6 Sept

Responce to 'Comments on Overflow Profiles'

#1. a. Using peak discharge, as previously explained, as any criteria or rule is incorrect. the controling factor is VOLUME. Alinement 3 has 11000 Ac-ft of volume more than existing Condition after 12 hr of flooding. This volume is accounted for by increased depths.

#1b. Similar to 1a concerning peak discharges; also. The change in flood plain width, elimining the Burlington area results in slightly higher stages

#2a. See revised profiles.

2b. See 1b

#3 Peak discharge is very very misleading. Volume controls. more volume of water escapes for Aline. #1 than existing.

#4 My error. Can revise.

#5 " "

P004638

FB
1 SEPT 78

Comments on Overflow Profiles

① Thru Samish Overflow ✓

For #3 discharge peak is only 1,000 cfs more than 100 year existing but at station 7 it is 4' higher, at 11 - 3' higher, at 21 - 4.5' higher.

For #1 discharge peak is 15,000 cfs less than 100 year existing but overflow profile is generally 1' to 2' higher than 100 year existing

② Big Bend to Padilla Bay

#2 is different shape than other profiles at station 3 it is 7.5' higher than natural

For #1 discharge peak is 10,000 cfs less than existing 100-year but profile is 1' to 3' higher than existing

③ Big Bend to La Conner

For #1 discharge peak is 10,000 cfs less than 100 year existing but profile is 1' to 2' higher than existing

④ Mount Vernon to Conway

all alignments seem to be generally lower than existing 100 year propile mistake

⑤ Fir Island

all alignments are lower than existing 100 year propile mistake