

4796

Diag. Ckt. No. 1215-2

Form 504
 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 U. S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY
 Director

G. & G. SURVEY
 L. & A.
 JUN 27 1928
 Acc. No.

State: New York

DESCRIPTIVE REPORT
~~Topographic~~ } Sheet No. 5 4796
 Hydrographic }

LOCALITY
 South Coast of Long Island
 Jones Beach and South Oyster Bay

1927

CHIEF OF PARTY
 G. B. Meaney

4796

2105

12

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U. S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

REG. NO. 4796

HYDROGRAPHIC TITLE SHEET

The Hydrographic Sheet should be accompanied by this form, filled in as completely as possible, when the sheet is forwarded to the Office.

Field No. 5

REGISTER NO. 4796

State New York

General locality South Coast of Long Island

Locality South Oyster Bay
~~Vicinity of Jones Beach and Massapequa~~

Scale 1:10,000 Date of survey Sept. 14 to Nov. 8, 1927

Vessel Lanch 66

Chief of Party O. D. Meaney

Surveyed by O. D. Meaney

Protracted by F. C. Johnson

Soundings penciled by F. C. Johnson

Soundings in fathoms feet

Plane of reference M.L.W.

Subdivision of wire dragged areas by - - - -

Inked by

Verified by

Instructions dated April 8, 1928

Remarks:

*Use Rep.
1/3 S.
12 Vols.*

C. & G. SURVEY
L. & A.
JUN 19 1925
Acc. No.

DESCRIPTIVE REPORT

TO ACCOMPANY

HYDROGRAPHIC SHEET # 4796

U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey

E. Lester Jones, Director.

C. D. Meaney, Chief of Party.

AUTHORITY

In accordance with instructions dated April 8, 1927, a hydrographic survey of the south coast of Long Island was made of the water area between latitude $40^{\circ} 35'$ and latitude $40^{\circ} 40'$ and longitude $73^{\circ} 26'$ W. to longitude $73^{\circ} 31.5'$ W. ✓

JUNCTION

This sheet joins sheet 4 on the west and chart 578 on the east. ✓

photo 680 m. WRECK

The boiler and part of the hull of a steamer was located at latitude $40^{\circ} 36' 68''$ m(N), longitude $73^{\circ} 25' 976''$ m(W). This wreck was previously located by triangulation. The wreck bares 3 feet at M.L.W. ✓

Blue)
Recond 64 B
guy 6.3 ft
R

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The land area comprised within the limits of this survey has been described in the reports for the topographic sheets for 1926. ✓

The water along the outside coast deepens gradually, except for a bar which extends along the coast about 100 meters offshore. ✓

The creeks and flats along the inside are generally muddy. The deep water in the channels shoals rapidly to flats nearly bare at low water. Brown grass which grows to the surface of the water at low water covers many of the flats. Due to this grass propellers become fouled in going over these waters at high water. Weedless propellers are used by launches which find it necessary to traverse the flats. ✓

CHANNELS

The main channels shown on this sheet are from north of Brant Point Hotel to the eastern limit of the sheet south of Unqua Point with an effective depth of 6' at M.L.W.; from north of Brant Point Hotel to Wantagh with an effective depth of 4.5 feet at M.L.W.; from north of Brant Point Hotel to High Hill beach with an effective depth of 4 feet at M.L.W.; from north of Brant Point Hotel to the head of Seaford Creek with an effective depth of 4 feet at M.L.W.; from Sloop Channel west of Squaw Island to Biltmore Shores with an effective depth of 5 feet to M.L.W.; from Sloop Channel south of West Island to signal Hut with an effective depth of 4 feet M.L.W.; from Sloop Channel to Unqua Point with a depth of 4 feet at M.L.W.

TIDES

w
To control tide reducers gauges were maintained at Prospect Gun Club dock on the S.W. point of Meadow Island (Sheet 4) at Freeport near the head of Enories Canal (Sheet 4) and near signal Ambrose at Biltmore Shores.

A comparison of the time and range of the tide at the above places compared with Fort Hamilton is given below

	H.W.I.	L.W.I.	Mean Range
Prospect Gun Club	7.98	1.70	3.1
Freeport	8.61	2.87	2.6
Biltmore Shores	9.89	4.48	1.4

The range of tide and the height of the tide at Biltmore Shore is largely affected by prevailing winds. Therefore, ordinary methods of interpolating can not be used in determining tide reducers for soundings between stations affected by Biltmore Shores. For these soundings tide curves for the Prospect Gun Club and Biltmore Shores were plotted and reducers interpolated directly from the curves.

SMOOTH SHEET PLOTTING

The smooth sheet was plotted in the Washington Office by F. G. Johnson, Lieutenant (j.g.).

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Meaney

Table of Statistics for Sheet 5

Sea Sled Dinghy

Vol.	Day	Date	Miles	Soundings	Positions
1	a	September 14	2.5	190	23
	b	September 23	3.6	287	64
	c	September 26	11.0	806	183
	d	September 27	3.2	210	42
2	d	September 27	2.4	160	45
	e	September 28	6.6	474	94
	f	September 29	13.5	896	150
3	g	September 30	7.7	548	121
	h	October 5	10.0	776	180
4	h	October 5	1.2	132	13
	j	October 6	13.3	897	188
	k	October 7	6.6	482	116
5	k	October 7	4.0	288	81
	l	October 10	10.8	763	189
	m	October 11	6.1	498	52
6	m	October 11	6.5	488	97
	n	October 12	12.3	857	139
	p	October 14	6.2	415	67
7	p	October 14	10.5	737	102
	q	October 17	1.4	104	18
	r	October 19	7.0	516	74
	s	October 20	3.3	226	34
8	s	October 20	6.5	482	58
	t	October 24	6.4	463	88
	u	October 25	8.3	601	171
9	v	October 26	7.0	513	87
	w	November 2 locating buoys		12	4
	x	November 8 locating buoys			17
Total			177.9	12821	2497

Launch #66

1	A	August 2	16.7	486	106
	B	August 3	26.0	850	160
	C	September 23	3.0	108	15
2	C	September 23	5.7	183	20
	D	September 27	15.6	517	58
	E	September 28	10.5	333	36
Total			77.5	2477	395

Coast Guard Surfboat

1	A	August 10	10.5	513	103
---	---	-----------	------	-----	-----

June 30, 1928

Division of Hydrography and Topography:

✓ Division of Charts:

Tide reducers are approved in
12 volumes of sounding records for

HYDROGRAPHIC SHEET 4796

Locality: South coast of Long Island, N. Y.

Chief of Party: C. D. Meaney, 1927

Plane of reference is M. L. W:

4.2 ft. on tide staff at Jones Inlet (Standard gauge)

5.8 " " " " " Biltmore Shore

Condition of records satisfactory except as checked below:

1. Locality and sublocality of survey omitted.
2. Month and day of month omitted.
3. Time meridian not given at beginning of day's work.
4. Time (whether A.M. or P.M.) not given at beginning of day's work.
5. Soundings (whether in feet or fathoms) not clearly shown in record.
6. Leadline correction entered in wrong column.
7. Field reductions entered in "Office" column.
8. Location of tide gauge not given at beginning of each day's work.
9. Leadline corrections not clearly stated.
10. Kind of sounding tube used not stated.
11. Sounding tube No. entered in column of "Soundings" instead of "Remarks".
12. Legibility of record could be improved.
13. Remarks.

Hammann
Chief, Division of Tides and Currents.

Note: For time and height corrections see notes in sounding books.

Sheet 5
Coast Guard A day started with station 50

0



Jones Inlet
30 min. later
0.8 of range

{ 1C - 35C *
1D - 26D
50D - 58D
1E - 14E

Jones Inlet
1.4 x range
1 hr. ahead

{ 1A - 106A *
1B - 160B *

Jones Inlet
0.7 x range
1 hr. later

{ 26D - 50D
14E - 36E

COAST GUARD

Sheet #5 4796

Jones Inlet

1.4 ~~5~~ range *
1 hr. earlier

A day

Post#	Fathometer	Fathometer Corrected for J.A. Boyer's method	V. C.	Echo	Diff. V.C. & Fath.	+ V.C.T	(4)
1 B	605		602				
1 C	215	?	285				
2 C	195	?	230				
33 C	270	?	300				
34 C	140	146	221		+ 75	<u>Inc.</u>	
37 C	140	?	206				
40 C	115	124	123		- 1		✓
42 C	147	175	162		- 13		✓
10 D	620	620	610		- 10		✓
43 D	780	780	795		+ 15		✓
86 D	490	491	496		+ 5		✓
23 E	185	?	191				
25 E	140	?	95	also, long instrument			✓
28	193	221	209		- 12		
32 E	317	346	306		- 40		
18 F	385	382	370		- 15		✓
19 F	395	471	395		- 70		
22 F	145	145	148		+ 3		✓
49 F	300	337 ?	269	F. tabular error had went down 3'-15"	- 68		
50 F	420	455	437		- 18		
51 F	220, 240, 285	274, 256, 303	286				
63 F	340, 355, 355, 368	406, 424, 435, 438 (4)	428				
64 F	455, 503	515, 559	549				
66 F	458	510	450	V.P. V. Poor	W. 7 1/2 slope - 60		
67 F	385	?	363				
68 F	245	293	261		- 32		
2 H	135	151	-190	Echo spread out	+ 39		
3 H	311	343	315		- 28		
4 H	240	253	258		+ 5		✓
47 H	220	223	200		- 23		
79 H	214	277	201		- 76		
33 G	190	194	173		- 21		
39 G	445	450	404		- 46		
59 G	330	368	369		+ 1		✓
81 G	685	692	694		+ 2		✓
97 G	935	945	943				✓
26 L	156	179	152		- 27		
53 L	528	601	554		- 47		
72 L	880	889	867		- 22		
1 M	660	659	640		- 19		
:	793	814	794		- 20		
4 M	698	705	730		+ 25		
5 M	265	?	235	Brown echo			
6 M	270	277	301		+ 24		

Fathometer and Vertical Cast Comparisons
 In depths over 100 fms.
 H-4798
 (Fathometer in about 100 fms. is OK.)

As above, fathometer usually too deep

37 86.7
 27 fms. range diff.

Field Records Section (Charts)

HYDROGRAPHIC SHEET No. 4796

The following statistics will be submitted with the
cartographer's report on the sheet:

Number of positions on sheet 2892
Number of positions checked 493
Number of positions revised 10 ~~XX~~
Number of soundings recorded 15,298
Number of soundings revised 50
Number of signals erroneously
plotted or transferred . . 2

Date: Oct. 29, 1928
Cartographer: G. Piccini

Supplement Report NO 2.

A conflict exists as shown by the older surveys, in the naming of Island Creek and Jackson Creek, both located at the northwestern corner of sheet.

The creek west of Wantagh Canal is named as follows from, -

B.P.	22,006	-	Jackson Creek	(1926)
T.	1850	-	" "	(1887)
Chart	1215		" "	(1928)
T.	15386		David Ball Creek	(1880)
T.	4274		Bellmore Creek	(1926)

In view of the fact that Chart 1215 recognizes this creek as "Jackson Creek," it is assumed that this matter was investigated by the cartographer before its acceptance for publication and further investigation was not deemed necessary.

The creek bordering the northwestern shore of Hamens Island is named as follows from, -

B.P.	22,006	-	Island Creek	(1926)
T.	1849	-	" "	(1887)
T.	15386		Jackson Creek	(1880)
T.	4274		" "	(1926)

In view of the fact that Jackson Creek has been established by Chart 1215 the name Island Creek appears to be correct for the name of this creek and it is so recognized by Chief of Party.

R.

5 (Cont.) those involving the use of signal Pipe.

Signal Pipe (north east corner of sheet) showed the largest disagreement and its location was obtained by long cuts made on a "sheet of signals" accompanying this ~~to~~ hydro. sheet (The topo. sheet did not develop this area). It was necessary to prolong the cuts which ended at the north edge of the "sheet of signals" and then transfer to the hydro. sheet. O.K.

The new location of signal Pipe improved the location of the ~~and~~ surroundings affected ^{which} appear to be correctly plotted.

Signal Pole, southwest corner of sheet, was located from the computations of Mr. Meany which were in his possession at the time and loaned to me.

- 6. (a) Character and scope of surveying, - good.
- (b) Field drafting, - good.

7. Reviewed by S. Pisgari Oct. 27, 1928.

Supplement Report. No 1.

The Junction with Hyd. 4795 appears to be satisfactory.

Further information relative to insufficient development will include a number of important spots which should be developed, are as follows: -

East side of Long Meadow	630 m N of Lat. 40°36'	570m. W of Long. 73°29'
South end of Great I.	1150 " " " 40°37'	730 " " " 73°30'
East side of South line I.	110 " " " 40°37'	950 " " " 73°28'
North east of West I in channel	" 40°38'	" 73°26'

OK

Sheet Inspected by - A. L. Shalant,

Report continued on opposite page.

June 7th, 1929.

SECTION OF FIELD RECORDS

Report on Hydrographic Sheet No. 4798

West Coast of Hawaii Island - Loa Pt to Kailua Bay

Surveyed in 1928

Instructions dated November 3, 1927 (Guide)

Chief of Party, T. J. Maher.

Surveyed by T. J. M., H. C. Warwick and V. M. Gibbons.

Protracted by H. C. W., V. M. G. and G. W. Lovelee.

Soundings by H. C. W. and V. M. G.

Verified and inked by J. Fleming.

1. The records conform to the requirements of the General Instructions with three exceptions. Looking up all correspondence with the Guide in 1928 in the office it appears samples were supposed to be furnished Scripps's Institute for salinity determination. There appears no record of salinity samples taken. It is probable that this party had past data which permitted the use of $33 \frac{0}{00}$ salinity, as the average value around the Hawaiian Islands. Salinity should be known for each sounding within one part in one thousand, according to general instructions. The salinity correction is as a rule of minor importance so long as approximate salinity is known. This is illustrated by the red pencil curves for $31 \frac{0}{00}$ and $35 \frac{0}{00}$ salinity drawn by me in conjunction with the field party's salinity curve of $33 \frac{0}{00}$ in the Descriptive Report. Temperature values are very important and these

were obtained.

In many cases the "check mark at the extreme right hand edge of the left hand page just to the right of the bottom column" in the records is not entered. This mark is supposed to show that the tachometer is vibrating correctly at maximum amplitude and the readings are coming in correctly for the fathometer rated speed. See notes later under Additional Remarks page 7.

The line ends and line begins are not filled in completely in the record books.

2. The plan and character of development conform to the requirements of the General Instructions except as regards fathometer values in areas of excessive slope. This is taken up further under paragraph number 10.
3. The plan and extent of development satisfy the specific instructions except as follows. Sounding lines as a general statement are much closer than instructions required altho this is perhaps permissible under paragraph number 14 of the Instructions.

A short sounding line running down the meridian $155^{\circ} 04'$ between latitude $19^{\circ} 38'$ and $19^{\circ} 34'$ would have filled in that area better to comply with spacing instructions there.

There is no record of bottom specimens having been taken every 5 miles out to the 1000 fathom curve as mentioned under paragraph number 17 of the Instructions.

4. In the shoaler water under about 100 fathoms the sounding line crossings are very good. In five instances in shoal water near the shore more careful plotting rectified apparent inadequate crossings. At 7 H to 8 H (ship) the depths are 2 to 4 fathoms too deep in water greater than 35 fathoms depth. Soundings here enough. Advise reject.

At 66 G and 12 H (ship) the depths differ about 2 fathoms in water about 20 fathoms deep. The shoaler depth is plotted as it is obtained by two tubes, and the deeper is fathometer.

Aside from the deeper fathometer soundings in pencil on H4798, which are at excessive slopes, and which an uncertain value is apparent, the crossings on the whole are good.

5. The usual depth curves can be drawn but with the uncertainty of fathometer values along the 200 fathom curve due to slope this curve is open to doubt in several places.
6. The field plotting was completed to the extent prescribed by the General Instructions except as noted below.

The control for this sheet was obtained from T 4343, T 4344, T 4354 and T 4355, all of 1928, and T 3424 of 1913, which latter sheet is based upon a different datum. The 1928 topography was based upon the Old Hawaiian Datum now in use. As the datum on the 1913 sheet was not reduced in the field to the common basis, displacement of some of the signals resulted. All signals from T 3424 were corrected and the hydrographic signals cut in again by J. Fleming, Cartographic Engineer. Then the inshore work was replotted entirely, dependent upon these signals, and the position errors were found to be from nothing to a maximum of 50 meters in a few spots. The greatest displacement of positions due to the shift in the control was observed in "a" day south of Δ Punu, and west of Δ Target on "c" day (blue), and opposite \odot Spot. The triangulation plotting was checked and found to be accurate. As the offshore hydrography was based upon this, no changes were necessary.

That part of the shoreline and its attending features represent-

ed by a solid line was pantographed from the 1928 topographic sheets mentioned above. The shoreline represented by a dashed or broken line was traced from T 3424. Signals from T 3424 and now corrected are marked after the name on H 4798 in pencil thus * . Signals from other topographic sheets on the correct datum are marked after the name on H 4798 in pencil thus ⊕ .

Altho not standard practice up and down soundings are indicated by a pencil circle around the sounding, and pressure tube soundings have a pencil dash below them.

7. There is a good agreement between the hydrographic and topographic sheets except at the following places.

Near ⊙ Flag the rocky reef extends offshore 75 meters on the topographic sheet but 150 meters on the hydrographic sheet. Usually such as here the hydrographic determination is correct while the other is an estimate while looking seaward.

Near 20 d (red) ⊙ Hen and near ⊙ Bud (Bad) the low water line differs on the two sheets. Should follow the hydrographic sheet low water line.

The greatest difference in shoreline is observed at ⊙ So (Get) where it amounts to 100 meters with correct datums. A rock awash here has an equal displacement but it is in the same location with respect to each determination. The 1928 shoreline at ⊙ So and the rock is about 100 meters south of the 1923 topography. The 1928 work has better triangulation control, and should be used.

⊙ SO H 4798 is ⊙ GET T 4354.

Rock awash 300 meters W x N of Δ Signal was formerly omitted from the hydrographic sheet but was on the topographic sheet 4354.

Some inshore sounding between ⊙ Las and ⊙ Sha; position 81 H (ship) ;

and inshore sounding between 24g and 29g (red) were incorrectly plotted by the ship plotter but were corrected and now agree with the records and the boatsheet.

○ Oke and ○ Twin are topographic signals on H 4798 but are believed to be hydrographic signals with angles unrecorded in the records.

The rock awash 50 meters SW of Δ Point has been moved north 15 meters on H 4798. It is quite certain the rock here on T 3424; H 4798 and on boatsheet 4798, while all plotted somewhat different, are the same rock.

Two sunken rocks about 60 meters west of ○ Low previously omitted were placed on H 4798.

8. The junctions with adjacent sheets are satisfactory. This includes H 4768; H 4787; H4789 and H 4790. There are no offshore hydrographic sheets as yet overlapping H 4798 at either the northern or southern extremities.

At 15 H day (ship) crossing Keauhou Bay there are two 18 fathom soundings with the fathometer that appear to be read too deep by $2\frac{1}{2}$ fathoms, as the whaleboat soundings and the motorsailor soundings hereabouts check each other at the shoaler depths. These two soundings have been rejected.

At position 23 F day (ship) there is a sounding of 133 fathoms which has been restored to the sheet and the depth curves altered. There is no reason for omitting this sounding.

The two fathometer soundings of 160 and 148 fathoms between 103 D and 104 D day (ship) are rejected as they were obtained on a large swinging course, and indefinitely located.

9. I do not consider the fathometer soundings satisfactory along the

300 fathom curve where the island shelf drops off into deeper water with steep slope. Additional accurate^{work} should be done as mentioned below under Remarks if my solution there is not believed acceptable.

10. Remarks.

Methods of handling depths obtained with the fathometer on steep slopes are as yet in a state of flux and corrected values are very difficult to determine satisfactorily. In fact if the true depth must be determined as for scientific purposes the fathometer method is not suitable for steep slopes due to the depth normal to the slope being obtained, such slope being knowable only approximately. Perhaps with sufficient study the maximum slope at which fathometer soundings can be reduced sufficiently accurate may be determined, and all soundings thereafter over this limit to be taken with either the pressure tube or vertical casts.

Up to the present status of this H 4798 sheet fathometer soundings have been accepted and inked where the slope corrections are not over 15% of the indicated fathometer depths in depths not over 300 fathoms, and where corrections are not over 10% in depths over 300 fathoms.

As I understand tests have been conducted in the office with officers showing that the personal equation of reading the deep values of the fathometer (white light) are as large as 40 or 50 fathoms, it does not seem unreasonable to use the arbitrary limits of 10% and 15% corrections as above, and are recommended for adoption on this sheet.

Most of the slope corrections have^{much} smaller percentages than the 10% and 15%.

With the fathometer soundings in pencil on H 4798, that is those with corrections exceeding the above percentages, it is recommended

that these depths be re-computed using Capt. Parker's graph, C. & G. S. Print 357, where within its limits, and the method explained by me on the appended onion paper be used. This method is an average of the graph depths at each fathometer sounding obtained from the surrounding fathometer depths, or if necessary in some instances to depth curves. This gives an average value from the surrounding slopes and is not dependent upon only one slope direction, as I believe used heretofore. As shown in the example on the onion paper these values at each fathometer sounding from the different slopes check remarkably well I believe when within the limits of the graph as constructed.

Fathometer soundings in pencil a few of which may not give suitable results should be rejected.

If this re-computing the pencil soundings is impracticable from the standpoint of volume of additional work, which I believe with the graph is not large, it is recommended that the pencil soundings be all rejected, and some additional vertical casts only be taken along the 200 to 300 fathom curve area from Kealakekua Bay south-eastward about 3 miles when hydrography is resumed south of this sheet.

This graph, Print 357, would be better for this sheet if the graph was extended to cover fathometer soundings as close as 175 or 200 meters apart instead of the 275 meters at present, and if the 5 to 555 curves representing difference of adjacent soundings were extended in length down another 6 inches or more at the bottom of the graph.

Additional Remarks.

As I understand the notation in the record books as on page 21,

vol. 1, " Mark ✓ (REED) indicates that the third reed from the left vibrated- Fathometer could not be speeded up sufficiently to make center reed vibrate" means that all the fathometer work with the check mark was done not at the rated speed of the fathometer disk 245 R P M, or assumed sound velocity of 820 fathoms per second. Some days there are no check marks for the reed, and other days there are check marks without the above notes. Check marks without any qualifying note should mean according to the Regulations that the fathometer center reed (one to the right of the third reed) is vibrating and therefore the apparatus is working as rated.

As shown on page 68 of the Hydrographic Manual, which was issued to the field I think just after this survey, under the box " Vibratory Tachometer " with a fathometer rated at a sound velocity of 800 fathoms per second the third reed vibrating from the left would give a sound velocity of 793 fathoms per second, and the machine not working at the rated condition. No data is available ^{in the Manual} for the difference in velocity of such conditions for an 820 fathom velocity machine.

This affects the velocity of sound values as computed in the Correction Table at the back of the Descriptive Report. It is believed this error is of minor importance, but it has not been computed. When the center reed of the fathometer is vibrating the fathometer is operating at a speed corresponding to the standard sound velocity for the apparatus, here 820, and the correction factors for the velocity of sound in salt water as given on page 159 of the Manual are then applicable.

While it is not usually difficult to read the fathometer under about 100 fathoms the question naturally arises in connection with the deeper uncertain fathometer readings whether or not officers only

should be detailed to read the fathometer. In the case at hand the Recorder read the fathometer practically entirely, so far as the records show. While of course he may be an excellent fathometer man, when there are questionable results, such facts that an officer did not read the fathometer, should be brought out. As far as apparent however all the principal difficulties of the depths are due to the slope.

There is a sheet appended showing the fathometer corrected for slope, and vertical cast comparisons over 100 fathoms in depth. The differences are erratic.

It is my recollection when serving on the Pioneer in 1925, on which ship there was no fathometer, that the sonic depth finder obtained excellent results in depths greater than about 100 or 200 fathoms by comparison with the vertical casts. In this work the problem of slope did not arise. The sonic depth finder was unsatisfactory in depths less than about 100 fathoms.

From the experience on the Surveyor in 1927, on which ship there was no sonic, my recollection is that under about 100 or 200 fathoms the fathometer comparisons with the vertical casts checked remarkably well, but over these depths the comparisons were unsatisfactory.

Experience to date in reviewing this sheet further confirms my earlier opinion that these two sounding methods so far as at present perfected compliment each other in working depths.

I have gone into the review of this sheet as minutely as time allowed before going back into the field again, both to point out fathometer survey salient points for reviewers, to try and

help solve the slope problems, at least somewhat, and also for my own benefit in understanding the field and office problems of the finished fathometer sheets.

Reviewed by *Charles Shaw*
Charles Shaw, June 1929.

Approved:

Chief, Section of Field Records (Charts)

Chief, Section of Field Work (H. & T.)

Note: The method recommended consists in computing slope correction from all adjacent soundings - each one giving a different value - and taking the mean. It would be more logical to take the largest correction. On account of the work involved and the relative unimportance of the soundings involved, all soundings under 300 fathoms having a slope corr. as computed by field party in excess of 15% and all edg's under 300 fathoms with slope corr in excess of 10% were rejected.

A. M. Sobieralski
Chief Section of Field Records