1. Reference is made to your DF dated 19 August 1977, subject as above, and Design Branch comment 2 response thereto dated 5 October 1977.

2. The preparation of survey scope designs and cost estimates for the seven alternative plans has not been completed. The status for each of the alternatives is as follows:

   a. **Alternative 1.** Levee design sections have not been furnished by F&M Branch. As a result, virtually no work has been performed by Design Branch.

   b. **Alternative 2.** Levee Design sections, I-wall top elevations and penetration depths have not been furnished by F&M Branch. As a result, no work has been performed by Design Branch.

   c. **Alternative 3.** Levee design sections, I-wall top elevations and penetration depths, T-wall top elevations and piling depths have not been furnished by F&M Branch. As a result, no work has been performed by Design Branch.

   d. **Alternative 4.** Design Branch has completed the preliminary design and cost estimate for this alternative. However, assumptions made as to the size of the box culvert openings must be verified by H&H Branch. Also, F&M Branch must verify assumptions made for the piling design.

   e. **Alternative 5.** Design Branch has completed the preliminary design and cost estimate for this alternative. However, H&H Branch must verify the size assumed for the gated openings. Also, F&M Branch must verify assumptions made for the lakeward tie-in levees design sections and also assumptions made for the piling design.

   f. **Alternative 6.** Design Branch has completed the preliminary design and cost estimate for this alternative. The same cost was used for the auxiliary low-head pumping station in this alternative as was determined for the new station in Alternative 7. F&M Branch must verify assumptions made for the lakeward tie-in levees design sections and also assumptions made for the piling design.

   g. **Alternative 7.** Design Branch has completed the preliminary design and cost estimate for this alternative. The estimate includes floodgates on the lakeward side of the pumping station for positive cutoff. H&H Branch must verify the size assumed for the floodgate openings. F&M Branch must verify assumptions made for the lakeward tie-in levee design section and also assumptions made for the piling design.

3. Design Branch has verbally requested from the Orleans Levee District (OLD) a cross-section survey for the Orleans Canal. OLD has indicated that the survey should be forthcoming in approximately one month.
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4. Upon receipt of the information listed above, i.e., the H&H Branch and F&M Branch input along with the OLD cross-section survey, Design Branch can proceed with the estimate of costs for the seven alternatives. This estimate will take approximately three months to complete assuming that H&H Branch and F&M Branches merely verify the assumptions Design Branch has used in preparation of the estimates for alternatives 4 through 7. If considerable revisions are made to the Design Branch assumptions, the cost estimates may take an additional two months to complete.