Initial comments on JTH Estates CLOMR

1. Why did Doug use a “future” flow of 35,853 cfs when the FIS has 30,500?

2. Is the duplicate effective the NGVD 27?

3. CLOMR shows a rise of 1 foot or greater at river stations AT, 46 and 51 due to JTH 3B. City may take a hit for this.

4. The FIS at river station AT has a WSE of 5475. The CLOMR has 5473.5 prior to construction and a revised WSE of 5474.5.

5. The revised HEC-RAS cross sections are entitled AMAFCA floodplain? Probably no big deal, just unusual.

6. The cross –section (just before the annotated FIRM section of the report) has JTH 3B in NGVD 27.

7. River station 8 effective WSE 19.7, Revised 20.9. This is a rise of 1.2 feet. Usually not OK.

8. Just upstream of river station AM show a rise from effective to revised. Usually not OK.

9. Still considering if the Manning “n” at river station 2.9 is OK. This is the location of the fence and Doug used .035 and 0.045, same as all other cross sections.