

9534

Original

9534

Form 504 U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY DESCRIPTIVE REPORT	
<i>Type of Survey</i>	SHORELINE
<i>Field No.</i>	<i>Office No.</i> T-9534
LOCALITY	
<i>State</i>	ALASKA
<i>General locality</i>	PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND
<i>Locality</i>	KNIGHT ISLAND PASSAGE
<u>1950-54</u>	
CHIEF OF PARTY	
Field:	G. A. Nelson
Office:	L. W. Swanson
LIBRARY & ARCHIVES	
DATE	

DESCRIPTIVE REPORT - DATA RECORD

1

T-9534

Project No. (II): PH-152 Quadrangle Name (IV):

Field Office (II): SHIP LESTER JONES Chief of Party: George A. Nelson

Photogrammetric Office (III): Washington, D. C. Officer-in-Charge: L. W. Swanson

Instructions dated (II) (III): 16 March 1951 Copy filed in Division of
Photogrammetry (IV)

Method of Compilation (III): Graphic

Manuscript Scale (III): 1:10,000 Stereoscopic Plotting Instrument Scale (III):

Scale Factor (III): 1.0

Date received in Washington Office (IV): FEB 3 - 1960 Date reported to Nautical Chart Branch (IV):

Applied to Chart No. Date: Date registered (IV):

Publication Scale (IV): Publication date (IV):

Geographic Datum (III): N. A. 1928 Vertical Datum (III): MHW

Mean sea level except as follows:
Elevations shown as (25) refer to mean high water
Elevations shown as (5) refer to sounding datum
i.e., mean low water or mean lower low water

Reference Station (III):

Lat.: Long.: Adjusted
Unadjusted

Plane Coordinates (IV): State: Zone:

Y= X=

Roman numerals indicate whether the item is to be entered by (II) Field Party, (III) Photogrammetric Office,
or (IV) Washington Office.

When entering names of personnel on this record give the surname and initials, not initials only.

DESCRIPTIVE REPORT - DATA RECORD

2

Field Inspection by (II): R. A. Gilmore
David F. Romero

Date: June-Sept. 1951

Planetable contouring by (II): Inapplicable

Date:

Completion Surveys by (II): Inapplicable

Date:

Mean High Water Location (III) (State date and method of location):

Identified on 1954 photographs by aid of field notes

Projection and Grids ruled by (IV): A. Riley

Date: 8-22-56

Projection and Grids checked by (IV): A. Riley

Date: 8-22-56

Control plotted by (III): R. Sugden

Date: 5-27-59

Control checked by (III): G. Amburn

Date: 5-29-59

Radial Plot or Stereoscopic R. Sugden
Control extension by (III):

Date: 7-10-59

Stereoscopic Instrument compilation (III):
Planimetry
Contours

Date:

Date:

Manuscript delineated by (III): G. Amburn

Date: 8-14-59

Photogrammetric Office Review by (III): E. H. Ramey

Date: October 1959

Elevations on Manuscript
checked by (II) (III):

Date:

DESCRIPTIVE REPORT - DATA RECORD

3

Camera (kind or source) (III): C&GS "W" Single-lens and U.S. Air Force Single-lens

Number	Date	PHOTOGRAPHS (III) Time	Scale	Stage of Tide
35 VV	17 Jul. 1950		1:40,000	
36 VV	" "		" "	
54-W-2287 to 2289	26 Jul. 1954	12:28	1:30,000	6.5

Tide (III)

Reference Station: Cordova, Alaska
Subordinate Station: Chenega Island
Subordinate Station:

Ratio of Ranges	Mean Range	Spring Range
	10.0	12.4
.94	9.4	11.7

Atlantic Marine Center
~~Washington Office~~ Review by (IV): C. H. Bishop

Date: 11-23-70

Final Drafting by (IV):

Date:

Drafting verified for reproduction by (IV):

Date:

Proof Edit by (IV):

Date:

Land Area (Sq. Statute Miles) (III):

Shoreline (More than 200 meters to opposite shore) (III):

6 mi.

Shoreline (Less than 200 meters to opposite shore) (III):

Control Leveling - Miles (II):

Number of Triangulation Stations searched for (II):

Recovered:

Identified:

Number of BMs searched for (II):

Recovered:

Identified:


Number of Recoverable Photo Stations established (III):

Number of Temporary Photo Hydro Stations established (III):

Remarks:

T-9534

COMPILATION RECORD	COMPLETION DATE	REMARKS
Shoreline compiled	Aug. 1959	
Final Review	Nov. 1970	



OFFICIAL MILEAGE FOR COST ACCOUNTING
 LIN. MI. AREA
 SHEET NO. SHORELINE MILES

9118	3	13
9119	9	11
9121	11	10
9122	23	7
9123	17	7
9124	7	5
9125	15	6
9126	5	3
9127	6	3
9128	5	3
9129	7	8
9130	14	6
9131	12	95
9132	48	50
9133	36	45
9134	5	11
9135	24	90
9136	26	85
9137	68	48
9138	10	7
9139	13	5
9140	12	8
9141	24	12
9142	10	3
9143	9	4
9144	26	9
9145	19	8
9146	18	8
9147	24	9
9148	25	9
9149	19	7
9150	24	8
9151	15	8
9534	6	4
9536	6	6
9538	4	1
9817	9	10
9818	11	5
9819	3	9
9820	7	5
9821	2	10
9822	9	9
9823	7	4
9824	9	10
9825	11	6
9826	10	8
11578	19	21

TOTALS 702 726

SUMMARY TO ACCOMPANY
DESCRIPTIVE REPORT T-9534

Several years have elapsed between the compilation and final review of this map. The compilation record and notes concerning the absence of reports and forms have been added by the final reviewer.

This shoreline manuscript, scale 1:10,000, is one of 43 maps comprising Project PH-152, which is in the western part of Prince William Sound. T-9534 is on the west side of Knight Island Passage at the north east end of Chenega Island.

Compilation was by radial plot, using 1:10,000 scale ratio prints of 1:30,000 scale photography taken in July, 1954. Field inspection was done in September 1951, using ratio prints of 1:40,000 scale photography taken by the Air Force in July 1950.

There is no record of field edit of this map.

Final review was done at the Atlantic Marine Center in November 1970.

The compilation manuscript was a vinylite sheet 3 minutes 45 seconds in latitude by 5 minutes 37.5 seconds in longitude.

A cronaflex copy of the final reviewed manuscript and a negative have been forwarded for record and registry.

FIELD INSPECTION REPORT
 PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND, ALASKA
 Project Ph-39(48); CS-277, 1951 Season
 Ship LESTER JONES, George A. Nelson, Commanding

2. Areal field inspection.---In general, the 1951 photogrammetric field surveys of the Ship LESTER JONES for Project Ph-39(48) consisted of all of item (a) and part of item (b) of paragraph 2. of the project instructions. A PROGRESS SKETCH showing the entire area of field inspection is attached to this report. In accordance with letter 71-jgh, dated 4 October 1951 (copy attached), the field data was compiled in the following order:

Area 1.-- Area east of Unakwik Inlet (part of item 2. (a) of project instructions).

Area 2.-- Remainder of item 2.(a).

Area 3.-- Area in vicinity of Chenega Island.

This arrangement was maintained in compiling control, topographic and peak station data and the various areas are indicated on the attached print of the PROGRESS SKETCH. All data and photographs for Area 1 were transmitted to the Washington Office on 15 November 1951 and the remaining two areas are being submitted as of the date of this report.

Field inspection consisted of (1) recovery and identification on aerial photographs of alongshore triangulation stations; (2) approximate identification of existing interior stations and establishment of a few new interior stations in Area 3; (3) shoreline inspection; and (4) selection and identification of phototopographic and photohydro stations.

In general, the coastline inspected is mountainous with little or no beach except at the heads of bays and larger indentations (usually glacial moraines). In most all cases the shoreline is vertical with trees growing to the immediate cliff edge or high water line. The mountainsides are generally covered with a thick growth of coniferous trees interspersed with patches of moss and grass and berry bushes. Alder is found in the glacial valleys and in patches along some of the side slopes, mostly in Area 3. The rock in the area inspected is a very hard granite, oftentimes polished smooth from glacial action. Numerous extensive crevices and faults were noted during the inspection and are very evident on the photographs.

Photographic coverage consisted of nine-lines photographs taken in 1948 and 1949 at a scale of 1:20,000 and single-lens photographs taken by the Air Force in 1950 at an approximate scale of 1:40,000. Ratio prints of the Air Force photographs were furnished on a scale somewhat larger than 1:20,000. Most of the nine-lens photographs were cut to a folded size of 18" x 24" for convenience in handling in the field. Considerable of the nine-lens photographs had been sent to the field in 1948 and had already been cut up in 12" x 12" squares. It was found that better efficiency could be maintained in the field if these squares were rejoined by scotch tape and folded on the cuts to suit the area

being inspected rather than to use them as individual 12" x 12" squares. Cutting the nine-lens photographs to this small size also creates a difficulty in that shoreline detail is often cut at a disadvantageous place. It was found that by cutting the photographs to a 18" x 24" size and making use of the central portion of the photograph that better results were obtained. All of Areas 1 and 2 with the exception of the Naked Island group and the west side of Perry Island (where single-lens photographs were supplied) were adequately covered by nine-lens photographs except for the main part of Perry Island. Here, the nine-lens coverage was such that extreme wing portions had to be used. This presented a problem in control identification. In general, the definition of the nine-lens photographs was good and were easier to interpret than the single-lens. Here, due to having been enlarged to twice their original scale, the inherent only fair definition of the single-lens photographs was amplified causing considerable trouble and excessive eye strain in making accurate identification. However, the single-lens photographs were more convenient to handle and use in the field than the folded nine-lens photographs. Poor coverage was had in parts of Area 3 due to the excessive width of the flight lines. In some instances there was no overlap in flights in this area.

All shoreline inspection was accomplished using the ship's 20 foot dories fitted with a small "dog house" across the gunwales to protect the photographs and instrumental equipment. However, it was generally necessary to take the photograph out into the daylight for close inspection, thus exposing it to the weather. All notes were made directly on the photographs with a soft lead pencil with leaders to the points pricked or detail noted. No inking was attempted in the field. All control and topographic station data was inked on the photographs in the evening of the same day the field work was accomplished, leaving other data to be inked at a latter date. Consequently, a maximum of field work could be accomplished and certainty assured that control data was complete before advancing to a new area.

Photographs were clipped to a piece of light plywood to facilitate handling and at most times the inspector could stand up in the boat and by using the top of the "dog house" as a plotting table carry on his shoreline inspection quite readily. In general, it is believed that sufficient notes have been made to aid the compiler in interpreting the photographs. No attempt was made to use a stereoscope in the dory. This is an impracticability. All stereoscope work was done aboard ship.

3. Horizontal control.---Sufficient alongshore horizontal control stations were recovered and identified. No new stations were established except in Area 3. Here, 4 peak stations were established by occupying recovered triangulation stations (see Geographic Positions, Form 28 b, submitted 15 November 1951). In a good many instances there is a plethora of identified control stations, especially in the Naked Island group and parts of Area 3. However, due to the fuzziness of detail sometimes on the single-lens photographs and overhanging trees, etc., most stations were recovered with the idea of identification if possible as it would not be

known until arriving at the next station which would be the best to identify. In as much as an attempt was made to recover all along-shore stations anyways, not too much additional time was used in actual identification. It is believed that the plethora of identification was justified in taking all things into consideration.

Station ROCK, 1912 and FERRY ISLAND LIGHT, 1948 were recovered prior to receipt of the single-lens photographs covering this area and inspection and identification had to be made on the outer wing portion of Photo No. 29842. It is possible that better results would have resulted here had better coverage been available at the time of field inspection.

The three control stations identified on single-lens photograph M-383, 28 VV(2) fall outside of the reported 1951 field inspection area. The control data is attached to the photograph and is submitted to assist in controlling the radia plot of Area 3.

A breakdown of recovered and identified horizontal control stations was made for each area and have been listed alphabetically, showing the photograph on which identified and the method of identification. In most cases identification was made by the substitute station method. The above lists are attached to this report. A separate list has been attached showing control stations recovered but not identified, also indicating LOST stations. All alongshore control stations were searched for and have been reported on Form 526, RECOVERY NOTE, TRIANGULATION STATION. All control stations recovered and identified have been shown on the PROGRESS SKETCH for the project.

Peak stations were spot identified as outlined in paragraph 10. of the project instructions. Stations for which a horizontal position is available have been indicated by a large green triangle on the photographs and those without position but having only a single direction and vertical angle have been indicated by a large green circle. All peak stations identified have been listed by areas and are attached to this report. A concerted effort was made to identify as many of these inland stations as practicable depending upon the location of the ship while in an area and also weather conditions at the time. Additional inland stations were determined in Area 3 as called for in paragraph 11. of the project instructions. From necessity, the locations determined depended upon thin intersections. Cuts and vertical angles were taken to additional identified peaks in this area.

4. Vertical control.---Vertical control for contouring by stereoscopic instruments can be obtained from the identified alongshore and inland control stations for which elevations are available. No attempt was made to abstract all stations with elevations as this data is available on the geographic position lists. However, an abstract of new elevations determined was made and is attached to this report. The

vertical angles for stations for which no horizontal position has been determined can be obtained from the ABSTRACT OF ZENITH DISTANCES, Form 29, submitted with other triangulation data on 15 November 1951. Standard methods were used in locating additional peaks and obtaining elevations.

5. Contours and drainage.---

Inapplicable.

6. Woodland cover.---Woodland cover exists in almost the entire area of the project and in most cases is right to the waters' edge. See paragraph 2. of this report for further information regarding this subject.

7. Shoreline and alongshore features.---Shoreline inspection was accomplished in the entire area indicated by cross hatching on the attached PROGRESS SKETCH. The mean high-water line has been indicated on the photographs and no difficulty should be experienced by the compiler in its delineation. In a great many cases the high-water line is at the immediate bluff edge which is also the tree and grass or tundra line. In some cases the approximate low-water line is indicated on the photographs but generally only the limits of shoal or reef areas are shown. All shoreline inspection was done from a 20 foot dory by skirting along the shore and also by actually going ashore at appropriate places where phototopographic stations were to be selected or horizontal control stations were being recovered and identified. It is believed that sufficient notes have been made to give the compiler a good idea of shoreline and alongshore features. However, it should be pointed out that a lot of shoreline information not specifically shown can be gleaned from reading the short descriptions of the photohydro stations inked directly on the face of the photographs. There are a few piers, landings and buildings alongshore in the area field inspected. These have been indicated on the photographs and all buildings considered worth delineating have been shown.

8. Offshore features.---An attempt was made to indicate all offshore high-water rocks and rocks awash on the photographs. In some instances a 3 point sextant fix was taken on offshore rocks which could not be readily identified. These fixes have been shown directly on the photograph. In some cases where a spot of some nature appeared on the photograph but no actual feature was found a note was made (generally by the letters NE) indicating the feature or spot was not evident upon visiting the area. In a few instances notes were made requesting fur-

ther investigation by the hydrographer.

9. Landmarks and aids.---There are two buildings in the area inspected which have been submitted on Form 567 as LANDMARKS. Also, there are 3 fixed aids to navigation which have been submitted on Form 567, two having been previously located by triangulation and the third has been identified as a phototopographic station. Conditions at the time did not warrant locating the latter by triangulation. The above forms 567 accompany this report.

10. Boundaries, monuments and lines.---Generally speaking, this paragraph is inapplicable. However, a General Land Office marker was found on the most northerly extremity of Naked Island and was referenced to triangulation KELSO, 1949 and classified as topographic station USIM S2454 1939 (GLO). Form 524 has been submitted for this station.

11. Other control.---Recoverable topographic stations were established along the shoreline in accordance with paragraph 13. of the project instructions. In many parts of the project no topographic stations had to be established due to the plethora of triangulation stations. Practically all phototopographic stations established were marked stations. A complete listing of all phototopographic stations by areas is attached to this report indicating the photograph upon which the station was identified. Form 524 has been submitted for each station.

Photohydro stations were selected and identified for future hydrographic surveys. A particular effort was made to select stations that could be re-identified and used by the hydrographer. Each station was assigned a temporary field number and indicated on the photograph. From necessity, due to two inspectors working in close proximity to each other, oftentimes using the same photograph another day, or even parts of the same photograph the same day, the numbering system became somewhat jumbled but in no case is there a duplication of numbers on the same photograph. A short description of each photohydro station has been inked directly on the face of the photograph upon which it was pricked. In some instances where the shoreline was too badly shadowed by overhanging trees or bluff, photohydro stations could not be pricked; but generally, very good hydro station coverage is available. As a matter of fact in some cases where the shoreline is considerably broken there is almost a plethora of stations and it will be up to the discretion of the hydrographer which stations to eliminate.

Photohydro stations were selected for the entire area inspected. In the Naked Island group where graphic control had been executed in 1949 and hydrographic stations had been built but no hydrography done, an attempt was made to identify the same stations indicated on the copies of the graphic control surveys furnished. In a good many cases this was possible and they have been indicated on the photographs in the photohydro station descriptions. A number was assigned to the pricked photohydro station in the usual manner and then the graphic control survey station name was shown in parentheses to indicate that it was the same station originally located in 1949. In some cases the original whitewashes were still evident and in others a railroad spike was found driven into a crack in the rock approximately midway of where the whitewash had been.

12. Other interior features.---There are no bridges or known cable areas in the area field inspected, nor are there any airports or landing fields. Air transportation is all done by float planes in this area. The CAA station in the Dutch Group and the village at Chenega are the most outstanding habitations. Most of the other habitations indicated on the photographs are abandoned fox farms except for the one on the south side of Farry Island. Here the buildings are kept up and residence maintained the year around.


The village of Chenega has about 90 residents and has a Bureau of Indian Affairs school and post office (both in the same building). There is a Russian Orthodox Church here and a native store. There is a long narrow pier here which was in bad repair at the time of inspection. There are no marine facilities here but water can be obtained by hose at the end of the pier.

13. Geographic names.---A special report on geographic names has been prepared and was forwarded to the Washington Office on 14 November 1951.

14. Special reports and supplemental data.---In addition to the data contained in this report, the following data obtained during the 1951 season by the Ship LESTER JONES is pertinent to the photogrammetric work accomplished in Prince William Sound.


<u>TITLE</u>	<u>DATE FORWARDED TO WASHINGTON OFFICE</u>
SEASON'S REPORT	4 January 1952
BEACH REPORTS (3), Prince William Sound	18 August 1951

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>DATE FORWARDED TO WASHINGTON OFFICE</u>
BEACH REPORT (1), Prince William Sound	19 October 1951
COAST PILOT NOTES, Prince William Sound	10 October 1951
GEOGRAPHIC NAMES REPORT, Prince William Sound	14 November 1951
SKETCH to accompany GEOGRAPHIC NAMES REPORT	15 November 1951
TRIANGULATION RECORDS and SKETCH (see tran- smittal letter)	15 November 1951
AREA 1, Ph-39(49), FIELD DATA (see transmittal letter)	15 November 1951
AREAS 2 and 3, Ph-39(48), FIELD DATA (see transmittal letter)	15 January 1952
PROGRESS SKETCH, to accompany SEASON'S REPORT (tracing)	15 January 1952



Ross A. Gilmore
Commander, C&GS

Approved and Forwarded:



George A. Nelson
Cmdr., C&GS
Comdg., Ship LESTER JONES

PHOTOGRAMMETRIC PLOT REPORT
PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND, ALASKA
PH-152
July 1959

21. AREA COVERED:

This radial plot comprises seven manuscripts covering the area of Dangerous Passage and including the northern part of Chenega Island. The surveys included are T-9134, T-9822 thru T-9826 and T-9534.

22. METHOD:

Vinylite manuscripts ruled with polyconic projections and UTM grid lines were joined using the grid lines. Completed surveys T-9139, T-9536 and T-9538 to the south and T-9125 to the north were included for junctioning.

Single-lens 54 W series photographs ratioed to 1:10,000 scale were prepared for use in the plot. Vinylite templets were made using a master templet to correct for paper distortion.

The plot was begun on T-9825 which was thought to be strongest controlled, junctioning with positions and control on T-9139. The plot was continued up Dangerous Passage with the best controlled templets. The weaker controlled templets were then added and the plot was re-adjusted to fit control and improve pass point intersections.

One flight of photographs was extended on the base set up by this plot into survey T-9125. A satisfactory junction with this sheet was obtained.

Those positions obtained by intersections of three or more templet rays were circled on the back of the manuscript with red plastic ink, and those formed by two rays in green.

23. ADEQUACY OF CONTROL:

The control throughout most of the area was adequate. Of the 29 stations used, 20 of them held. (within 0.3mm). Three of them were held within 0.4mm. Those stations missed by larger amounts were SCOT (0.8mm N.E.) TURF (0.7mm N. W.) PRECIP (0.8mm N.E.) TOUS (0.8mm N) CENTER (1.5mm N.W.). All of these stations which were missed by large amounts were field-identified as questionable except CENTER 1933 which was due to erroneous identification on the field photograph. Plot positions for station DANG, 0.5mm difference and CHUCK, 0.4 mm. difference were formed by only two radials. Discrepancies thus are unchecked. Station CHUCK could easily have been misidentified by this amount.

Control stations in the area of T-9534 fall very close to the flight lines with conditions such that they could not be identified on the adjacent flights. There was also difficulty in identification because of shadow and overhang of shoreline features. Positions thus may be weak in a north-south direction.

Survey T-9824 had three control stations which did not hold. These discrepancies are explained above and do not signify an error in datum. Positions in this area were also verified by comparing with prior planetable surveys.

Except for the northern part of T-9823 the plot was adequately referenced to field-identified control stations and is considered as fixed in datum. The northern part of T-9823 was controlled by four office-identified stations all of which held.

24. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:

None used for controlling the plot.

25. PHOTOGRAPHY:

The photographs were adequate for coverage. Side lap averaged only about 25%. More side lap would have resulted in a stronger plot as a number of the control stations were intersected by only two maps. This was especially true along the shoreline of T-9534.

26-30 INAPPLICABLE

Sketch and form M-2388-12-control stations submitted with this report.


Submitted by:

Robert L. Sugden
 R. L. Sugden
 Cartographer

Approved by:

Everett H. Ramsey

 Everett H. Ramsey
 Chief, Graphic Compilation Unit



PHOTOGRAMMETRIC PLOT SKETCH

▲ Field identified stations held
 △ Field identified stations not held
 ⊙ Office identified stations held
 ⊚ Office identified stations not held
 □ Topographic stations located by plot

NOTE: All stations not dated are 1933

148° 17' 45"

MAP T-9534 PROJECT NO. 152 SCALE OF MAP 1:10,000 SCALE FACTOR

STATION	SOURCE OF INFORMATION (INDEX)	DATUM	LATITUDE OR μ -COORDINATE LONGITUDE OR λ -COORDINATE	DISTANCE FROM GRID IN FEET. OR PROJECTION LINE IN METERS		DATUM CORRECTION	N.A. 1927 - DATUM DISTANCE FROM GRID OR PROJECTION LINE IN METERS		FACTOR DISTANCE FROM GRID OR PROJECTION LINE IN METERS
				FORWARD	(BACK)		FORWARD	(BACK)	
LINT, 1933	VI 162NA	1927	60 19' 57.395" 148 00 22.496			1857.0	1776.4	80.6	
CHOP, 1907	VI 91	"	60 20 53.449 147 59 28.862			920.7	345.2	575.5	
CAGE, 1907	VI 258	"	60 22 03.841 147 59 06.081			1857.0	1654.2	202.8	
OSTART, 1933	VI 157	"	60 22 21.177 147 59 12.249			920.3	442.7	477.6	
(Sub Pt) O LINT, 1933	Field Card	"	60 19 148 00			1857.0	118.9	1738.1	
						919.7	93.2	826.5	
						1857.0	655.4	1201.6	
						919.6	187.7	731.9	
						1857.0	1739.1	117.9	
						920.7	379.3	541.4	

17

COMPILATION REPORT
Shoreline Survey T-9534

31. Delineation

Shoreline and foreshore features were delineated by stereoscopic interpretation of single-lens photographs taken in 1954 using field inspection of 1951 as a guide.

Field inspection photographs used on this survey were numbered 35 and 36 VV taken in 1950.

32. Control

See Photogrammetric Plot Report filed as part of the Descriptive Report for T-9134.

33. Supplemental Data

None

34. Contours and Drainage

Inapplicable

35. Shoreline and Alongshore Details

In a few areas segments of shoreline were partially obscured on the photographs by shadow and overhang. However, it is believed that these areas meet accuracy requirements.

36. Offshore Details

Compiled as field inspected. Tone lines visible on the photographs were compiled as shallow limits. They are subject to some error.

37. Landmarks and Aids

None

38. Control for Future Surveys

None

39. Junctions

North: T-9823; South: T-9538; East: T-9826 and South: No contemporary survey.

- 2 -

40. Horizontal and Vertical Accuracy

No deficiencies in accuracy were noted.

46. Comparison with Existing Maps

T-4808, Scale 1:20,000 dated 1933

47. Comparison with Nautical Charts

No. 8515 corrected to 1952


Items to be applied to nautical charts immediately: None

Items to be carried forward: None

Submitted by


G. S. Amburn

Approved by


Everett H. Ramey
Chief, Graphic Unit

October 19, 1970

GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

FINAL NAME SHEET

PH-152 (Alaska)


T-9534

Chenega Island


Knight Island Passage

Masked Bay

Approved by:


A. Joseph Wright
Chief Geographer

Prepared by:


Frank W. Bickett
Cartographic Technician

T- 9534

49. NOTES FOR THE HYDROGRAPHER:

There were no notes to the hydrographer available at the time of final review and none are bound with this report.

FORM 1002(T-2) PHOTOGRAMMETRIC OFFICE REVIEW

MAP T-9534

PROJECT PH-152

No Form 1002(T-2) was available at the time of final review and none is bound with this Descriptive Report.

FIELD EDIT REPORT

MAP T-9534

PROJECT PH-152

No record of field edit was available at the time of final review; therefore, no Field Edit Report is bound with this Descriptive Report.

REVIEW REPORT T-9534

SHORELINE

NOVEMBER 23, 1970

61. GENERAL STATEMENT:

See Summary on page 6 of this Descriptive Report.

An ozalid comparison print, (pages 25 through 28), with differences noted in Items 62 through 65, is bound with the original of this report.

62. COMPARISON WITH REGISTERED TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEYS:

A comparison was made with Survey T-4808, scale 1:20,000, dated May - June 1933, using triangulation stations common to both maps and projection intersections as control. Differences between T-4808 and T-9534 are shown in blue on the comparison print.

In general, the shoreline compared well. Some rocks are shown on T-4808 that could not be identified on the photographs and, therefore, do not appear on T-9534. These are noted on the comparison print.

63. COMPARISON WITH MAPS OF OTHER AGENCIES:

A visual comparison was made with U.S.G.S. Quadrangle SEWARD (B-3), ALASKA, scale 1:63,360, dated 1950. No significant shoreline differences were noted. Rock differences are noted on the comparison print in brown.

64. COMPARISON WITH CONTEMPORARY HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS:

There were no contemporary hydrographic surveys available for comparison.

65. COMPARISON WITH NAUTICAL CHARTS:

A visual comparison was made with Chart 8515, scale 1:80,000, 10th edition, dated October 25, 1969. No significant shoreline differences were noted. Rock differences are noted in red on the comparison print.

It is pointed out here that rock differences are the same on T-4808, SEWARD (B-3), and Chart 8515.

66. ADEQUACY OF RESULTS AND FUTURE SURVEYS:

This survey complies with Job Instructions, Bureau requirements, and the National Standards for map accuracy. No accuracy tests were run in the field.

Reviewed by:

Charles H. Bishop

Charles H. Bishop
Cartographer
November 23, 1970

Approved:

Allen L. Powell

Allen L. Powell, RADM, NOAA
Director, Atlantic Marine Center

Approved:

Charles H. Bishop

Chief, Photogrammetric Branch

Jack E. Guth

Chief, Photogrammetry Division

148°01'52.5"

Y=6.893000

60°22'00"

COMPARISON PRINT

Blue = T-4808


M
a
s
k
e
d
B
a
y

66°21'30"

MHW
Station

148°01'00"

C
H
E
N
E
G
A



54-W-
© 2287

COMPARISON PRINT


- Blue = T-4808
- Brown = SEWARD (B-3)
- Red = Chart 8515

148° 00' 00"

147° 59' 00"

JOINS SURVEY NO. 9823

60°22'30"



Not visible on photos
 Also on SEWARD (B-3)
 Also on Chart 8515

60°22' 00"

MIA USMA X

ISLAND

COMPARISON PRINT

Blue = T-4808
Brown = SEWARD (B-3)
Red = Chart 8515

54-W-
© 2288

60°21'00"

△ CHOP 1907

Rks awash
Not visible on photos
Also shown on SEWARD (B-3)
Also shown on Chart 8515

60°20'30"


Foul

148°00'00"

147°59'00"

SLAND

60° 20' 00"



K N I

60° 19' 30"

54-W-

2289

COMPARISON PRINT

Blue = T-4808

Foul
(4)

60° 19' 00"

148° 01' 00"

148° 00' 00"

60° 18' 45"

148

JOINS SURVEY N