasons.
14. Page 2-11, 2nd pp, last sentence: replace successful with accurately
15. Page 2-13 – 15: Omit CF discussion. I still don't understand the need for it. I also do not understand the explanation in the write-up. It's very confusing.
16. Page 2-16, 1st pp: Give a more detailed explanation of what the MSE represents.
17. Page 2-17, 2nd pp, 2nd sentence: error in wording "...and to reach weighted..."
18. Page 2-19, 1st sentence: What is meant by "the sign"?
19. Page 2-19, 2nd pp: What is meant by "goodness of fit"?
20. Page 2-19, 3rd pp: Change sentence to: "Figure 2-6 describes how three model results relate to the prototype **on a range by range basis.**"
21. Page 2-22, Table 2-4: Explain why the mean area values of both the 75 and 76 surveys differ greatly between the MM and WES model calculations. This table requires more explanation in the write-up.
22. Page 2-24, 1st pp: Before the 1st sentence, insert the following sentence: "The 0 foot LWRP elevation used for the morphologic calculations in this analysis represents the extreme low flow channel where extreme variability occurs in both the prototype and the model." In the last sentence, change "This bias results..." to "An exaggeration in the difference calculations results..."
23. Page 2-25, 3rd pp: "...periodically the calculation..." "Sometimes only a limited..."
24. Page 2-30: Agree with Steve that most of this truncation section could be removed. The 2nd and 3rd pps on page 2-30 along with pages 2-31 through 2-41 could be removed. Pages 2-42 & 43 should be kept. A simple explanation using Figure 2-8 to describe the incorrect values that would occur with this section should suffice.

25. Page 2-43: Add sentences: "However, a few of the studies used in the analysis contained a few truncated sections. These sections were subsequently removed from the analysis. The range-by-range plots indicate these sections by breaks in the plot lines."
26. Page 3-2, last pp: remove 1st sentence
27. Page 3-4: Figures are referenced incorrectly, should be Figures 3-4 and 3-5.
(Combine this sentence with the one before)
28. Page 3-11, Table 3-1: Out of order compared to graph order. From looking at the graphs, I disagree with some of your assessments. Thalweg – Model (not reproduced between R20 & 30) Prototype (more variable R21 to 24 & R32 to 35); Width – Prototype (especially R23 –25 & R39 - 41); Width/Depth – Prototype (large variability R24 – 25 & R39 – 41); Area – Model (area too low throughout reach except much higher R27 – 28 and much lower R32 – 41)
29. Page 3-12: I don't understand "0.50 probability level"
30. Page 3-15, 1st pp: ref to sections 3.3 & 3.4 not found
31. Page 3-20, 3rd pp: red to section 3.3 not found
32. Page 3-33, Table 3-3: Slightly different assessment: Width – Prototype (R29 – 54 & R65 – 79); Width/Depth – Model (low R25 – 34) Prototype (large variability throughout); Area – Prototype (R46-60 & R66-74)
33. Page 3-34, Table 3-5: See prototype assessment from Table 3-3
34. Tables 3-4 & 3-6: The vagueness of assessment using the CF (as compared to Tables 3-3 & 3-6) suggests that the CF does not add anything different.
35. Table 3-6: Area **slightly** over ...
36. Page 3-35: ref to section 2.4.2 not found
37. Page 3-36: ref to section 3.4.2 not found
38. Page 3-36, 2nd pp: I thought the whole reason for using the KA reach was that the predictive capability of the large models could also be studied.
39. Page 3-36: Need to discuss the obvious differences within the problem reach between the 1998 and 2001 surveys.
40. Page 3-46, Table 3-7: Assessment of Width and Width/Depth ratio need to be reversed.
41. Page 3-47, 1st pp: Why discuss how CF is computed in the summary?
42. Page 3-47, 2nd pp: I don't understand this? Why are you singling out the 1:16000 model for over predicting area and width when the other two models under predict area and width by approximately the same factors? The statements that are made here about flow patterns and velocity distribution are not backed up by the data as far as I can see. This should probably be in the MVM assessment.
43. Section 4 should probably be in main report
44. Tables 4-1 to 4-5: Add average values of MSE for each model type
45. Table 4-2: Check the area MSE for Wolf Island. 0.456 seems abnormally high compared to the other models.
46. Figures 4-4 & 4-5: Check numbers. Alternating high and low values look suspect.
47. Figures 4-1 to 4-5: need bold line separating model types.
48. Talk to me about y-axis scales on the range graphs.