Response to 'Comments on Overflow Profiles'

1. a. Using peak discharge, as previously explained, as any criteria or rule is incorrect, the controlling factor is **VOLUME**. Alignment 3 has 11,000 ft³ 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 discharge; also, the change in flood plain width eliminating the Burlington area results in slightly higher stages.

2a. See revised profiles.

2b. See 2b

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

"4/ My error. Can revise."
Comments on Overflow Profiles

1. **Thrus Damish 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 Canway
   All elevations seem to be generally
   lower than existing 100 year profile
   more

5) Fire Island
   All elevations are lower than existing
   100 year profile more