Delta Risk Management Strategy (DRMS) Phase 1
Response To Comments: Wind Wave Technical Memorandum

Comments	Responses
Reviewer: Laurine White, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	
1. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations – Why are both CEM and DEM listed as acronyms for the Coastal Engineering Manual?	DEM was listed by mistake and was removed.
2. The wind roses for Appendix B are for the period 1 Jan 1997 – 31 Dec 2005, yet the frequency distribution tables in Appendices A and B say Year 1957 to 1965. This is confusing. If the period listed on the wind roses was the one used, this period begins in the middle of a severe storm (31Dec96 – 01Jan97) and finishes just at the end of a severe storm (30-31 Dec05). Couldn't the period of analysis have been extended to cover any severe winds in the days prior to 01 January 1997 or possible high winds for several days after 31 December 2005, when stages may have been higher in the Delta?	The data in Appendix A and Appendix B are for stations from different sources. Appendix A is for NWS stations and Appendix B is for DWR and CIMIS stations. The periods of record do not necessarily overlap. Given the length of the record, adding a few days should not change the statistics of the wind data.
3. Page 11, 2nd paragraph of Section 3.2.2.3, Spacial Wind Speed Distribution, Wind Speed Distributions, reference is made to Figure 6a-f, but Figure 6 includes only a-c. Page 12, 3rd paragraph, reference is made twice to Figure 10a-f, but Figure 10 includes only a-e, for five NWS stations.	The text was corrected.
4. The report does an excellent good job in describing the procedures for collection and analysis of wind data, and applying wind speeds for Delta areas away from the wind gage locations. I used some of the methodology described here for wind data analysis for a wave runup study I am currently involved with.	Noted.

Delta Risk Management Strategy (DRMS) Phase 1
Response To Comments: Wind Wave Technical Memorandum

Comments	Responses
Application of the ACES (CEDAS) program did not produce the same results as the Twitchell Island example in the report. I could not develop a deepwater wave of 2.1 feet with a Ts of 2.6 seconds, but perhaps I was not using the right combination of Wind Observation Type and Wind Fetch Options, and could only try different observed wind durations. The problem I have is that when I enter the following data into the Wave Runup Module, wave transmission on impermeable structure: • Smooth slope runup and transmission, • Wave Height = 2.1 feet • Wave Period = 2.6 seconds • Cotangent Theta (Slope) = 1.5 The computed wave runup is 4.82 feet, not the 6.9 feet in the example. I do not know what caused this difference in wave runup results.	

Delta Risk Management Strategy (DRMS) Phase 1
Response To Comments: Wind Wave Technical Memorandum

Comments	Responses
Schlunegger, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	
1. Section 4.1, page 15. I was unable to find the Lookup Tables (Tables 2 thru 6) for the wind wave parameters in the text or in the back with the figures. I am hopeful they will be included in the final version of the report. I would like to see this information as it helps give the equations more meaning.	These tables were inadvertently omitted from the first version of this TM that was posted. These tables are included in the Draft 2 version of this TM (June 2007).
2. Section 5.4, page 19. Based on the summary, is the spatial wind hazard model and wind wave analysis going to be re-calibrated or adjusted to account for the model under predicting?	The wind save analysis will be revisited in Phase 2, if necessary.