

H13943

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Ocean Service

DESCRIPTIVE REPORT

Type of Survey: Navigable Area

Registry Number: H13943

LOCALITY

State(s): Illinois

General Locality: Offshore Chicago and Michigan City

Sub-locality: 3.8 NM East of Wilmette

2024

CHIEF OF PARTY
Nicholas Damm, CH

LIBRARY & ARCHIVES

Date:

HYDROGRAPHIC TITLE SHEET

H13943

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

State(s): **Illinois**

General Locality: **Offshore Chicago and Michigan City**

Sub-Locality: **3.8 NM East of Wilmette**

Scale: **5000**

Dates of Survey: **08/10/2024 to 10/18/2024**

Instructions Dated: **06/12/2024**

Project Number: **OPR-Y393-KR-24**

Field Unit: **Geodynamics LLC**

Chief of Party: **Nicholas Damm, CH**

Soundings by: **Multibeam Echo Sounder**

Imagery by: **Multibeam Echo Sounder Backscatter**

Verification by: **Atlantic Hydrographic Branch**

Soundings Acquired in: **meters at Low Water Datum IGLD-1985**

Remarks: *Any revisions to the Descriptive Report (DR) applied during office processing are shown in red italic text. The DR is maintained as a field unit product, therefore all information and recommendations within this report are considered preliminary unless otherwise noted. The final disposition of survey data is represented in the NOAA nautical chart products. All pertinent records for this survey are archived at the National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI) and can be retrieved via <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/>.*

Products created during office processing were generated in NAD83 UTM 16N, LWD. All references to other horizontal or vertical datums in this report are applicable to the processed hydrographic data provided by the field unit.

Table of Contents

A. Area Surveyed	1
A.1 Survey Limits.....	1
A.2 Survey Purpose.....	5
A.3 Survey Quality.....	5
A.4 Survey Coverage.....	5
A.6 Survey Statistics.....	6
B. Data Acquisition and Processing	8
B.1 Equipment and Vessels.....	8
B.1.1 Vessels.....	9
B.1.2 Equipment.....	9
B.2 Quality Control.....	10
B.2.1 Crosslines.....	10
B.2.2 Uncertainty.....	11
B.2.3 Junctions.....	14
B.2.4 Sonar QC Checks.....	24
B.2.5 Equipment Effectiveness.....	24
B.2.6 Factors Affecting Soundings.....	25
B.2.7 Sound Speed Methods.....	27
B.2.8 Coverage Equipment and Methods.....	28
B.2.9 Holidays.....	28
B.2.10 Density.....	28
B.2.11 Flier Finder.....	31
B.3 Echo Sounding Corrections.....	31
B.3.1 Corrections to Echo Soundings.....	31
B.3.2 Calibrations.....	32
B.4 Backscatter.....	32
B.5 Data Processing.....	33
B.5.1 Primary Data Processing Software.....	33
B.5.2 Surfaces.....	34
B.5.3 Designated Soundings.....	36
C. Vertical and Horizontal Control	37
C.1 Vertical Control.....	37
C.2 Horizontal Control.....	37
D. Results and Recommendations	38
D.1 Chart Comparison.....	38
D.1.1 Electronic Navigational Charts.....	39
D.1.2 Shoal and Hazardous Features.....	39
D.1.3 Charted Features.....	39
D.1.4 Uncharted Features.....	39
D.1.5 Channels.....	40
D.2 Additional Results.....	40
D.2.1 Aids to Navigation.....	40
D.2.2 Maritime Boundary Points.....	40

D.2.3 Bottom Samples.....	40
D.2.4 Overhead Features.....	40
D.2.5 Submarine Features.....	40
D.2.6 Platforms.....	40
D.2.7 Ferry Routes and Terminals.....	41
D.2.8 Abnormal Seafloor or Environmental Conditions.....	41
D.2.9 Construction and Dredging.....	41
D.2.10 New Survey Recommendations.....	41
D.2.11 ENC Scale Recommendations.....	41
E. Approval Sheet.....	42
F. Table of Acronyms.....	43

List of Tables

Table 1: Survey Limits.....	1
Table 2: Survey Coverage.....	5
Table 3: Hydrographic Survey Statistics.....	7
Table 4: Dates of Hydrography.....	8
Table 5: Vessels Used.....	9
Table 6: Major Systems Used.....	9
Table 7: Survey Specific Tide TPU Values.....	11
Table 8: Survey Specific Sound Speed TPU Values.....	12
Table 9: Junctioning Surveys.....	16
Table 10: Primary bathymetric data processing software.....	34
Table 11: Primary imagery data processing software.....	34
Table 12: Submitted Surfaces.....	35
Table 13: ERS method and SEP file.....	37
Table 14: Largest Scale ENCs.....	39

List of Figures

Figure 1: Overview of project survey limits (H13943 shown in blue), overlaid onto Chart US2MI01M.....	2
Figure 2: H13943 survey limits overlaid onto Charts US4IL1YX, US4IL1YY, and US5CHILL.....	3
Figure 3: H13943 extents of additional coverage past survey limits as part of CLIN2 for this project, overlaid onto Charts US4IL1YX, US4IL1YY, and US5CHILL.....	4
Figure 4: H13943 survey coverage overlaid onto Charts US4IL1YX, US4IL1YY, and US5CHILL.....	6
Figure 5: H13943 crossline to mainscheme difference statistics.....	11
Figure 6: Finalized 1 m CUBE surface TVU statistics for H13943.....	12
Figure 7: Finalized 2 m CUBE surface TVU statistics for H13943.....	13
Figure 8: Finalized 4 m CUBE surface TVU statistics for H13943.....	14
Figure 9: Overview of H13943 junction surveys.....	15
Figure 10: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13942 Finalized 1 m MBES CUBE surface.....	17
Figure 11: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13942 Finalized 2 m MBES CUBE surface.....	18
Figure 12: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13942 Finalized 4 m MBES CUBE surface.....	19

Figure 13: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13364 Finalized 1 m MBES CUBE surface.....	20
Figure 14: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13368 Finalized 1 m MBES CUBE surface.....	21
Figure 15: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13368 Finalized 2 m MBES CUBE surface.....	22
Figure 16: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13814 Finalized 2 m MBES CUBE surface.....	23
Figure 17: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13815 2 m MBES CUBE surface.....	24
Figure 18: Example of MBES ping drops observed from R/V Benthos on 10/10/2024.....	25
Figure 19: H13943 surface artifacts as a result of refraction causing the soundings to trend concave / convex.....	26
Figure 20: H13943 surface artifacts as a result of refraction causing outer beam noise.....	27
Figure 21: Finalized 1 m CUBE surface density statistics for H13943.....	29
Figure 22: Finalized 2 m CUBE surface density statistics for H13943.....	30
Figure 23: Finalized 4 m CUBE surface density statistics for H13943.....	31
Figure 24: H13943 combined backscatter coverage.....	33
Figure 25: Image representing 1 m, 2 m, and 4 m finalized CUBE surface resolutions in H13943.....	36
Figure 26: H13943 statistical analysis of surveyed depths to charted soundings.....	38

Descriptive Report to Accompany Survey H13943

Project: OPR-Y393-KR-24

Locality: Offshore Chicago and Michigan City

Sublocality: 3.8 NM East of Wilmette

Scale: 1:5000

August 2024 - October 2024

Geodynamics LLC

Chief of Party: Nicholas Damm, CH

A. Area Surveyed

Geodynamics conducted a hydrographic survey in the assigned area of H13943 located within the sublocality of 3.8 NM East of Wilmette, Southern Lake Michigan. Within H13943, all survey operations were conducted in accordance with the provided Statement of Work (SOW), Hydrographic Survey Project Instructions (PI), and the March 2022 National Ocean Service (NOS) Hydrographic Survey Specifications and Deliverables (HSSD). Any deviations from the aforementioned guidelines have been approved by the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Hydrographic Survey Division (HSD) Operations (OPS) branch and are documented in the survey correspondences.

A.1 Survey Limits

Data were acquired within the following survey limits:

Northwest Limit	Southeast Limit
42° 14' 38.09" N 87° 41' 11.95" W	42° 2' 46.4" N 87° 30' 52.71" W

Table 1: Survey Limits

Data were acquired to the survey limits in accordance with the requirements listed in the PI and the HSSD. It should be noted that as a part of CLIN2 for this project, an additional 51 LNMs were added to the planned project area. This area was selected by Geodynamics and approved by NOAA HSD OPS. The additional LNMs were developed offshore of H13943 (Figure 3). As directed by NOAA HSD OPS, the additional LNMs were added to the overall deliverable package and report for H13943. See DR Appendix II Supplemental records for related correspondence with NOAA HSD OPS.




Figure 1: Overview of project survey limits (H13943 shown in blue), overlaid onto Chart US2MI01M




Figure 2: H13943 survey limits overlaid onto Charts US4IL1YX, US4IL1YY, and US5CHILL




Figure 3: H13943 extents of additional coverage past survey limits as part of CLIN2 for this project, overlaid onto Charts US4IL1YX, US4IL1YY, and US5CHILL

A.2 Survey Purpose

This project is located in Southern Lake Michigan, northeast of Chicago, Illinois extending to Michigan City, Indiana. The Chicago harbor is the northern entrance to the Mississippi River and has a tremendous amount of local barge traffic moving commodities throughout the year. Much of this 481 SNM survey area has not been surveyed since the late 1940's, forcing many throughout the Lake Michigan community to predict the hazards and depths associated with the area near shore, including tug and barge operators as well as recreational boaters.

Conducting a modern bathymetric survey in this area will provide critical data for the updating of NOS nautical charting products and services to increase maritime safety near the Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois shoreline. Survey data from this project is intended to supersede all prior survey data in the common area.

A.3 Survey Quality

The entire survey is adequate to supersede previous data.

Survey quality in H13943 meets or exceeds requirements set forth in the HSSD. Survey quality was assessed through visual inspection, the analysis of crosslines, and utilizing QC Tools to assess uncertainty and density. Additionally, junction analyses were conducted between overlapping data collected on this project and existing bathymetric data. For more information on methods and results of the data quality assessments for this survey, refer to section B.2 of this report.

A.4 Survey Coverage

The following table lists the coverage requirements for this survey as assigned in the project instructions:

Water Depth	Coverage Required
All waters in survey area	Complete Coverage (HSSD 5.2.2.3)

Table 2: Survey Coverage

The entirety of H13943 was acquired with complete coverage within the planned survey extents as described in the PI, in accordance with section 5.2.2.3 of the HSSD. As previously mentioned, the additional 51 LNMs added to this project as part of CLIN2 extended the survey coverage of H13943. These additional LNMs were acquired to complete coverage specifications (HSSD 5.2.2.3) and are reported on and included in the final deliverable package for H13943. See DR Appendix II Supplemental records for related correspondence with NOAA HSD OPS.




Figure 4: H13943 survey coverage overlaid onto Charts US4IL1YX, US4IL1YY, and US5CHILL

A.6 Survey Statistics

The following table lists the mainscheme and crossline acquisition mileage for this survey:

	HULL ID	<i>R/V Benthos</i>	<i>R/V Substantial</i>	<i>Total</i>
LNM	SBES Mainscheme	0.0	0.0	0.0
	MBES Mainscheme	348.28	923.22	1271.5
	Lidar Mainscheme	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SSS Mainscheme	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SBES/SSS Mainscheme	0.0	0.0	0.0
	MBES/SSS Mainscheme	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SBES/MBES Crosslines	69.8	3.1	72.89
	Lidar Crosslines	0.0	0.0	0.0
Number of Bottom Samples			10	
Number Maritime Boundary Points Investigated			0	
Number of DPs			0	
Number of Items Investigated by Dive Ops			0	
Total SNM			46.2	

Table 3: Hydrographic Survey Statistics

The following table lists the specific dates of data acquisition for this survey:

Survey Dates	Day of the Year
08/10/2024	223

Survey Dates	Day of the Year
08/11/2024	224
08/12/2024	225
08/13/2024	226
08/14/2024	227
08/17/2024	230
09/16/2024	260
09/17/2024	261
09/18/2024	262
09/21/2024	265
09/25/2024	269
09/26/2024	270
09/30/2024	274
10/02/2024	276
10/03/2024	277
10/06/2024	280
10/08/2024	282
10/09/2024	283
10/10/2024	284
10/13/2024	287
10/17/2024	291
10/18/2024	292

Table 4: Dates of Hydrography

Bottom samples were collected on 10/13/2024, 10/17/2024, and 10/18/2024. It should be noted that several bottom samples were collected after the last day of MBES collection. Therefore, the last day of survey and SORDAT reflects a bottom sample acquisition day and does not have accompanying MBES data for that specific date. See Project Correspondence for more information.

B. Data Acquisition and Processing

B.1 Equipment and Vessels

Refer to the OPR-Y393-KR-24 Data Acquisition and Processing Report (DAPR) for a complete description of data acquisition and processing systems, survey vessels, quality control procedures and data processing

methods. Additional information to supplement sounding and survey data, and any deviations from the DAPR are discussed in the following sections.

B.1.1 Vessels

The following vessels were used for data acquisition during this survey:

Hull ID	<i>R/V Benthos</i>	<i>R/V Substantial</i>
LOA	9.14 meters	18.0 meters
Draft	0.61 meters	2.22 meters

Table 5: Vessels Used

B.1.2 Equipment

The following major systems were used for data acquisition during this survey:

Manufacturer	Model	Type
Kongsberg Maritime	EM 2040C	MBES
Applanix	POS MV OceanMaster	Positioning and Attitude System
AML Oceanographic	1-RT Velocity Probe	Sound Speed System
AML Oceanographic	AML-3 LGR	Sound Speed System
AML Oceanographic	MVP30-350	Sound Speed System

Table 6: Major Systems Used

R/V Benthos and the R/V Substantial utilized a dual-head Kongsberg EM 2040C multibeam system, a POS M/V OceanMaster positioning and attitude system, and AML Oceanographic AML-1 RT surface sound speed units. The R/V Benthos utilized an AML-3 LGR sound speed system for sound speed profiles. The R/V Substantial utilized an AML MVP30-350 sound speed profiling system, with usage of the AML-3 LGR only when MVP equipment issues occurred. Further details on equipment and software used can be found in the DAPR.

B.2 Quality Control

B.2.1 Crosslines

Multibeam crosslines acquired for H13943 totaled 5.73% of mainscheme acquisition.

H13943 crosslines were collected and analyzed in accordance with section 5.2.4.2 of the HSSD. Crosslines were evaluated in CARIS HIPS with a detailed visual inspection followed by a thorough statistical analysis. To conduct the statistical analysis, a 2 m CUBE surface was generated with strictly mainscheme data and another, separate 2 m CUBE surface was generated with only crossline data. The mainscheme and crossline surfaces were analyzed using the Compare Grids tool in Pydro Explorer, which generated a difference surface and associated statistics. In addition to the direct statistics from the surface differencing, the tool assessed the difference surface statistics and computed the proportion of NOS total allowable vertical uncertainty (TVU) consumed by the mainscheme to crossline differences per surface node.

The statistical results of the difference comparison show 95% of nodes falling within +/- 0.11 m, with a mean difference of -0.01 m (Figure 5). Additionally, greater than 95% of the difference surface nodes meet or exceed TVU specifications, as described in section 5.1.3 of the HSSD.




Figure 5: H13943 crossline to mainscheme difference statistics

B.2.2 Uncertainty

The following survey specific parameters were used for this survey:

Method	Measured	Zoning
ERS via VDATUM	0.0 meters	0.045 meters

Table 7: Survey Specific Tide TPU Values.

Hull ID	Measured - CTD	Measured - MVP	Measured - XBT	Surface
R/V Benthos	2.00 meters/second	N/A meters/second	N/A meters/second	0.05 meters/second
R/V Substantial	2.00 meters/second	2.00 meters/second	N/A meters/second	0.05 meters/second

Table 8: Survey Specific Sound Speed TPU Values.

The finalized CUBE surfaces were analyzed using the HydrOffice QC Tools Grid QA tool to assure at least 95% of the surface nodes met TVU specifications. The results of the Grid QA tool determined that all finalized CUBE surfaces meet or exceed the TVU specifications, as shown in Figures 6-8.

The multibeam surfaces were finalized with the computed uncertainty, derived from a mix of a priori and real-time uncertainty estimates, assigned as the uncertainty value. It should be noted that the uncertainty associated with the SEP model was applied in CARIS as the GPS Sounding Datum uncertainty, and not as Tide Zoning uncertainty. Additional details related to uncertainty methods may be found in the DAPR.




Figure 6: Finalized 1 m CUBE surface TVU statistics for H13943

Uncertainty Standards - NOAA HSSD

Grid source: H13943_MB_2m_LWD_Final

100% pass (26,919,421 of 26,919,421 nodes), min=0.20, mode=0.21, max=0.71

Percentiles: 2.5%=0.21, Q1=0.22, median=0.29, Q3=0.35, 97.5%=0.42




Figure 7: Finalized 2 m CUBE surface TVU statistics for H13943




Figure 8: Finalized 4 m CUBE surface TVU statistics for H13943

B.2.3 Junctions

H13943 junctions with H13942 and H13944. H13943 also junctions with previously existing 2020 Geodynamics MBES data, registry numbers H13364 and H13368, as well as the provided 2023 Ocean Surveys Inc MBES data, registry numbers H13814 and H13815. (Figure 9). Please refer to PI and Project Correspondence for further information.

Data overlap between H13943 and the adjacent surveys were attained. To conduct junction analyses, similar to section B.2.1 of this report, the Pydro Compare Grids tool was utilized. The inputs for this tool were the surfaces for each individual survey at matching resolutions. In addition to the statistical results of the junction analyses, the resultant difference surfaces were visually inspected and CARIS HIPS Subset Editor was used to examine overlapping data for consistency, agreement between surveys, and confirming data met TVU specifications.

Details regarding the results of the comparisons can be found below.




Figure 9: Overview of H13943 junction surveys

The following junctions were made with this survey:

Registry Number	Scale	Year	Field Unit	Relative Location
H13944	1:20000	2024	Geodynamics	E
H13942	1:20000	2024	Geodynamics	N
H13364	1:5000	2020	Geodynamics	SW
H13368	1:20000	2020	Geodynamics	S
H13814	1:5000	2023	Ocean Surveys Inc	NW
H13815	1:5000	2023	Ocean Surveys Inc	W

Table 9: Junctioning Surveys

H13944

Please refer to the H13944 Descriptive Report for the junction analysis between H13943 and H13944.



H13942

The statistical results of the difference comparison with the H13942 Finalized 1 m MBES CUBE surface show 95% of nodes falling within +/- 0.04 m, with a mean difference of 0.02 m (Figure 10). Additionally, greater than 95% of the difference surface nodes meet or exceed TVU specifications, as described in section 5.1.3 of the HSSD.

The statistical results of the difference comparison with the H13942 Finalized 2 m MBES CUBE surface show 95% of nodes falling within +/- 0.11 m, with a mean difference of - 0.00 m (Figure 11). Additionally, greater than 95% of the difference surface nodes meet or exceed TVU specifications, as described in section 5.1.3 of the HSSD.

The statistical results of the difference comparison with the H13942 Finalized 4 m MBES CUBE surface show 95% of nodes failing within +/- 0.11 m, with a mean difference of 0.01 m (Figure 12). Additionally, greater than 95% of the difference surface nodes meet or exceed TVU specifications, as described in section 5.1.3 of the HSSD.

H13943_MB_1m_LWD_Final-H13942_MB_1m_LWD_Final
 Mean: 0.02 | Mode: 0.02 | One Standard Deviation: 0.02 | Bin size: 0.01



Percent of nodes	Deviation (m)
50%	+/- 0.01
60%	+/- 0.01
70%	+/- 0.02
80%	+/- 0.02
90%	+/- 0.03
95%	+/- 0.04

Figure 10: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13942 Finalized 1 m MBES CUBE surface

H13943_MB_2m_LWD_Final-H13942_MB_2m_LWD_Final
 Mean: -0.00 | Mode: -0.02 | One Standard Deviation: 0.06 | Bin size: 0.01




Figure 11: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13942 Finalized 2 m MBES CUBE surface




Figure 12: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13942 Finalized 4 m MBES CUBE surface

H13364

The statistical results of the difference comparison with the H13364 Finalized 1 m MBES CUBE surface show 95% of nodes falling within +/- 0.16 m, with a mean difference of 0.05 m (Figure 13). Additionally, greater than 95% of the difference surface nodes meet or exceed TVU specifications, as described in section 5.1.3 of the HSSD.

H13943_MB_1m_LWD_Final-H13364_MB_1m_LWD_6of6_Final
 Mean: 0.05 | Mode: 0.07 | One Standard Deviation: 0.08 | Bin size: 0.01




Figure 13: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13364 Finalized 1 m MBES CUBE surface

H13368

The statistical results of the difference comparison with the H13368 Finalized 1 m MBES CUBE surface show 95% of nodes falling within +/- 0.17 m, with a mean difference of 0.09 m (Figure 14). Additionally, greater than 95% of the difference surface nodes meet or exceed TVU specifications, as described in section 5.1.3 of the HSSD.

The statistical results of the difference comparison with the H13368 Finalized 2 m MBES CUBE surface show 95% of nodes falling within +/- 0.20 m, with a mean difference of 0.11 m (Figure 15). Additionally, greater than 95% of the difference surface nodes meet or exceed TVU specifications, as described in section 5.1.3 of the HSSD.

H13943_MB_1m_LWD_Final-H13368_1m_CUBE
 Mean: 0.09 | Mode: 0.11 | One Standard Deviation: 0.09 | Bin size: 0.01




Figure 14: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13368 Finalized 1 m MBES CUBE surface




Figure 15: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13368 Finalized 2 m MBES CUBE surface

H13814

The statistical results of the difference comparison with the H13814 Finalized 2 m MBES CUBE surface show 95% of nodes falling within +/- 0.10 m, with a mean difference of 0.03 m (Figure 16). Additionally, greater than 95% of the difference surface nodes meet or exceed TVU specifications, as described in section 5.1.3 of the HSSD.




Figure 16: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13814 Finalized 2 m MBES CUBE surface

H13815

The statistical results of the difference comparison with the H13815 2 m MBES CUBE surface show 95% of nodes falling within +/- 0.10 m, with a mean difference of - 0.03 m (Figure 17). Additionally, greater than 95% of the difference surface nodes meet or exceed TVU specifications, as described in section 5.1.3 of the HSSD.

H13943_MB_2m_LWD-H13815_MB_2m_LWD_Combined
 Mean: -0.03 | Mode: -0.03 | One Standard Deviation: 0.06 | Bin size: 0.01




Figure 17: Junction analysis between H13943 and H13815 2 m MBES CUBE surface

B.2.4 Sonar QC Checks

Sonar system quality control checks were conducted as detailed in the quality control section of the DAPR.

B.2.5 Equipment Effectiveness

Multibeam Echosounder Ping Drops

On rare occasions, it was observed that the R/V Benthos multibeam echosounder would experience a "ping drop" issue which resulted in unexpectedly missing ping records, which were not observed by survey

personnel at the time of acquisition. These ping drops were observed in the multibeam data from R/V Benthos on 10/08/2024 and 10/10/2024. An example of these ping drops is shown below in Figure 18.

Ping drops resulting in data gaps were recovered and no holidays resulting from these intermittent issues remain in the final delivered surfaces. Additionally, in the final delivered surfaces, density requirements were achieved for the finalized CUBE surfaces (see Section B.2.10 below). For further information on echo sounding equipment, please reference the DAPR.




Figure 18: Example of MBES ping drops observed from R/V Benthos on 10/10/2024

B.2.6 Factors Affecting Soundings

Sound Speed

The spatio-temporal variability in temperature of the water column created complex sound speed conditions throughout the survey. These complexities often created challenges for the field team and resulted in occasional refraction artifacts in the survey data and resultant surfaces, as shown in Figures 19 and 20.

The hydrographer made considerable efforts to reduce the impact of sound speed issues during acquisition. These efforts included increasing frequency of casts, closely monitoring real-time swath "smiling" or "frowning", utilizing alerts for surface-to-profile sound speed deviation, observing the real-time standard deviation map display, and increasing the percentage of swath overlap. Additional efforts in post-processing to minimize refraction artifacts included outer beam filtering, manual outer beam editing, and assessing the application of sound speed profiles.

In addition to the outer beam noise associated with refraction, the convex or concave trend in the across-track sonar data is most prevalent in the outer beams and is noticeable in the surface as a striped line to line artifact. Remaining artifacts in the final delivered surfaces are all within the allowable TVU limit.




Figure 19: H13943 surface artifacts as a result of refraction causing the soundings to trend concave / convex




Figure 20: H13943 surface artifacts as a result of refraction causing outer beam noise

B.2.7 Sound Speed Methods

Sound Speed Cast Frequency: Sound speed casts were acquired at least once every four hours. Casts were often conducted more frequently than this time interval because of the dynamic water properties in the survey area. Additionally, the R/V Substantial utilized an MVP onboard which allowed for a higher frequency of casts.

Surface sound speed was compared in real-time to the sound speed profile. When the comparison differed by more than 2 m/s, a new sound speed profile was acquired. Additionally, QPS Qinsy and Kongsberg SIS provided a real-time visual assessment of data quality (standard deviation grids, bathymetric grids, swath views) aiding the hydrographer in determining when a new cast was required.

For more detailed information on sound speed methods, please refer to the DAPR.

B.2.8 Coverage Equipment and Methods

All equipment and survey methods were used as detailed in the DAPR.

B.2.9 Holidays

All CUBE surfaces were analyzed using HydrOffice QC Tools Holiday Finder to determine if the surfaces contained holidays, as described in section 5.2.2.3 of the HSSD. The tool scanned the CUBE surfaces, identifying any holidays, and generated an S-57 file to illustrate the locations of holidays.

Another method of holiday evaluation was to visually pan the CUBE surfaces to identify holidays. The hydrographer would often alter the surface display (color ranges, symbology, shading) to help aid the hydrographer in identifying coverage gaps. The results reflected the same outcome as the tool and no holidays were identified within the survey area.

B.2.10 Density

All finalized CUBE surfaces were analyzed using HydrOffice QC Tools Grid QA tool to assure data met the required density specifications. Density requirements were achieved for the finalized surfaces in H13943 with greater than 95% of the surface nodes containing at least five or more soundings, exceeding the specifications required by section 5.2.2.3 of the HSSD (Figures 21 - 23).




Figure 21: Finalized 1 m CUBE surface density statistics for H13943




Figure 22: Finalized 2 m CUBE surface density statistics for H13943




Figure 23: Finalized 4 m CUBE surface density statistics for H13943

B.2.11 Flier Finder

In addition to a visual inspection, all CUBE surfaces were analyzed using HydrOffice QC Tools Flier Finder tool to assure data does not contain fliers. While the Flier Finder tool flags surface fliers meeting a set criteria, it will also flag real surface features that meet the same criteria. Spurious soundings flagged by Flier Finder were cleaned until either no fliers remained or the remaining flagged fliers were deemed valid aspects of the surface.

B.3 Echo Sounding Corrections

B.3.1 Corrections to Echo Soundings

All data reduction procedures conform to those detailed in the DAPR.

B.3.2 Calibrations

All sounding systems were calibrated as detailed in the DAPR.

B.4 Backscatter

Raw backscatter data were collected and stored within the .ALL files. Backscatter data were processed and reviewed for quality assurance in QPS FMGT. In accordance with the HSSD, GSFs and backscatter mosaics were exported from FMGT. Hydrographers in the field monitored backscatter intensities in real-time and made efforts to collect quality backscatter without hindering bathymetric data quality. Refer to the DAPR for more information on backscatter data acquisition and processing procedures.




Figure 24: H13943 combined backscatter coverage

B.5 Data Processing

B.5.1 Primary Data Processing Software

The following software program was the primary program used for bathymetric data processing:

Manufacturer	Name	Version
CARIS	HIPS and SIPS	11.4.20
CARIS	HIPS and SIPS	11.4.26

Table 10: Primary bathymetric data processing software

The following software program was the primary program used for imagery data processing:

Manufacturer	Name	Version
QPS	FMGT	7.11.1

Table 11: Primary imagery data processing software

The following Feature Object Catalog was used: NOAA Profile Version 2023.

B.5.2 Surfaces

The following surfaces and/or BAGs were submitted to the Processing Branch:

Surface Name	Surface Type	Resolution	Depth Range	Surface Parameter	Purpose
H13943_MB_1m_LWD_Final	CARIS Raster Surface (CUBE)	1 meters	7.8 meters - 20.0 meters	NOAA_1m	Complete MBES
H13943_MB_2m_LWD_Final	CARIS Raster Surface (CUBE)	2 meters	18.0 meters - 40.0 meters	NOAA_2m	Complete MBES
H13943_MB_4m_LWD_Final	CARIS Raster Surface (CUBE)	4 meters	36.0 meters - 40.98 meters	NOAA_4m	Complete MBES
H13943_MB_1m_LWD	CARIS Raster Surface (CUBE)	1 meters	8.04 meters - 41.04 meters	NOAA_1m	Complete MBES
H13943_MB_2m_LWD	CARIS Raster Surface (CUBE)	2 meters	8.06 meters - 41.03 meters	NOAA_2m	Complete MBES

Surface Name	Surface Type	Resolution	Depth Range	Surface Parameter	Purpose
H13943_MB_4m_LWD	CARIS Raster Surface (CUBE)	4 meters	8.15 meters - 40.98 meters	NOAA_4m	Complete MBES
H13943_MBAB_2m_Substantial_300kHz_1of2	MB Backscatter Mosaic	2 meters	-	N/A	Complete MBES
H13943_MBAB_2m_Benthos_300kHz_2of2	MB Backscatter Mosaic	2 meters	-	N/A	Complete MBES

Table 12: Submitted Surfaces

All surfaces submitted are in compliance with the complete coverage MBES requirements per section 5.2.2.3 of the HSSD. See Figure 25 below for an overview of the submitted finalized surface resolutions.




Figure 25: Image representing 1 m, 2 m, and 4 m finalized CUBE surface resolutions in H13943

B.5.3 Designated Soundings

H13943 contains six designated soundings in accordance with section 5.2.1.2.3 and 7.4 of the HSSD. These designated soundings were created to facilitate feature management and best represent the least depths over

features in the Final Feature File (FFF). In the finalized CUBE surfaces, the CARIS HIPS Apply Designated Soundings function ensured designated soundings depths are retained in the finalized surfaces.

C. Vertical and Horizontal Control

Additional information discussing the vertical and horizontal control for this survey can be found in the accompanying DAPR.

C.1 Vertical Control

The vertical datum for this project is Low Water Datum IGLD-1985.

ERS Datum Transformation

The following ellipsoid-to-chart vertical datum transformation was used:

Method	Ellipsoid to Chart Datum Separation File
ERS via VDATUM	OPR-Y393-KR-24_100m_NAD83_2011-LWD_IGLD85_geoid18.csar

Table 13: ERS method and SEP file

Real-time positional and GPS Height data were corrected with G2+ Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) satellite corrections provided by the Fugro Marinestar Satellite-Based Augmentation System (SBAS). To improve the accuracy of the real-time data, real-time position and GPS Height data were post-processed using Applanix POSPac Mobile Mapping Solution (MMS) software. Trimble CenterPoint RTX correction methods were used to create Smoothed Best Estimate of Trajectory (SBET) files, which were applied to the survey data in CARIS HIPS. The provided separation model was then utilized to bring the data from ellipsoid heights to chart datum. For further information regarding processing and application of SBET and SEP files, please reference the DAPR.

C.2 Horizontal Control

The horizontal datum for this project is North American Datum 1983 (2011).

The projection used for this project is Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) Zone 16.

RTK

Real-time positional and GPS Height data were corrected with G2+ GNSS satellite corrections provided by the Fugro Marinestar SBAS.

D. Results and Recommendations

D.1 Chart Comparison

A comparison was performed in CARIS HIPS between H13943 and the ENC's listed in Table 14 of section D.1.1. Sounding layers were generated from the CUBE surface and overlaid onto the ENC's to visually assess differences between the surveyed and charted depths.

In addition to a detailed visual inspection in CARIS HIPS, all soundings from the chart were downloaded as a shapefile from NOAA's ENC Direct to GIS application and differenced with the nearest surveyed depth from the 2 m surface in ESRI ArcPro. A statistical analysis of the difference comparison is shown in Figure 26. The surveyed depths from H13943 generally agree with the charted soundings from the largest scale ENC's within the survey area, with a mean difference of 0.88 m. Areas with large discrepancies between the charted soundings and surveyed depths were assessed and two shoal soundings as well as one obstruction, were determined to pose an imminent danger to navigation and were subsequently reported as Dangers to Navigation (DTONs). Refer to Section D.1.2 of this report for further information.




Figure 26: H13943 statistical analysis of surveyed depths to charted soundings

D.1.1 Electronic Navigational Charts

The following are the largest scale ENC's, which cover the survey area:

ENC	Scale	Edition	Update Application Date	Issue Date
US4IL1YX	1:90000	1	08/27/2024	08/27/2024
US4IL1YY	1:80000	1	06/02/2023	06/02/2023
US5CHILL	1:12000	1	12/31/2024	12/31/2024

Table 14: Largest Scale ENC's

D.1.2 Shoal and Hazardous Features

Two shoals were identified as hazardous in H13943 and were reported and forwarded to MCD as Dangers to Navigation (Dtons) and are included in the FFF with Special Feature Type as "DTON". It should be noted that the grids accurately represent the least depths of the two shoals, therefore, they were submitted as two sounding features and were selected as sounding features based off of the shoal sounding layers created from the bathymetric CUBE surface. These sounding features do not have accompanying designated soundings. Additionally, one dangerous obstruction was reported and forwarded to MCD as a Danger to Navigation (Dton) and is included in the FFF with Special Feature Type as "DTON".

It should be noted that the least depth, position, or feature geometry may have changed slightly during post-processing for reported DTONS. Refer to the FFF for the remarks and recommendations for each feature. See DR Appendix II Supplemental Records for DTON related correspondence.

D.1.3 Charted Features

No assigned charted features existed for this survey; however, one charted feature was detected outside of the sheet limits, within junctioning sheet H13815 (Ocean Surveys Inc, 2023). This charted feature (Unique ID: 4_005_1) was investigated and is addressed as a Delete/New in the FFF with New Feature Unique ID: 4_005_2 in accordance with section 7.3 of the HSSD. This charted feature (Unique ID: 4_005_1) was imported into the FFF from ENC US4IL1YX.

D.1.4 Uncharted Features

All new features found within H13943 are detailed in the FFF in accordance with section 7.3 of the HSSD.

D.1.5 Channels

No channels exist for this survey.

D.2 Additional Results

D.2.1 Aids to Navigation

All ATONs located within the survey area were observed to be on station and serving their intended purpose.

D.2.2 Maritime Boundary Points

No Maritime Boundary Points were assigned for this survey.

D.2.3 Bottom Samples

Ten bottom samples were acquired in accordance with section 7.2.3 of the HSSD and are described in the FFF. Predetermined bottom sample locations were not provided for this project. Instead, ten bottom sample locations within each sheet were identified by the team of hydrographers based off of multiple factors including but not limited to, backscatter data, bathymetric data, geologic and/or navigation areas of interest. See Project Instructions for more information.

Bottom samples were collected on 10/13/2024, 10/17/2024, and 10/18/2024. It should be noted that several bottom samples were collected after the last day of MBES collection. Therefore, the last day of survey and SORDAT reflects a bottom sample acquisition day and does not have accompanying MBES data for that specific date. See Project Correspondence for more information.

D.2.4 Overhead Features

No overhead features exist for this survey.

D.2.5 Submarine Features

No submarine features exist for this survey.

D.2.6 Platforms

No platforms exist for this survey.

D.2.7 Ferry Routes and Terminals

No ferry routes or terminals exist for this survey.

D.2.8 Abnormal Seafloor or Environmental Conditions

No abnormal seafloor or environmental conditions exist for this survey.

D.2.9 Construction and Dredging

No present or planned construction or dredging exist within the survey limits.

D.2.10 New Survey Recommendations

No new surveys or further investigations are recommended for this area.

D.2.11 ENC Scale Recommendations

No new ENC scales are recommended for this area.


E. Approval Sheet

As Chief of Party, field operations for this hydrographic survey were conducted under my direct supervision, with frequent personal checks of progress and adequacy. I have reviewed the attached survey data and reports.

All field sheets, this Descriptive Report, and all accompanying records and data are approved. All records are forwarded for final review and processing to the Processing Branch.

The survey data meets or exceeds requirements as set forth in the NOS Hydrographic Surveys Specifications and Deliverables, Field Procedures Manual, Letter Instructions, and all HSD Technical Directives. These data are adequate to supersede charted data in their common areas. This survey is complete and no additional work is required with the exception of deficiencies noted in the Descriptive Report.

Report Name	Report Date Sent
Data Acquisition and Processing Report	2025-01-20
Coast Pilot Report	2024-11-27

Approver Name	Approver Title	Approval Date	Signature
Nicholas Damm, CH	Chief of Party	02/21/2025	Nicholas Damm  Digitally signed by Nicholas Damm Date: 2025.02.21 16:27:25 -05'00'

F. Table of Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
AHB	Atlantic Hydrographic Branch
AST	Assistant Survey Technician
ATON	Aid to Navigation
AWOIS	Automated Wreck and Obstruction Information System
BAG	Bathymetric Attributed Grid
BASE	Bathymetry Associated with Statistical Error
CO	Commanding Officer
CO-OPS	Center for Operational Products and Services
CORS	Continuously Operating Reference Station
CTD	Conductivity Temperature Depth
CEF	Chart Evaluation File
CSF	Composite Source File
CST	Chief Survey Technician
CUBE	Combined Uncertainty and Bathymetry Estimator
DAPR	Data Acquisition and Processing Report
DGPS	Differential Global Positioning System
DP	Detached Position
DR	Descriptive Report
DTON	Danger to Navigation
ENC	Electronic Navigational Chart
ERS	Ellipsoidal Referenced Survey
ERTDM	Ellipsoidally Referenced Tidal Datum Model
ERZT	Ellipsoidally Referenced Zoned Tides
FFF	Final Feature File
FOO	Field Operations Officer
FPM	Field Procedures Manual
GAMS	GPS Azimuth Measurement Subsystem
GC	Geographic Cell
GPS	Global Positioning System
HIPS	Hydrographic Information Processing System
HSD	Hydrographic Surveys Division

Acronym	Definition
HSSD	Hydrographic Survey Specifications and Deliverables
HSTB	Hydrographic Systems Technology Branch
HSX	Hypack Hysweep File Format
HTD	Hydrographic Surveys Technical Directive
HVCR	Horizontal and Vertical Control Report
HVF	HIPS Vessel File
IHO	International Hydrographic Organization
IMU	Inertial Motion Unit
ITRF	International Terrestrial Reference Frame
LNM	Linear Nautical Miles
MBAB	Multibeam Echosounder Acoustic Backscatter
MCD	Marine Chart Division
MHW	Mean High Water
MLLW	Mean Lower Low Water
NAD 83	North American Datum of 1983
NALL	Navigable Area Limit Line
NTM	Notice to Mariners
NMEA	National Marine Electronics Association
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOS	National Ocean Service
NRT	Navigation Response Team
NSD	Navigation Services Division
OCS	Office of Coast Survey
OMAO	Office of Marine and Aviation Operations (NOAA)
OPS	Operations Branch
MBES	Multibeam Echosounder
NWLON	National Water Level Observation Network
PDBS	Phase Differencing Bathymetric Sonar
PHB	Pacific Hydrographic Branch
POS/MV	Position and Orientation System for Marine Vessels
PPK	Post Processed Kinematic
PPP	Precise Point Positioning
PPS	Pulse per second

Acronym	Definition
PRF	Project Reference File
PS	Physical Scientist
RNC	Raster Navigational Chart
RTK	Real Time Kinematic
RTX	Real Time Extended
SBES	Singlebeam Echosounder
SBET	Smooth Best Estimate and Trajectory
SNM	Square Nautical Miles
SSS	Side Scan Sonar
SSSAB	Side Scan Sonar Acoustic Backscatter
ST	Survey Technician
SVP	Sound Velocity Profiler
TCARI	Tidal Constituent And Residual Interpolation
TPU	Total Propagated Uncertainty
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USCG	United States Coast Guard
UTM	Universal Transverse Mercator
XO	Executive Officer
ZDF	Zone Definition File