

G-5

GORDON

**EMAIL RE: KATE AUBREY
PREDICTIVE CASE**

Gaines, Roger A MVM

From: Gordon, David MVS
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2002 4:28 PM
Subject: RE: Kate Aubrey Predictive Case

is dredging issue should definitely be discussed in the report if the predictive case stays in. The two prototype surveys presented in the report look quite different from one another.

-----Original Message-----

From: Gaines, Roger A MVM
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2002 9:17 AM
To: Maynard, Stephen T ERDC-CHL-MS
Cc: Gordon, David MVS
Subject: Kate Aubrey Predictive Case
Importance: High

Steve,

I have looked at your comments on the KA model comparisons. I do not know how much additional consideration I place on what I have seen in other data (which you don't presently have), but I consider the predictive capability differently than you suggest. Perhaps we are unable to use the prototype data for the predictive case as intended because of reasons mentioned below.

In addition to the 1998 and 2001 bathymetry for KA, the information in the attached PPT file should also be considered. The 1999 and 2000 surveys were not included in the calculations of Morph. parameters because of the section truncation issue. Also, dredging was not included in operation of the micromodel.

Perhaps the assessment of using the later (2001) survey would be inconsistent with stating that the future prototype condition was placed in the micromodel -- Structures were placed in the model according to 1998 timeframe; however, the large amount of dredging in 1999 may invalidate use of this as a predictive test.

I am working to get a plan view showing where the dredge cuts were made in the last 4-5 years. I'll pass that along ASAP.

Thoughts?

<< File: ka-1999&2000Bathymetry with Dredging BarChart.ppt >>

Andy Gaines, P.E.
US Army Corps of Engineers, Memphis
167 North Main St.
Memphis, TN 38103
901-544-3392 or 1-800-317-4156 x3392 Phone
901-544-0920 FAX
roger.a.gaines@usace.army.mil