

A0007063

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

Date 10/14/86

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)

	Initials	Date
1. Mr. Jodlman	RA CA W	15
2. Mr. Soileau	CW	
3. Mr. Harrington	RA	17
4. Mr. Cherry	W	
5.		

Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

Memo should point out that wide-open, the head loss is only 0.1 foot or less depending on lake stage. Soileau

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post) GWIZERIX	Room No.—Bldg.
	Phone No.

MINUTES OF MEETING

SUBJECT: Lake Pontchartrain Outfall Canals Butterfly Valves.

DATE: 9 October 1986

ATTENDEES:

Cecil Soileau	Dan Marsalone
Arthur Laurent	Dennis Strecker
Ernest Barton	Robert Guizerix
Vann Stutts	Carl Guggenheimer
Ron Elmer	Larry Weed

Guizerix kicked off the meeting by stating that the principal issue was whether or not the butterfly valves could be designed to cause ~~more~~ less than a 0.5 foot head loss across the structure.

Soileau stated that based on information from the WES model studies, two gates would have to be cocked at a 24 degree angle to assure sufficient forces under reverse flow to close the gates. With two gates cocked at 24 degrees and with a discharge of 8000 cfs, the head loss would be 0.5 feet.

Strecker explained that based on the model study results, there is sufficient torque force created by the 8000 cfs. discharge to spring load the gates in the fully open position. The spring load force (tentatively estimated at 10 foot kips) would give the gates a propensity to close. At zero discharge the spring loaded gates would automatically close approximately 30 degrees.

After some discussion, it was agreed that the spring loading would alleviate the need to cock the gates; thus the head loss across the structure would be greatly reduced. It was also agreed that the spring loading could be modeled in the future section model study.

($< 0.1 \text{ ft.}$)

In response to Guggenheimer's question, Soileau advised that the above decision would not change in any way design data which has been previously furnished to Design Branch by Hydraulics Branch.

Guizerix
Guizerix

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

Date 10/20/86

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1. <u>Mr. Guggenheimer</u>		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

Action	File	Note and Return
Approval <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post) <u>GUIZERIX</u>	Room No.—Bldg.
	Phone No.

5041-102

☆ U.S. G.P.O. 1982-387-346

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206