

2056

Diag. Chy. No. 8202-1

2056

Form 504  
Ed. June, 1928

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
U. S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

....., Director

State: Alaska

---

**DESCRIPTIVE REPORT**

*Topographic* } Sheet No. 2056  
*Hydrographic* }

---

LOCALITY

~~Behm Canal~~

~~(Lower Part)~~

Juncture of Stephen's

Passage & Lynn Canal

---

1890  
~~1890~~

---

CHIEF OF PARTY

H. B. Mansfield

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
U. S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

WASHINGTON

September 19, 1923.

MEMORANDUM ON CORRECTIONS TO H. 2056.

Attention has been called by Mr. Deetz to the following discrepancies existing on H. 2056 and W. D. 3985: A 9 foot spot shown on H. 2056 off the northwest point of North Island plots within a 45 foot (effective depth) drag on H. 3985: In reference thereto, I wish to make the following report and recommendation:

The drag work pertaining to this area in question was carefully replotted and found to check the existing plotting on the smooth sheet. The drag grounded at 50 K apparently on the shoal that the 9 foot spot is a part of. The least sounding obtained however was 20 feet, without a clearance depth. A note in the wire drag sounding record opposite this 20 foot sounding reads "sunken reef close inshore." It is logical to suppose then that there is deeper water further away from the 20 foot spot. Moreover if the 9 foot spot had existed as shown on the hydrographic sheet then the drag would have hung up on this spot first. The tender would then have sounded in this vicinity instead of where the 20 foot sounding is. If the location of the N and F buoys are correct then for the length of drag used it would have been impossible for the drag to have hung up at the place where the 9 foot spot is. The drag would have had to be much longer. Hence there is very little doubt that the 45 foot drag passed over the spot where the 9 foot sounding is shown. Further it would seem that the shoal on which the grounding took place was in the vicinity of the 20 foot spot since at 47 K a note in the wire drag record states that the F buoy is bumping.

The  $4\frac{1}{2}$  fathom spot close to the 9 foot spot on H. 2056 is doubtless part of the same shoal. This falls within an area that was dragged over by an 82 foot drag and by a 45 foot drag. This should be almost conclusive proof that the spot does not exist in the position shown on the original sheet.

The original records for H. 2056 were then gone into and the two positions 44 and 45 b' ~~feet~~ (Pirate) for these soundings were carefully replotted. The left object for both these positions was @ Heap which is in about the middle of the eastern side of Shelter Island. There is no definite symbol for this signal but just a little north of the name on shore there is a prick point which was assumed to be the signal, as this point checks well with positions close by @ Heap that used the latter as one of the objects. With this assumed location of @ Heap the two positions 44 and 45 b' ~~feet~~ were replotted. This brought the 9 foot spot

about 240 meters northwest of the present plotted position and almost on top of a 62 fathom sounding, and also within an area covered by an 82 foot drag. The 4½ fathom sounding plotted about 700 meters southeast (approx.) of its present position. It falls just north of a 10 fathom spot and is in a more logical position than that shown on the original sheet. An inspection of the shoreline of Shelter Island will show that ⑥ Heap is, on no prominent part of the island and from where the boat was it would have been extremely difficult to pick up ⑥ Heap 8 miles away unless it was marked by a very prominent signal (which is very unlikely). It must therefore be assumed that some other object was observed upon and mistaken for ⑥ Heap. The loci of the right angles of both positions were plotted and with the observed left angles probable position for the two soundings were attempted to be obtained by using some other signal for the left object. Using  $\Delta$  Band which is close by and slightly offshore, a very good location for the 4½ fathom spot was obtained, but by using the same signal for plotting the 9 foot spot it is thrown way offshore in an impossible area. The left angles must therefore be considered as doubtful, and as the information is not sufficient to plot with the loci of the right angles alone as no courses are given and as 44 b' is the beginning of a line and no note appears in the record as to where the line begins, it is recommended that in view of the inadequate information in the sounding records and the subsequent wire drag work, that these two positions be rejected and all the soundings dependent on these be expunged from H. 2056.

A. L. Shalowitz

Approved E. R. B.

A. L. Shalowitz,  
Cartographer, Field Records Section.

Reject  $\checkmark$  44 &  $\checkmark$  45 b' on H. 2056 and  
expunge soundings dependent on  
these positions. See W. D. No. 3985.  
Nov. 9, 1923

H. L. Isaacson  
Chief, Section of Field Records

Applied to Reconstruction of Chart 8235 2-10-40 by Chas A. Beach, Jr.