

W00105-W00112

NOAA FORM 76-35A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION  
NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE

## DESCRIPTIVE REPORT

*Type of Survey* ..... HYDROGRAPHIC .....

*Field No.* .....

*Registry No.* ..... W00105 - W00112 .....

### LOCALITY

*State* ..... Hawaii .....

*General Locality* ..... Oahu .....

*Sublocality* ..... South Coast of Oahu .....

**2000-2002**

### CHIEF OF PARTY

..... Maxim F. Van Norden .....

### LIBRARY & ARCHIVES

**DATE** .....

**HYDROGRAPHIC TITLE SHEET**

W00105-112

INSTRUCTIONS 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.

State Hawaii

General Locali Oahu

Sublocality South Coast of Oahu

Scale 1:10,000

Date of Survey 2000-2002

Instructions Dated \_\_\_\_\_

Project No. \_\_\_\_\_

Vessel LIDAR (SHOALS), USNS SUMNER

Chief of Party Maxim F. Van Norden

Surveyed by U.S. Naval Hydrographic Office

Soundings taken by echo sounder, hand lead, pole SHOALS 400 Lidar, Simrad Em 1002

Graphic record scaled by Fleet Survey Team

Graphic record checked by Fleet Survey Team

Evaluation by Bonnie Johnston Automated plo HP Designjet1050c

Verification by Physical Scientist: B. Johnston, Cartographer: Russ Davies

Soundings in meters at MLLW

REMARKS: Revisions and annotations appearing as endnotes were generated by the cartographer during office processing.

All depths listed in this report are referenced to mean lower low water unless otherwise noted.

UTM Zone 04



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE  
OFFICE OF COAST SURVEY  
Pacific Hydrographic Branch  
Seattle, Washington 98115-6349

May 19, 2006

MEMORANDUM TO: Captain James C. Gardner, NOAA  
Chief, Marine Chart Division

THROUGH: Commander Gerd G. Glang, NOAA  
Chief, Hydrographic Surveys Division

FROM: ~~Commander Donald W. Haines, NOAA~~  
Chief, Pacific Hydrographic Branch

SUBJECT: Approval Memorandum for W00105, W00106, W00107,  
W00108, W00109, W00110, W00111 & W00112

Pacific Hydrographic Branch has completed an evaluation and chart application of Outside Source Data from the Naval Oceanographic Office (W00105, W00106, W00107, W00108, W00109, W00110, W00111 & W00112). I have reviewed the data, reports and compilation to the chart. Data are suitable for nautical charting except where specifically recommended in the Evaluation and Quality Assurance Memorandum and Chart Application Memorandum.

The southeast side of Oahu is currently listed as "Priority 2" in the NOAA Hydrographic Survey Priorities (NHSP). The LIDAR provided adequate depth information in the near shore areas and multibeam provided complete coverage in the areas where it was utilized. However, additional fieldwork including side-scan and/or multibeam surveys of AWOIS items and approaches to harbors is recommended next time a survey asset is at this location in order to complete bottom search and object detection requirements in areas where only LIDAR was conducted. These areas where only LIDAR was conducted should remain classified as "Priority 2" and where multibeam coverage was completed the area should be reclassified as "Priority 4".

The survey area where LIDAR was utilized should be classified as Category of Zones of Confidence (CATZOC) "B" if used to update ENC's (Full seafloor coverage not achieved; uncharted features, hazardous to surface navigation are not expected but may exist. Controlled, systematic survey to standard accuracy.).

The survey area where multibeam was utilized should be classified as Category of Zones of Confidence (CATZOC) "A2" if used to update ENC's (Full seafloor ensonification or sweep. All significant seafloor features detected and depths measured.)

cc: Chief, HSD Operations Branch N/CS31





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE  
OFFICE OF COAST SURVEY  
Pacific Hydrographic Branch  
Seattle, Washington 98115-6349

May 19, 2006

MEMORANDUM TO: Commander Donald W. Haines, NOAA  
Chief, Pacific Hydrographic Branch

FROM: *for* *Aliquid & Muzi*  
Bonnie Johnston  
Physical Scientist

SUBJECT: Review of Outside Source Data Survey W00105, W00106,  
W00107, W00108, W00109, W00110, W00111 and  
W00112  
U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office / SHOALS 400 LIDAR  
Southeast Coast of Oahu, HI, Waikiki to Waimanalo Bay

I have reviewed outside source hydrographic survey W00105, W00106, W00107, W00108, W00109, W00110, W00111 and W00112 with regard to data integrity and completeness of the data submission package, survey field procedures, data processing and quality assurance methods, and overall data accuracy and data quality. Surveys W00105 through W00112 comply with specifications and requirements set forth in the NOS Hydrographic Surveys Specifications and Deliverables Manual, with the following exceptions:

- SHOALS 400 LIDAR data acquired in this survey does not meet NOAA HSSDM requirements (equivalent to IHO Order 1) for object detection. <sup>1</sup> The capability of LIDAR to meet NOAA object detection requirements are still unproven and questionable, and item investigations to either disprove charted features or acquire definitive least depths were not conducted.
- EM1002 MB data was only acquired on hydrographic survey W00112. This data cannot be fully certified to meet NOAA HSSDM requirements due to limited documentation provided by NAVOCEANO. There are some questions as to the depth and position accuracy of the system. However, the data contains no significant artifacts and the depths were between 41 and 419 meters. Therefore, the multibeam data should fully supersede the data currently charted in this area. <sup>2</sup>

Special attention should be given to the following:

- A stretch of coast spanning from the Northeast corner of Makapuu Head to Koko Crater does not meet HSSDM standards for data redundancy and object detection. The region was surveyed per request of the US Army Corps of Engineers using



8x8 meter spot density and 100% coverage and was not required to meet charting standards. The lack of redundant data increases uncertainty regarding the accuracy of least depth soundings over charted or new shoals and obstructions. The surveys affected by this coverage deficiency include W00107 and W00108.

- Fifteen obstructions identified as fish havens were reported by NAVOCEANO for survey W00110. The obstructions are located in the vicinity of a charted (19358) region labeled "Obstrn Fish Haven." A number of the submitted fish havens are positioned at a significant distance beyond the limits of the charted region and it is recommended that the boundaries of the Fish Haven area be redefined to include these obstructions. <sup>3</sup>
- Refer to the Outside Source Data Quality Assurance Checklist for additional specific charting recommendations.

#### Final Recommendations:

- The data should be used to chart soundings and depth curves representing general bathymetric trends, and new shoals and features that are not currently depicted on NOAA charts 19358 and 19369. <sup>4</sup>
- The data should not be used to supersede near shore features such as, charted shoals, rocks, obstructions, foul areas or coral reefs. <sup>5</sup>
- The charted shoreline should be retained as charted.
- Bottom samples were not acquired and should be retained as charted. <sup>6</sup>
- Although MB data in this survey may meet higher requirements, the survey area should be classified as Category of Zone of Confidence (CATZOC) "B" if used to update ENC survey area classification. <sup>7</sup>

Revisions compiled during office processing by the cartographer

---

<sup>1</sup> Concur

<sup>2</sup> Concur

<sup>3</sup> Concur

<sup>4</sup> Concur

<sup>5</sup> Except where there is evidence of shoaler features

<sup>6</sup> Concur

<sup>7</sup> Concur



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE  
OFFICE OF COAST SURVEY  
Pacific Hydrographic Branch  
Seattle, Washington 98115-6349

April 25, 2006

MEMORANDUM TO: Commander Donald W. Haines  
Chief, Pacific Hydrographic Branch

FROM: *Russ Davis*  
Russ Davies  
Cartographer, Pacific Hydrographic Branch

SUBJECT: Application of Outside Source Data Surveys, W00105 -  
W00112 U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office/  
SHOALS 400 LIDAR and USNS SUMNER

I concur with all recommendations by the reviewer Bonnie Johnston except where noted in their reports.

Summary of compilation:

- soundings, curves and features applied
- no rocks, shoals were superseded
- shoreline and alongshore features were retained as charted
- bottom characteristics were retained
- recommend aids to navigation be updated with the latest information
- \* no additional Dangers to Navigation were found during compilation

It is recommended that OSD surveys W00105 - W00112, supersede charted information within the common area and applied to chart 19358, 21<sup>st</sup> and chart 19369, 6th Edition.

Record of Application to Charts is attached.

Review and Approved

*Gary C. Nelson*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary Nelson, Cartographer Team Leader  
Pacific Hydrographic Branch





Title:

**HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST**

Page #:

1 of 25

Registry No: \_\_\_\_\_

State: \_\_\_\_\_

General Locality: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Locality: \_\_\_\_\_

Dates of Survey: \_\_\_\_\_

OSD Supplier: \_\_\_\_\_

OSD Project No: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Review Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**I. DATA INVENTORY**

**A. Reports**

Report Type	Format	Document Title	Date
Descriptive Report or equivalent			
Data Acquisition and Processing Report or equivalent			
Horizontal and Vertical Control Report or equivalent			
System Certification Report or Equivalent			
Other			

**B. Data**

Data Type	Format	Description (Raw, Processed)
Smooth Sheet Sounding Plots		
XYZ ASCII Files		
Multibeam		
Side Scan Sonar		
LIDAR		
Single Beam		





Title:

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

Page #:

3 of 25

II. DATA ACQUISITION AND PROCESSING

A. System Calibrations and/or Certifications

\_\_\_\_\_ A sensor offset and alignment survey was conducted to NOAA HSSDM requirements

\_\_\_\_\_ Offset values provided

\_\_\_\_\_ Patch tests were conducted for shallow-water multibeam systems

\_\_\_\_\_ Alignment bias and latency values provided

\_\_\_\_\_ Draft measurements were conducted

\_\_\_\_\_ Static Draft \_\_\_\_\_ Dynamic Draft \_\_\_\_\_ Loading

\_\_\_\_\_ Draft values were provided

\_\_\_\_\_ Sensors were calibrated in accordance with manufacturer requirements and NOAA specifications

\_\_\_\_\_ Calibration reports were provided.

B. Sound Velocity Corrections

\_\_\_\_\_ Sound velocity sampling regimen is in accordance with NOAA HSSDM requirements

\_\_\_\_\_ Sound velocity profiles were supplied

\_\_\_\_\_ All profiles appear valid

C. Water Levels

\_\_\_\_\_ Water level measuring equipment and methods are consistent with NOAA equipment and methods and are capable of meeting specifications

Equipment / method used: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Tide corrector files were supplied

\_\_\_\_\_ All tide correctors appear valid

\_\_\_\_\_ Water level correctors applied to sounding data

\_\_\_\_\_ Verified \_\_\_\_\_ Observed \_\_\_\_\_ Predicted \_\_\_\_\_ NOAA Zoning \_\_\_\_\_ Other zoning

\_\_\_\_\_ Water level error estimate provided by CO-OPS

Water level / zoning error estimate: \_\_\_\_\_



Title:

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

Page #:

4 of 25

E. Survey Methodology

\_\_\_\_\_ The surveyor has conducted adequate quality control of horizontal positioning data

\_\_\_\_\_ DTM, BASE surface, and/or mosaics indicate that seafloor coverage requirements (per NOAA HSSDM) were met and no significant coverage holidays exist.

\_\_\_\_\_ All least depths over shoals, wrecks, rocks, obstructions, and other features have been determined

\_\_\_\_\_ The Hydrographer has conducted the required quantity of cross lines, or acquired sufficient redundant data, in accordance with the HSSDM, to assess internal data consistency.

F. Data Processing and Quality Control

\_\_\_\_\_ An adequate description of data processing and quality control methods is provided in documentation.

Processing software used: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Data processing methodology is robust enough and adequate to provide a dataset suitable for charting.

\_\_\_\_\_ Data have been reviewed and are cleaned appropriately with no noise, fliers, or systematic errors noted.

\_\_\_\_\_ Crossline agreement or redundant data overlap has been visually inspected by the hydrographer

\_\_\_\_\_ Disagreements have been noted

\_\_\_\_\_ A Chart comparison was conducted by the hydrographer

\_\_\_\_\_ Disagreements have been noted.



Title:

**HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST**

Page #:

5 of 25

**III. DATA QUALITY AND RESULTS**

**A. Internal Data Consistency**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Full resolution data was provided in order to gauge the adequacy of cleaning and/or processing of the data.
- \_\_\_\_\_ A review of the data reveals no positioning errors exceeding NOAA specifications
- \_\_\_\_\_ Crossline agreement or redundant data overlap shows no disagreements exceeding NOAA HSSDM tolerances.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Anomalous data (fliers, noise, etc) were apparent in the BASE surface, DTM, and/or selected sounding set.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Are there any tide errors exceeding NOAA HSSDM requirements observable in the data
- \_\_\_\_\_ Are there any observable SV errors exceeding NOAA HSSDM accuracy standards.
- \_\_\_\_\_ All shoals are valid (no fliers) and the proper least depth has been retained.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Where multiple systems, platforms, and/or sensors were used, junctioning or overlapping data agree within NOAA HSSDM tolerance between platforms.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Any statistical assessment of the data (e.g. BASE standard deviation, QC reports, etc) indicate that data agree within NOAA HSSDM tolerances.

**B. Error Budget Analysis**

- \_\_\_\_\_ An error budget analysis was provided by the surveyor
  - \_\_\_\_\_ The error budget analysis indicates that data are capable of meeting NOAA HSSDM standards
  - \_\_\_\_\_ The evaluator concurs with the provided error budget analysis
- \_\_\_\_\_ The evaluator has conducted an error budget analysis
  - \_\_\_\_\_ The error budget analysis indicates that data are capable of meeting NOAA HSSDM standards

**D. Automated Wreck and Obstruction Information System (AWOIS) Items**

- \_\_\_\_\_ AWOIS Items are located within the limits of the survey.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ AWOIS Items can be sufficiently confirmed or disproved using data from this survey (Attach AWOIS pages to the certification memorandum.).



Title:

**HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST**

Page #:

6 of 25

**E. Dangers to Navigation**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Dangers to Navigation (DTONs) were selected and submitted by the surveyor / data provider
- \_\_\_\_\_ DTONs have been verified by the office evaluator.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Additional DTONs were noted during office evaluation and submitted

**F. Aids to Navigation**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Aids to Navigation (ATONs) were positioned during this survey
- \_\_\_\_\_ New ATONS were positioned during this survey
- \_\_\_\_\_ Survey positions match charted positions
- \_\_\_\_\_ The surveyor / data provider issued DTONs or notified the USCG for any ATON discrepancies
- \_\_\_\_\_ ATON discrepancies were noted during office evaluation and submitted as DTONs.

**G. Shoreline and Bottom Samples**

- \_\_\_\_\_ The shoreline (MHW and/or MLLW lines) were included as part of this survey
- \_\_\_\_\_ Surveyed shoreline matches charted shoreline
- \_\_\_\_\_ Surveyed shoreline compares with NGS/RSD source data
- \_\_\_\_\_ Surveyed shoreline should be used to revise nautical charts
- \_\_\_\_\_ Shoreline features were positioned during this survey
- \_\_\_\_\_ Surveyed features match charted shoreline
- \_\_\_\_\_ Surveyed features compares with NGS/RSD source data
- \_\_\_\_\_ Surveyed features should be used to revise nautical charts
- \_\_\_\_\_ Bottom samples were acquired during this survey
- \_\_\_\_\_ Bottom sample spacing was in accordance with NOAA HSSDM requirements
- \_\_\_\_\_ Bottom samples should be used to update NOAA charts



**Title:**

**HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE  
CHECKLIST**


**Page #:**

**7 of 25**


**IV. COMMENTS**

	<b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b>	<b>Document #:</b> <b>PHB-QA-03</b>	<b>Rev.:</b> <b>1</b>
<b>Title:</b> <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY  ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b>		<b>Page #:</b> 8 of 25	

	<p align="center"><b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b></p>	<p>Document #: <b>PHB-QA-03</b></p>	<p>Rev.: <b>1</b></p>
<p>Title: <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b></p>		<p>Page #: 9 of 27</p>	




**Figure 1.** Small coverage holidays in the DTMs from survey W00109 and W00112 displayed in Fledermaus; soundings are colored by depth.




**Figure 2.** Image depicting LIDAR coverage for Oahu. Areas surveyed by the US Navy and USGS were surveyed with 4x4 m spot density and 200% coverage. Areas surveyed by the USACE were surveyed with 8x8 m spot density and 100% coverage. Image was submitted in Appendix A of Hawaii\_Final.doc.

	<p align="center"><b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b></p>	<p>Document #: <b>PHB-QA-03</b></p>	<p>Rev.: <b>1</b></p>
<p>Title: <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b></p>		<p>Page #: 10 of 27</p>	



**Figure 3.** Images from Fledermaus 3DEditor displaying the difference in sounding coverage between LIDAR surveys run with 100% coverage versus 200% coverage. Soundings are colored by survey line.



**Figure 4.** (a) A DTM of survey W00107 is displayed in Fledermaus; an abundance of fliers are visible. (b) The fliers present in the DTM are not present in the sounding data when a subset of the survey is viewed in Fledermaus 3DEditor.

	<b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b>	Document #: <b>PHB-QA-03</b>	Rev.: <b>1</b>
	Title: <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b>		Page #: 11 of 27

## V. CHART COMPARISON

Chart comparisons were conducted for surveys W00105 through W00112. In general, smooth sheet soundings agree with the charted soundings within one fathom, with the smooth sheet soundings being slightly shoaler than the charted soundings in most instances.<sup>1</sup> Numerous new shoals were detected with the LIDAR data. All shoaler soundings should supersede deeper charted soundings.<sup>2</sup>

All charted wrecks, rocks, obstructions and shoals should be retained due to the absence of item investigations in the survey area and the unproven object detection capability of LIDAR systems for use in chart disprovals.<sup>3</sup>

The following sections highlight NAVOCEANO reported obstructions, new features and updates to charted features specific to individual surveys. Only the surveys with significant discrepancies or updates were included.<sup>4</sup>

### SURVEY W00105

#### Affected Charts

<u>Chart</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Edition</u>	<u>Date</u>
19358	1:20,000	20th	Apr 27, 2002

#### Reported Obstructions

No obstructions were reported by NAVOCEANO for this survey.

#### Charted Features


- A. Two soundings of 2.4 and 2.1 fathoms were found in the vicinity of a charted 2.25-fathom sounding reported in 2000. The charted sounding is located at 21°22'28.16" N, 157°41'28.96" W. It is recommended by the reviewer that the charted sounding be retained and the comment "Rep (2000)" be removed from the chart.<sup>5</sup>
- B. Two soundings of 2.7 and 2.2 fathoms were found in the vicinity of a 2.75-fathom charted sounding reported in 2000. The charted sounding is located at 21°21'41.64" N, 157°42'07.21" W. It is recommended by the reviewer that the charted sounding be retained and the comment "Rep (2000)" be removed from the chart.<sup>6</sup>

	<b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b>	Document #: <b>PHB-QA-03</b>	Rev.: <b>1</b>
Title: <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b>		Page #: 12 of 27	

- C. A 1.8-fathom sounding was found in the vicinity of a charted 2-fathom sounding reported in 2000. The charted sounding is located at 21°21'21.83" N, 157°41'58.08" W. It is recommended by the reviewer that the charted sounding be retained and the comment "Rep (2000)" be removed from the chart. <sup>7</sup>
  
- D. It was reported by NAVOCEANO that the ruins approximately positioned at 21°19'55" N, 157°41'30" W were not visible in the data. It is recommended that the ruins be retained as charted and added to the AWOIS database for future investigation. <sup>8</sup>
  
- E. NAVOCEANO reported a limiting depth of 5.0 meters (2.734 fathoms) for the channel leading to the Oceanic Institute Pier. However, the reviewer found the channel to have a limiting depth of 1.2 fathoms located at 21°19'7.79" N, 157°40'0.06" W, significantly shoaler than the charted depth of 16 feet reported in 1984. It is recommended that the channel depth be updated to reflect the changes in depth evident in the survey soundings. <sup>9</sup>

### New Features

- F. A 2.2-fm sounding located at 21°20'58.25" N, 157°41'38.27" W was reviewed in Fledermaus and it appears to be an uncharted submerged pinnacle with an approximate height of 3 meters. The reviewer recommends charting the feature at its surveyed least depth. <sup>10</sup>
  
- G. Smooth sheet soundings of 2.2 and 2.9 fms located in the vicinity of 21°21'5.08" N, 157°41'23.9" W were examined in Fledermaus. The soundings appear to represent an uncharted shoal falling between charted soundings of 4.25 and 5.25 fms. It is recommended that the charted soundings be superseded. <sup>11</sup>
  
- H. A 0.5-fm smooth sheet sounding located at 21°20'22.35" N, 157°41'1.03" W was examined in Fledermaus. The sounding was found in the vicinity of a 1.75-fm sounding and appears to be the new least depth of the charted shoal. It is recommended that the charted soundings be superseded. <sup>12</sup>



**Figure 5.** Image depicting data coverage and location of noted features for survey W00105; Chart 19358 is displayed in the background.

	<b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b>	Document #:	Rev.:
		PHB-QA-03	<b>1</b>
Title:		Page #:	
<b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b>		14 of 27	

### SURVEY W00109

#### Affected Charts


Chart	Scale	Edition	Date
19358	1:20,000	20th	Apr 27, 2002

#### Reported Obstructions

No obstructions were reported by NAVOCEANO for this survey.

#### Charted Features

- A. A 2.5 fathom smooth sheet sounding was found in the vicinity of a charted 2.5-fathom sounding reported in 2000. The charted sounding is located at 21°15'42.22" N, 157°42'46.8" W. It is recommended by the reviewer that the charted sounding be retained and the comment "Rep (2000)" be removed from the chart. <sup>13</sup>



**Figure 6.** Image depicting data coverage and location of the noted feature for survey W00109; Chart 19358 is displayed in the background.

	<b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b>	Document #: <b>PHB-QA-03</b>	Rev.: <b>1</b>
	Title: <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b>		Page #: 15 of 27

## SURVEY W00110

### Affected Charts

ChartScaleEditionDate

193581:20,00020th Apr 27, 2002


### Reported Obstructions

- A. A submerged pinnacle with a least depth of 13.89 meters (7.595 fathoms) was reported by NAVO at the following position: 21° 15' 41.12" N, 157° 45' 37.63" W. A visual review of the data in Fledermaus and 3DEditor confirmed the presence of the pinnacle and revealed a shallower least depth than was reported, 13.71 meters. The shallower depth of 13.7 is represented in the NAVO smooth sheet. It is recommended that the shallower sounding supersede the charted soundings. <sup>14</sup>
- B. NAVOCEANO reported 15 Fish Haven obstructions in the vicinity of the charted "Obstrn Fish Haven" with an approximate location of 21°14'50.31" N, 157°46'06.15" W. All of the obstructions were deeper than the minimum allowable depth of 6.75 fms listed on the chart. The positions and smooth sheet depths of the reported Fish Havens are listed in the table below. <sup>15</sup>


Obstruction	Latitude N	Longitude W	Depth (meters)	Depth (fms)
1	21 14' 58.34"	157 46' 10.09"	15.7	8.3
2	21 15' 02.94"	157 46' 08.24"	15.7	8.3
3	21 15' 02.00"	157 45' 55.28"	18.2	9.7
4	21 15' 03.94"	157 45' 55.84"	16	8.5
5	21 15' 08.81"	157 45' 51.32"	15.9	8.5
6	21 15' 07.29"	157 45' 54.47"	17.1	9.1
7	21 14' 53.23"	157 46' 04.82"	21.6	11.6
8	21 14' 56.90"	157 46' 07.47"	20.4	11
9	21 15' 07.35"	157 45' 40.57"	19.9	10.9
10	21 15' 00.51"	157 46' 07.88"	23	12.4
11	21 14' 59.36"	157 45' 50.15"	20.3	10.9
12	21 15' 08.93"	157 45' 43.26"	17.6	9.4
13	21 15' 08.20"	157 45' 33.68"	19.5	10.4
14	21 14' 58.94"	157 45' 58.31"	20	10.7
15	21 14' 54.31"	157 45' 51.38"	27.2	14.7

	<b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b>	Document #: <b>PHB-QA-03</b>	Rev.: <b>1</b>
Title: <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b>		Page #: 16 of 27	

- C. A channel surrounding Wailupe charted (19358) as dredged to 12-feet was reported as partially filled in by NAVOCEANO. A limiting depth of 3.75 meters in the N-S Channel through the reef was reported. Limiting depths surrounding Wailupe were reported as 5.5 meters at the SE corner, approximately 4.0 meters on the south and 3.0 to 4.0 meters on the west side. The depth of the channel is not reflected on the NAVO smooth sheets, but is apparent in the full resolution data set viewed in Fledermaus 3DEditor (Figures 7a, 7b).



**Figure 7a.** A DTM of soundings from Wailupe channel displayed from above in Fledermaus 3DEditor. The soundings were colored by depth and the white boxes represent soundings selected for smooth sheet plotting.



**Figure 7b.** The East to West and North to South topography of Wailupe channel as displayed in Fledermaus 3DEditor. Soundings are colored by depth.

	<b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b>				Document #:	Rev.:	
					<b>PHB-QA-03</b>	<b>1</b>	
Title:						Page #:	
<b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b>						17 of 27	

The following soundings selected from the center of the channel can be used to supplement the smooth sheet soundings (depths are in meters).

Record	Subrecord	File	Line	Easting	Northing	Lon	Lat	Depth ▾
18707	0	37	37	628824.6	2352892.3	-157°45.4951'	21°16.3930'	-3.96
64918	0	86	86	629406.1	2352920.2	-157°45.1587'	21°16.4056'	-4.14
19825	0	2	2	629458.4	2352806.3	-157°45.1290'	21°16.3437'	-4.28
31613	0	83	83	629062.6	2352915.2	-157°45.3574'	21°16.4044'	-5.75
22121	0	92	92	628936.5	2352891.7	-157°45.4304'	21°16.3922'	-6.06

It is recommended by the reviewer that the reported depth of the sounding remain as charted to 12 feet due to the uncertainty surrounding the object detection capabilities of LIDAR systems. <sup>16</sup>

### Charted Features

- D. It was not possible to verify a charted (19358) Pipes PA with an approximate position of 21°16'28.96" N, 157°45'20.5" W due to sparse data coverage in the area. It is recommended that the pipes be added to the AWOIS database for future investigation. <sup>17</sup>

### New Features

- E. A smooth sheet sounding of 6.5 fms located in the vicinity of 21°15'58.12" N, 157°44'25.1" W was examined in Fledermaus. The sounding appears to represent the new least depth of a charted shoal. It is recommended that the charted soundings be superseded. <sup>18</sup>
- F. A 7-fm smooth sheet sounding located in the vicinity of 21°15'28.2" N, 157°45'59.9" W was located between charted soundings of 8 and 9 fathoms. The sounding was examined in Fledermaus and it appears to be the least depth value of a new shoal. It is recommended that it supersede the charted soundings. <sup>19</sup>




Title:

**HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST**

Page #:

18 of 27



**Figure 8.** Image depicting data coverage and locations of noted features for survey W00110; Chart 19358 is displayed in the background.

	<b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b>	Document #: <b>PHB-QA-03</b>	Rev.: <b>1</b>
	<b>Title:</b> <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY          ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b>		Page #: 19 of 27

## SURVEY W00111

### Affected Charts

<u>Chart</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Edition</u>	<u>Date</u>
19358	1:20,000	20th	Apr 27, 2002
19369	1:20,000	5 <sup>th</sup>	July 8, 2000

### Reported Obstructions

No Obstructions were reported by NAVOCEANO for this survey.


### Charted Features

- A. A 5.3-fm sounding was found in the vicinity of a charted 5.25-fm sounding reported in 2000. The charted sounding is located at 21°15'02.44" N, 157°48'01.66" W. It is recommended by the reviewer that the charted sounding be retained and the comment "Rep (2000)" be removed from the chart. <sup>20</sup>
- B. A 1.7-fm sounding was found in the vicinity of a charted 1.75-fm sounding reported in 2000. The charted sounding is located at 21°15'16.92" N, 157°49'09.06" W. It is recommended by the reviewer that the charted sounding be retained and the comment "Rep (2000)" be removed from the chart. <sup>21</sup>

### New Features

- C. A smooth sheet sounding of 2.1 fms positioned at 21°15'48.45" N, 157°46'29.97" W was located in the vicinity of a charted 5.25-fm sounding. When reviewed in Fledermaus, the validity of the sounding remained uncertain due to the lack of connectivity to the surrounding soundings (Figure 9). The sounding could potentially be a flyer or it could be the least depth of an uncharted obstruction. Due to the uncertainty of the object detection capabilities of LIDAR systems and the lack of denser sounding coverage, it is recommended that the smooth sheet sounding supersede the charted sounding until it can be validated or disproved by future investigation. <sup>22</sup>

	<p align="center"><b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b></p>	<p>Document #: <b>PHB-QA-03</b></p>	<p>Rev.: <b>1</b></p>
<p>Title: <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b></p>		<p>Page #: 20 of 27</p>	



**Figure 9.** Image depicting position of 2.1 fm sounding in relation to the surrounding data. Soundings are displayed in Fledermaus 3DEditor and are colored by depth.

- D. A 7.5-fm sounding positioned at 21°15'10.7" N, 157°46'32.71" W was located in the vicinity of a charted 9-fm sounding. The sounding was reviewed in Fledermaus 3DEditor and appears to be the least depth of a submerged pinnacle with an approximate height of 2 meters. The reviewer recommends charting the obstruction at its least depth position. <sup>23</sup>
- E. A 9.3-fm sounding positioned at 21°15'0.99"N, 157°47'1.51" W was located in the vicinity of a charted 11-fm sounding. The sounding was reviewed in Fledermaus and appears to be a valid depth representing a natural shoaling trend. It is recommended that the smooth sheet sounding supersede the charted sounding. <sup>24</sup>

**Dangers to Navigation**

F/G/H. Three dangers to navigation (dtons) were found by the reviewer for survey W00111. One dton, a submerged obstruction with a least depth of 5.4 fathoms, was located between two 8-fathom charted (19358) soundings. The remaining dtons with depths of 6.9 and 6.6 fathoms are least depth soundings selected from the smooth sheet to identify shoaling trends not represented in the charted (19358) soundings. The 6.9-fm sounding is located between two charted 9-fm soundings and the 6.6-fm sounding is located between two charted soundings of 9.5 and 8.25 fathoms. The positions of the dtons are listed in the table below.



Feature	Depth(fm)	Latitude N	Longitude W
F	5.4 <sup>25</sup>	21°15'25.22"	157°46'28.65"
G	6.9 <sup>26</sup>	21°15'11.58"	157°46'55.92"
H	6.6 <sup>27</sup>	21°14'48.96"	157°47'29.99"




Figure 10. Image depicting data coverage and location of noted features for survey W00111; Chart 19358 is displayed in the background.

	<b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b>	Document #:	Rev.:
		<b>PHB-QA-03</b>	<b>1</b>
Title:			Page #:
<b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b>			22 of 27

## SURVEY W00112

### Affected Charts

<u>Chart</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Edition</u>	<u>Date</u>
19358	1:20,000	20th	Apr 27, 2002
19369	1:20,000	5th	July 8, 2000

### Reported Obstructions

- A. Three obstructions were reported by NAVOCEANO for this survey. The positions and smooth sheet depths are listed in the table below.

Obstruction	Latitude N	Longitude W	Depth (meters)	Depth (fms)
1	21°15'20.02"	157°50'02.72"	21.4	11.5 <sup>28</sup>
2	21°15'25.49"	157°50'06.16"	26	14
3	21°15'38.65"	157°50'13.45"	18.2	9.7

The first two obstructions were reported as geologic features, and after a visual inspection in Fledermaus 3DEditor, the reviewer concurs with NAVOCEANO's findings.

Obstruction 1 is an 11.5- fm sounding located in the vicinity of a charted (19369) 14-fathom sounding and should supersede the charted sounding.<sup>29</sup>


Obstruction 2 does not appear to be navigationally significant, as it is a 14-fm sounding in the vicinity of a charted (19369) 14-fm sounding. The charted sounding should be retained.<sup>30</sup>

Obstruction 3 appears to have been chosen to represent a submerged obstruction. However, the selected position and depth is not the least depth on this obstruction. The least depth sounding is represented by a 7.9-fm smooth sheet sounding located at 21°15'20.02" N, 157°50'02.72" W. It is recommended by the reviewer that the position and depth for the obstruction selected by NAVOCEANO be replaced by the true least depth of 7.9-fms. It is recommended that the 7.9-fm sounding be charted as an obstruction.<sup>31</sup>

	<b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b>	Document #: <b>PHB-QA-03</b>	Rev.: <b>1</b>
Title: <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b>		Page #: 23 of 27	

## Charted Features

- B. NAVOCEANO reported that a charted (19369) PA Wreck (rep 1982) with a depth of 5.75 fms was not seen in the data, however, suggests that remnants may still exist. The approximate position of the wreck is 21°16'44.0" N, 157°50'48.68" W. A visual inspection in Fledermaus 3DEditor could not confirm the presence of a wreck, as the area was characterized by multiple shoals at the mouth of the canal leading to Magic Island. It is recommended that the PA Wreck be retained as charted and added to the AWOIS database for future investigation. <sup>32</sup>
- C. A charted (19369) wreck with a depth of 0.75 fms located at 21°16'31.75" N, 157°50'28.01" W, was reported as not seen in data by NAVOCEANO, but suggest that remnants may still exist. It is recommended that the charted wreck be retained and added to the AWOIS database for future investigation. <sup>33</sup>
- D. A charted (19369) wreck located approximately at 21°16'28" N, 157°50'15" W was reported as not seen in the data by NAVOCEANO. They report the area as the top of the reef and remnants may still exist, but its existence is doubtful. It is recommended that the charted wreck be retained and added to the AWOIS database for future investigation. <sup>34</sup>
- E. A small lagoon south of Ala Wai Boat Harbor, adjoining a coral reef was charted (19369) as dredged to 5-feet. The depth of the lagoon is not reflected on the NAVOCEANO smooth sheets, but is apparent in the full resolution data set viewed in Fledermaus 3DEditor (Figure 11a, 11b). <sup>35</sup>



**Figure 11.** (a) A DTM of the soundings from the Ala Wai lagoon displayed from above in Fledermaus 3DEditor. Soundings are colored by depth with the white boxes representing soundings selected for the smooth sheet. (b) The topography of the lagoon displayed in Fledermaus 3DEditor, with soundings colored by depth.

The limiting depth at the entrance to the lagoon, through the coral, is 1.21 fms (7.25 ft), positioned at 21°16'38.97" N, 157°50'23.71" W. The following soundings selected from the center of the channel can be used to supplement the smooth sheet soundings (depths are in meters).


Record	△	Subrecord	File	Line	Easting	Northing	Lon	Lat	Depth
10870		0	19	19	620425.2	2353168.5	-157°50.3509'	21°16.5773'	-8.22
13436		0	26	26	620348.9	2353189.0	-157°50.3949'	21°16.5888'	-6.97
19128		0	24	24	620396.5	2353413.6	-157°50.3664'	21°16.7103'	-3.17
20363		0	91	91	620347.8	2353297.2	-157°50.3951'	21°16.6474'	-2.45
23410		0	79	79	620483.8	2353585.9	-157°50.3152'	21°16.8033'	-2.72
31593		0	14	14	620440.2	2353507.9	-157°50.3408'	21°16.7613'	-2.02

	<p align="center"><b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b></p>	<p>Document #: <b>PHB-QA-03</b></p>	<p>Rev.: <b>1</b></p>
<p>Title: <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b></p>		<p>Page #: 25 of 27</p>	

**Danger to Navigation**

- F. One danger to navigation was found during review of the survey. The dton is a submerged obstruction positioned at 21°15'37.9" N, 157°50'13.1" W with a least depth of 7.9 fathoms located between 10 and 20 fathom charted contours.

36



**Figure 12.** Image depicting data coverage and location of noted features for survey W00112; Chart 19369 is displayed in the background.

	<b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b>	Document #: <b>PHB-QA-03</b>	Rev.: <b>1</b>
	Title: <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b>		Page #: 26 of 27

**Revisions compiled during office processing by the cartographer**

- <sup>1</sup> Concur
- <sup>2</sup> Concur
- <sup>3</sup> Concur
- <sup>4</sup> See attached e-mail, dated May 3, 2006 for the discussion on the accuracy of the charted *reported 2000* soundings on charts 19358 and 19369.
- <sup>5</sup> Do not concur, remove charted sounding and *reported 2000*.
- <sup>6</sup> Do not concur, remove charted sounding and *reported 2000*.
- <sup>7</sup> Do not concur, chart according to the smooth sheet and remove the charted sounding and reported 2000.
- <sup>8</sup> Concur
- <sup>9</sup> Do not concur, due to the uncertainty of the object detection capabilities of LIDAR systems, a controlling depth for the channel could not be determined. Until a controlling depth can be determined, the charted note, *16 ft rep 1984*, should be removed and replaced with a note, *12 ft rep 2000*.
- <sup>10</sup> Concur, chart soundings according to the smooth sheet.
- <sup>11</sup> Concur, chart soundings according to the smooth sheet.
- <sup>12</sup> Concur, chart soundings according to the smooth sheet.
- <sup>13</sup> Do not concur; chart sounding, 2 fathoms 3 feet, according to the smooth sheet. Remove charted sounding and rep 2000.
- <sup>14</sup> Concur, chart according to the smooth sheet.
- <sup>15</sup> Revise fish haven note and it is recommended that the charted fish haven limits be expanded to include the fifteen obstructions listed in this report
- <sup>16</sup> Do not concur, a ten foot sounding was found within the charted boat harbor. The evaluator recommends revising the charted note *Reported dredged to 12 feet* with a *10 ft rep 2000* note unless MCD has additional information on the depths within this boat harbor.
- <sup>17</sup> Concur and retain the pipes PA at their charted location.
- <sup>18</sup> Concur, chart according to the smooth sheet.
- <sup>19</sup> Concur, chart according to the smooth sheet.
- <sup>20</sup> Do not concur, removed charted sounding and note and chart according to this survey.
- <sup>21</sup> Do not concur, removed charted sounding and note and chart according to this survey.
- <sup>22</sup> After further review, this sounding is located between a 1 fathom 2 foot sounding and a 3 fathom 4 foot sounding. Chart area according to this smooth sheet.
- <sup>23</sup> Concur with clarification, chart sounding not an obstruction according to the smooth sheet.
- <sup>24</sup> Concur
- <sup>25</sup> Chart a 5 fathom 5 foot obstruction
- <sup>26</sup> Chart a 7 fathom sounding
- <sup>27</sup> Chart a 6 fathom 5 foot sounding at survey position.
- <sup>28</sup> Chart 11 fathoms at survey position.
- <sup>29</sup> Concur
- <sup>30</sup> Do not concur, chart according to the smooth sheet.
- <sup>31</sup> Concur
- <sup>32</sup> Do not concur, this survey found a shoal depth of 5 fathoms in the approximate position of the charted wreck. Because the location of the wreck could not be determined in the data, it is recommended that the charted wreck be removed and a 5 fathom wreck PA be charted at the location of the shoal depth.
- <sup>33</sup> Concur; chart a five foot wreck at charted position.
- <sup>34</sup> Concur
- <sup>35</sup> Do not concur, due to the uncertainty of the object detection capabilities of LIDAR systems, a controlling depth for the channel and least depth for the boat harbor could not be determined. Until a controlling depth

	<b>Pacific Hydrographic Branch</b>	<b>Document #:</b> <b>PHB-QA-03</b>	<b>Rev.:</b> <b>1</b>
<b>Title:</b> <b>HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY OUTSIDE SOURCE DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST</b>		<b>Page #:</b> 27 of 27	

---

and least depth can be determined, the charted note, *5 ft rep*, should be removed and replaced with a note, *2 ft rep 2000*.

<sup>36</sup> Chart as 8 fathoms obstruction.

# W00111 Danger to Navigation Report

## Pacific Hydrographic Branch Danger to Navigation Report

Hydrographic Survey Registry Number: W00111

Survey Title: State: Hawaii  
Locality: Southeast Oahu Island  
Sub-locality: Maunalua Bay

Survey Dates: LIDAR – August 1 – December 20, 2000

LIDAR depths are reduced to Mean Lower Low Water using verified tides. Positions are based on the WGS84 horizontal datum.

### CHARTS AFFECTED:

Chart	Scale	Edition	Date
19358	1:20,000	20 <sup>th</sup>	Apr, 2002
19357	1:80,000	22 <sup>nd</sup>	Aug, 2002
19340	1:250,000	26 <sup>th</sup>	Dec, 2000
19010	1:675,000	18 <sup>th</sup>	Mar, 2004

### DANGERS:

Feature	Depth (fm)	Latitude N (D/M/S)	Longitude W (D/M/S)
Obstruction	5 1/4	21/15/25.22	157/46/28.65
Least Depth Sounding	6 3/4	21/15/11.58	157/46/55.92
Least Depth Sounding	6 1/2	21/14/48.96	157/47/29.99


### COMMENTS:

Three dangers to navigation (DTON) were found during review of survey W00111 submitted by the U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office.

One dton, a submerged obstruction with a least depth of 5 1/4 fathoms, was located between two 8-fathom charted (19358) soundings. The remaining dtons at 6 3/4 and 6 1/2 fathoms are least depth soundings selected from the smooth sheet to identify shoaling trends not represented in the charted (19358) soundings.

Questions concerning this report should be directed to the Chief, Pacific Hydrographic Branch at (206) 526-6835.

# W00111 Danger to Navigation Report



# W00112 Danger to Navigation Report

## Pacific Hydrographic Branch Danger to Navigation Report

Hydrographic Survey Registry Number: W00112

Survey Title: State: Hawaii

Locality: Southeast Oahu Island

Sub-locality: Approaches to Honolulu and Pearl Harbor

Survey Dates: LIDAR – August 1 – December 20, 2000

LIDAR depths are reduced to Mean Lower Low Water using verified tides.

Positions are based on the WGS84 horizontal datum.

### CHARTS AFFECTED:

<u>Chart</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Edition</u>	<u>Date</u>
19369	1:20,000	5 <sup>th</sup>	July, 2000

### DANGERS:

<u>Feature</u>	<u>Depth (fm)</u>	<u>Latitude N (D/M/S)</u>	<u>Longitude W (D/M/S)</u>
Obstruction	7.9	21/15/37.9	157/50/13.1

### COMMENTS:

The danger to navigation (DTON) is a submerged obstruction with a least depth of 7.9 fathoms located between 10 and 20 fathom charted contours (Figure 1). It was found during review of survey W00112 submitted by the U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office. The least depth sounding taken from the smooth sheet was acquired with the SHOALS LIDAR system.

Questions concerning this report should be directed to the Chief, Pacific Hydrographic Branch at (206) 526-6835.

# W00112 Danger to Navigation Report




Figure 1. A chartlet depicting the position of the danger to navigation reported for Survey W00112 with NOAA Chart 19369 as the background.

**Subject:** Re: [Fwd: Re: Navy surveys]

**From:** "Jenny.Thacker" <Jenny.Thacker@noaa.gov>

**Date:** Wed, 03 May 2006 11:35:32 -0400

**To:** David Merke <David.Merke@noaa.gov>

**CC:** russ davies <Russ.Davies@noaa.gov>, David Poltilove <David.Poltilove@noaa.gov>

Thanks Dave. Russ, please feel free to supersede any of the Rep 2000 values in your W-drg, since it looks like the locations for them were not good. We did not have the programs that we have now back when we did this, and in those days georeferencing was brand new.

David Merke wrote:

Hi Russ,

Jenny Thacker asked me to check the positioning for the navy survey on our end. I positioned it using 2 different processes and got the same results. It looks like it wasn't in the correct position when the reported values were added. I'm attaching two images which supports this conclusion.

Thanks,

Dave Merke

"Jenny.Thacker" wrote:

I just pulled up the survey that we have listed as Bp176232 and it looks identical to the one you attached here. The Navy number for it is 60900. The title blocks look the same. I don't know how we registered the data back then, so I don't know if we did it right. This was a lot of years ago. Sounds like one of us must have done something wrong though. Im going to play around with it and see if I can register the files with the software we have now and see if I get better results than you did. Could be we messed it up back then, but if we had it right, then we've got to figure out how to get it right for you. Shame these guys didn't believe in showing shoreline - that would have been useful.

Question: Why are you working on this now? It seems like we applied it, then took it off the charts, then re-applied it with only the critical stuff because the other stuff wasn't considered good enough. We have 100's of surveys that we know are good just sitting around getting old. Why re-open this stuff?

russ davies wrote:

Jenny.Thacker wrote:

Hi Russ,

Can you tell from the dates of the survey if these surveys whether or not you're working with the same dataset? I sort of hope it's not the same one. We went back and forth on that stuff so many times and so much energy was wasted putting stuff on and taking it off again - I think it shouldn't be used. I can't tell from these screen shots whether you've got what you have registered correctly or not, but it certainly looks like a different dataset.

Jenny

----- Original Message -----

**Subject:** Re: Navy surveys

**Date:** Tue, 02 May 2006 06:44:42 -0400

**From:** David Merke <David.Merke@noaa.gov>

To: Jenny.Thacker <Jenny.Thacker@noaa.gov>

References: <44528D4F.1030905@noaa.gov><4456636F.5040507@noaa.gov>

Jenny,

I took a quick look in the old histories and found the survey numbers and dates for that application:

Bp176232-39 1/1/00 US Navy Lidar survey

The only other source is L-377-2006 which adds 4 dangers to navigation.

Dave

"Jenny.Thacker" wrote:

Hi Russ,

While I remember applying the Rep 2000's, which were Navy LIDAR data, I honestly don't recall which datasets we used. They sure look different. The way I remember it, Dave Merke applied the data in full, but then QA decided it wasn't accurate enough to apply in full, and we took off the data he'd applied and put only the critical stuff on - and then only with the words Rep (2000). I can try to look into it a little more tomorrow. Maybe I can think of something. I'll check with Dave too.

Jenny

russ davies wrote:

Jenny,

Hope you had a great weekend.

I'm compiling a number of Navy surveys on chart 19358. I received the chart history from MCD and notice you applied all of the r/ep 2000/ soundings in 2002. When I reference the surveys onto chart 19358 there is either a shift with whats on the chart, /rep 2000/, or the data set is different. I was wondering if I am working with the same data set or did I scale the navy surveys incorrectly. Do you recall what data set you used. Are we working with the same navy surveys. Attached are a number of snapshots. Any suggestions?

Russ :-)


---

Jenny

Attached is one of the surveys that I am using. Is there anyway you can tell if its the dame data. I think the registration is OK, everything seems to fit together.

Russ

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----





FILE: HAWAII LIDAR ROS.DOC  
UPDATED: 14 Sept 2004  
BY: Scott Ebrite SNR

**NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHIC OFFICE**  
Stennis Space Center, Mississippi

**REPORT OF SURVEY**

**LIDAR**

**HAWAII**

Vessel: SHOALS AIRCRAFT

Detachment: SHOALS PROJECT

Country: U. S.

Dates of Survey: 01 AUGUST - 20 DECEMBER 2000

Archive Number: 00US16

Areas: Hawaiian Islands

Oahu

Makua Training Area, Pokai Bay, leeward coast; Kaena Pt. to Barbers Pt.  
Kaneohe Bay  
MCBH Kaneohe  
Bellows AFS - Waimanalo Bay and Bellows Beach  
Kahuku  
Pearl Harbor/Approach  
Waialua Bay

Kauai

PMRF - Barking Sands, Majors Bay, Waimea Bay  
Port Allen

Molokai

Kaunakakai area and south coast, other areas

Hawaii

Kawaihae Harbor and approach, other areas

Maui

Lanai

UNCLASSIFIED

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION IS UNLIMITED.

## REPORT OF SURVEY CONTENTS

	Page
1.0 Introduction	5
1.1 Purpose of Survey	5
1.2 General Survey Specifications	7
1.3 Tasking	7
1.4 IHO Standards and Coverage	7
1.5 Survey Area and Survey Sheet Details	9
1.6 Weather	10
1.7 Hydrographic Survey Specifications	10
1.8 Extraneous Activities Affecting the Survey	10
2.0 Geodetic Control	11
2.1 Datums	11
2.2 Sounding datum	11
2.3 Time	11
2.4 Existing and new control used	11
2.5 Datum shifts	11
2.6 Horizontal Control Reports	11
2.7 Station Descriptions/Recovery forms	11
3.0 Digital Surveying System	12
3.1 SHOALS GPS Positioning System	12
USCG DGPS Coverage for Hawaii	12
3.2 SHOALS LIDAR Data Acquisition System	13
3.2.2 Acquisition, Control and Display Sub-system	13
3.3 SHOALS System Calibration	14
3.4 SHOALS Positioning Quality Control	15
3.5 SHOALS LIDAR Data Processing System	15
3.5.6 Data Review and Inspection	18
4.0 Calibrations	19
4.1 Positioning Systems	19
4.2 SHOALS System Calibration	19
4.3 Survey System Offsets/Alignment	20
4.4 Deep Offset Bias Correction	20
5.0 Side Scan Sonar	21

6.0	Tides and Water Levels	22
6.1	General Requirements	22
6.2	Tidal Data Collection, Scope of Work	22
6.3	Tide Gauges	22
6.4	Preliminary Tidal Zoning	22
6.5	Tide Zone Accuracy	22
6.6	Final Tidal Zoning	23
6.7	Application of Tides	23
6.8	Currents and Tidal Streams	23
6.8.1	Large Scale Currents	23
6.8.2	Regional Currents	26
6.8.3	Tidal Currents and other Oscillations	27
7.0	Data Collection and Field Work	31
7.1	Units	31
7.2	Corrections to Soundings	31
7.3	Hydrography	31
7.4	Sounding Development and Coverage	31
7.5	Sounding Selection	31
7.6	Seabed Topography and Texture	31
7.7	Near Shore Seabed Topography	31
7.8	Data Quality Control	36
7.8.1	Processing Methodology	36
7.8.2	Cross Check/Swath Overlap Agreement	36
7.9	Agreement With Existing Charts	37
7.10	Agreement with Prior Surveys	37
7.11	Navigational Aids	37
7.12	Shoreline	37
8.0	Accuracy and Resolution of Soundings	37
8.1	LIDAR Positional Accuracy	37
8.2	Accuracy of Soundings - Assessment and Evaluation	38
8.3	SHOALS LIDAR Sounding Error Budget	40
9.0	N/A	
10.0	Navigational Aids	42

11.0 Sailing Directions	42
11.1 General	42
11.2 Coastal Pollution	42
11.3 Anchorage and Moorings	42
11.4 Photography	42
12.0 Charted and Uncharted Wrecks and Obstructions	42
12.1 Charted Wrecks and Obstructions	42
12.2 Uncharted Wrecks and Obstructions	
13.0 Environmental Observations	44
13.1 Water clarity Observations	44
13.2 Meteorological Observations	44
13.3 Biological Observations	44

Appendix A	Survey areas.
Appendix A-1	Sheet Coverage and Contours
Appendix B-1	NOAA Tide Station Descriptions
Appendix B-2	Tide Zones
Appendix C	Chart - Data comparison
Appendix D	Targets and Obstructions
Appendix E	Current Information
Appendix F	Optical Data

## 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose of Survey

The Hydrographic Survey Specification for the aforementioned areas was generated at the request of the primary Functional Customer (CINCPACFLT) in response to a DoD/US Navy initiative. This initiative is to support present and future increased naval activity and usage in WESTPAC as follows.

- 1.1.1 Seal Delivery Team One (SDVT-1) has requested SHOALS surveys of several training areas within Hawaii and the WESTPAC areas of Guam, Saipan, Tinian and Farallon de Medinilla (FDM). The requirement is not simply to update existing nautical charts, but to create unique high-density digital bathymetric datasets that can be used by SDVT-1 to improve the safety of their SDV training operations. SDVT-1 uses commercial GIS packages (ESRI ArcView with Spatial Analyst) to produce tailored products for their operations, including 3D perspectives of their target and training areas. Additionally, SDVT-1 has, or will be, requesting STOIC's (Special Tactical Operational Information Charts) for their training areas.
- 1.1.2 Pearl Harbor and Approaches. Pearl Harbor and its approaches are a safe haven for major surface and sub-surface Fleet units. The survey is required for updating charts 19AHA19366, 19AHA19362, 19AHA19369 and 19AHA19364. CINCPACFLT recently removed Limited Distribution restrictions on hydrographic data in Pearl Harbor and the approach. This effectively transfers the responsibility of charts for Pearl Harbor from NIMA to NOAA NOS. CINCPACFLT also intends to cancel chart 19AHA19369 following NOS publication of new editions of 19AHA19362 and 19AHA19369 with necessary approach data for Pearl Harbor. CINCPACFLT would like to create a complete baseline dataset of unclassified hydrographic and topographic data for use by NOAA NOS in updating Pearl Harbor charts. These data will provide a complete bathymetric model of Pearl Harbor that will be suitable for a variety of uses, including SDVT-1 training, geospatial product prototyping, high- resolution DNC, environmental impact modeling, and harbor defenses. USACOE has recently completed a standard survey of Pearl Harbor in support of normal dredging operations and these data have been forwarded to NIMA and NOAA NOS.
- 1.1.3 Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Kauai. PMRF desires detailed bathymetric data inshore of the Silas Bent survey of 1995. Their test and evaluation clientele are increasingly interested in very shallow water operations. Barking Sands, the PMRF beach north of the airfield, is also used for various amphibious training operations, including major exercises (RIMPAC). Majors Bay, south of the airfield, is a major amphibious and SOF training area. SDVT-1 also requires data in Waimea Bay, between PMRF and Port Allen, and Port Allen to support training operations. Data will be used

for updating NOAA NOS charts 19ACO19381, 19BHA19382 and 19XHA19386 and NIMA charts COMBT808528 and COMBT801253.

- 1.1.4 Bellows Air Force Station - Waimanalo Bay Bellows Beach is one of the three primary beaches in the Hawaiian Islands used for amphibious exercises including RIMPAC. Lack of high-density data for the approach to the beach presents problems for both safety and environmental protection. High-density data will improve the margin of safety in using this beach for future exercises. Data will be used to update NIMA chart COMBT800744 and NOAA NOS chart 19AHA19358. Data will also be used for future STOIC production.
- 1.1.5 Makua Training Area including Pokai Bay and leeward coast from Kaena Pt. to Barbers Pt.  
Makua Military Reservation is a live fire facility. Data are required to support SDVT-1 and ASDS and amphibious landing exercises at Makua Beach. Data will be used to update NIMA chart COMBT805647 and NOAA NOS chart 19ACO19357.
- 1.1.6 Kahuku  
Data are required to support SDVT-1 training operations. Data will be used to update NOAA NOS chart 19ACO19357.
- 1.1.7 Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii  
This area on the leeward coast of the Big Island is used for SDVT-1 training. Kawaihae Harbor is the Sea Port of Debarkation (SPOD) for USMC units deploying to Hawaii for training at the US Army training facility on Hawaii.
- 1.1.8 Kaunakakai, Molokai  
The area is to be used for SDVT-1 training operations. Data will be used to update NOAA NOS chart 19XHA19353.
- 1.1.9 Honolulu/SE Oahu  
This area is to be used for SDVT-1 training operations. Data will be used to update NIMA chart COMBT800744 and NOAA NOS chart 19AHA19364.
- 1.1.10 Kaneohe Bay, MCBH Kaneohe  
This area is to be used for SDVT-1 training operations. Data will be used to update NIMA chart COMBT800744 and NOAA NOS chart 19BHA19359.
- 1.1.11 The Hawaiian Islands datasets consist of LIDAR data collected in support of the above requirements, and data collected in support of USACOE and USGS requirements. The delineating factor separating these data and requirements are:

## 1.2 General Survey Specifications:

All Navy LIDAR operations are planned and executed to meet IHO Order 1 as a matter of policy. No specific survey specifications exist for areas originally outside the Navy areas. However, some of these areas were developed to meet IHO Order 1, as discussed in section 1.4.

## 1.3 Tasking

1.3.1 The scope of the LIDAR survey was depth measurement only from the shoreline out to the laser extinction depth, with shoreline delineation, limited beach topography and hazard detection within the capabilities of the system. LIDAR did not perform, nor was one intended, a comprehensive hydrographic survey and no comprehensive survey was done in areas worked solely by LIDAR. The survey specification required an IHO order 1 survey with 100% target/obstruction detection in all Navy areas of interest. USCOE and USGS requirements were not to charting specification, but were to support coastal modeling requirements.

## 1.4 IHO Standards and Coverage

1.4.1 All Navy areas meet IHO Order 1 specifications for positional and depth measurement accuracy. Theoretically, all Navy areas meet IHO Order 1 target/object detection requirements at the 95% confidence level for depths from 7m to 20m with single flight coverage. At depths deeper than 20m signal-to-noise ratio limitations greatly reduce target detection capability, particularly for small objects (Figure 1). Multiple flight coverage will theoretically improve the confidence of target detection capability in the depth range of 2m to 7m, and possibly down to 20m.


Subsequent testing of the follow-on CHARTS system, utilizing the same operating principles and algorithms and a lower power laser, at 4x4 spot spacing, targets of 2 meters were detected 100% of the time in depths 5 – 30 meters. Based on these actual tests the LIDAR system meets IHO order 1 target detection requirements. Multiple coverage provides a degree of redundancy for this capability.

1.4.2 The Navy areas were surveyed at 4x4-meter spot density and with greater than 200% coverage to ensure a very high confidence of target detection. USGS areas were also flown at 4x4-meter spot density and 100% coverage. USACE areas were flown at 8x8-meter spot density and 100% coverage. USACE and USGS areas were not typically surveyed to meet charting standards, and therefore do not require IHO accuracy and may not meet Order 1 standards for target/object detection. These areas were surveyed to support coastal modeling, storm surge, coral reef and environmental studies. There are, however, exceptions to this procedure, described below.

1.4.3 Where the USACE and USGS areas were small and adjacent to and interleaved with Navy areas, the USGS and USACE areas were typically flown as part of the Navy area for operational efficiency. In such cases, these USGS and USACOE areas will have multiple coverage and also will meet Navy requirements. Regardless of spot density and coverage, all areas meet IHO Order 1 positional and depth accuracy. These specific areas are described in the graphics of Appendix A.

1.4.4 Theoretically, based on target detection probability curves produced by NOAA, Guenther, et al, all Navy areas meet IHO Order 1 target/object detection requirements at the 95% confidence level for depths from 7m to 20m with single-flight coverage. At depths deeper than 20m, signal-to-noise ratio limitations greatly reduce target detection capability, particularly for small objects less than 2 meters (Figure 1). Multiple-flight coverage will theoretically improve the confidence of target detection capability in the depth range of 2m to 7m, and possibly down to 20m.

1.4.5 Subsequent testing of the follow-on CHARTS system, utilizing the same operating principles and algorithms and a lower power laser at 4x4 spot spacing, targets of 2 meters were detected 100% of the time in depths of 5 to 30 meters. Based on these actual tests the LIDAR system meets IHO Order 1 target detection requirements. Multiple coverage provides a degree of redundancy for this capability.



Theoretical detection confidence vs. depth for a 2m target at different laser spot densities.

Figure 1. Target detection confidence

## 1.5 Survey Sheet and Survey Area Details.

### 1.5.1 Oahu

IHO Order 1 sheets consist of sheets 01 - 03, 06 - 28, and sheet 30. Portions of USACOE area sheets 29, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 35 will meet Order 1 due to multiple coverage. Sheets 04 and 05 do not meet Order 1 due to lack of multiple coverage.

### 1.5.2 Kauai

All west coast sheets, 01 - 13, from Port Allen north to Barking Sands and the Na Pali coast meet IHO Order 1 requirements. Sheet 14 at Nawiliwili meets Order requirements due to lack of hazard/object detection.

### 1.5.3 Molokai

Sheets 01 - 10 along the south coast meet IHO Order 1 requirements. Sheets 11 - 18 meet Order 2 requirements due to lack of hazard/object detection.

### 1.5.4 Maui

All Maui sheets meet IHO Order 2 requirements. Maui sheets do not meet Order 1 requirements. NO TIDE CORRECTIONS APPLIED. Lack of double coverage to ensure target detection.

### 1.5.5 Lanai

All Lanai sheets meet IHO Order 2 requirements. Lanai sheets do not meet Order 1 requirements. NO TIDE CORRECTIONS APPLIED. Lack of double coverage to ensure target detection.

### 1.5.6 Hawaii (Big Island)

Kawaihae Harbor meets IHO Order 1 requirements. All other Hawaii areas meet Order 2 requirements due to lack of hazard/object detection. NO TIDE CORRECTIONS APPLIED other than Kawaihae Harbor and Bay.

### 1.5.7 Coverage. LIDAR coverage is 100% or better from above the shoreline to approximately 35m depth in all areas. Exceptions are:

### 1.5.8 Oahu - Pearl Harbor, west and north to Kaena Pt. coverage is to 50m depth. Oahu - Kaneohe Bay, coverage limited to 11m - 13m in the channel and inner bay due to water clarity issues. Turbidity and to some extent chlorophyll increases at 8m - 10m depth with a rapid falloff of transmissivity in the 532 nm optical band. See Appendix F for Kaneohe optics data demonstrating optical properties in the bay.

Oahu - Barbers Pt. harbor, coverage very limited due to water clarity.  
Oahu - Pearl Harbor, no coverage due to water clarity.  
Kauai - Port Allen, harbor coverage very limited due to water clarity.

## 1.6 Hydrographic Survey Specifications:

Hydrographic Survey Specifications for Hawaii, Archive No. 00US16

## 1.7 Weather.

The survey was conducted from late summer into winter. The only weather that affected operations were the winds, occasional rain showers and seas on the windward coasts. The Hawaiian Islands fall within the North east trade winds. The winds were a continuous 15 - 25 kts. Winds flowing over the mountain ranges and funneling down through the valleys made for difficult flying in many areas, with line keeping and altitude holding nearly impossible. Many holidays resulted that required numerous re-fly's. Surf on Oahu's north and east coasts, and the Big Islands windward north and east coasts made getting complete coverage in one or two flights difficult, if not impossible.

## 1.8 Extraneous Activities Affecting the Survey

1.8.1 Honolulu International Airport operations. This is reported to be the 15th busiest airport in the US. Initial discussions with the FAA indicated no flights would be possible within five miles of the airport, the area within the Terminal Control Area (TCA). After NAVO suggestions to the FAA to fly the survey flights during off-peak hours, we worked the survey flights into the midnight to 0500L time slot. Even at this time of day there were an average of 60 arrival/departures that required the SHOALS aircraft to vacate the area for short, though numerous, periods of time. Additionally, transitioning the flight crew from daytime to nighttime operations required a 24-hour rest period prior to and after night ops. As holidays became apparent in processing, usually after swapping back to daytime operations, we had to break flight operations for 24 hours to switch to night ops. This affected productivity and efficiency. Toward the end of the survey as time became a serious constraint, it became apparent there would be areas that did not get the required double flight coverage. This is because we couldn't continue to suffer the loss of 24 hours of survey time to swap the flight crews from days back to nights, and still meet other survey requirements within the allotted time frame. This was deemed not a serious issue in the area affected due to the relatively uniform bottom and no "surprises". The only area affected was within five miles of the VOR tower at Honolulu airport. This is an area of mixed Navy, USACoE and USGS requirements where Navy coverage requirements are not always met.

1.8.2 Political concerns. Prior to survey operations we were informed of numerous possible political concerns and sensitivities of the island residents. These were primarily noise abatement, environmental and governmental intrusion issues. We were informed by the FAA that residents are particularly sensitive to noise with respect to aircraft over-flight, and to expect many complaints concerning our low flying aircraft. During the course of five months of surveying only one noise complaint was received. Local officials informed us of native Hawaiian sensitivities and suspicions with regard to anything government or militarily related, mostly in reference to politically charged land use issues. No problems were encountered.

1.5.1 Surfers and Boogie boarders. Due to the popularity of Hawaii's beaches and surf, some lines had to be rescheduled to avoid "lighting up" the beach goers and wave riders.

## 2.0 Geodetic Control

2.1	<b>Horizontal Datum:</b>	WGS-84
	<b>Projection:</b>	Transverse Mercator
	<b>Spheroid:</b>	World Geodetic System of 1984
	<b>Grid:</b>	Universal Transverse Mercator
	<b>Vertical Datum:</b>	MLLW for LIDAR derived topography
	<b>Sounding Datum:</b>	MLLW

A vertical datum of MLLW for LIDAR-derived topography is contrary to the standard MSL datum for vertical elevations. All LIDAR data is referenced to the sea surface, thus LIDAR topography is referenced to the sea surface which is referenced to MLLW. The only exception to this is with kinematic GPS surveys utilizing On-The-Fly (OTF) processing techniques where the data are referenced to the ellipsoid. The Hawaii survey DID NOT USE OTF techniques.

**Sounding Datum:** Mean Lower Low Water. The NOAA-maintained automatic tide gauge, located at Honolulu Harbor, Oahu, Mokuoloe, Oahu (northern Kaneohe Bay), Nawilili, Kauai and Kawaihae, Hawaii were all referenced to MLLW.

2.4 **Time.** The time standard is UTC (GMT).

2.5 **Existing and New Control.** None used or established.


2.6 **Datum Shifts.** No datum shifts were applied.

2.7 **Horizontal Control Reports.** No horizontal control reports were generated.

2.8 **Station Descriptions/Recovery Forms.** No station descriptions/recovery forms were completed or issued.

### 3.0 Digital Survey System

3.1 **SHOALS GPS Positioning Systems.** ASHTECH Z-12 L1/L2 GPS receivers were used during the survey to provide navigational control in the survey platform in the DGPS. USCG DGPS stations located at Kokole Point Kauai, Upolu Point Hawaii (Big Island) and Pahoa Hawaii (Big Island) were utilized continuously to provide DGPS corrections to the aircraft Ashtech Z-12 receiver.



USCG DGPS beacon coverage for Hawaii.

Kokole Point was used for Kauai, and Oahu. Upolu Point was used for Molokai, Maui, Lanai and all but the south shore of Hawaii. Pahoa was used for the south shore of Hawaii.

**3.2 SHOALS Lidar data acquisition system.** The SHOALS (Scanning Hydrographic Operational Airborne Lidar Survey) system consists of an airborne laser transmitter/receiver capable of measuring 400 soundings per second. Lidar is an acronym for Light Detection And Ranging. The system operates from a deHavilland DHC-6 Twin Otter flying at altitudes between 300 and 400 meters with a ground speed of about 104 knots. The SHOALS system also includes a ground-based data processing system for calculating accurate horizontal position and water depth. The system operates by emitting a pulse of light that travels from an airborne platform to the water surface where a small portion of the laser energy is reflected back to the airborne receiver. The remaining energy at the water's surface propagates through the water column and reflects off the sea bottom and back to the airborne detector. The time difference between the surface return and the bottom return corresponds to water depth. The maximum depth the system is able to sense is related to the complex interaction of radiance of bottom material, incident sun angle and intensity, and the type and quantity of organic material or sediments in the water column. As a rule-of-thumb, the SHOALS system is capable of sensing bottom to depths equal to two or three times the Secchi depth.

3.2.1 The airborne system conducts all the data collection and is divided into three subsystems:

- 1) Acquisition, control and display,
- 2) Transceiver, and
- 3) Positioning and auxiliary sensors.

3.2.2 **Acquisition, Control and Display Sub-System (ACDS).** The ACDS is the primary component through which all data are collected and recorded, system integrity and self-checks conducted, and operator monitoring of key real-time system and survey information. All airborne data are recorded on Exabyte 8-mm dual tape drives at a rate of approximately 300 Kbytes per second. These tape drives were selected over other possible data storage media because of their proven performance and reliability in aircraft. The data tape is the only link between the airborne data collection system and the data processing system. It also provides the ability to load survey flight information for each survey mission into the airborne system prior to each flight.

3.2.3 The survey operator's interface with the system is through the ACDS. Real-time information is provided so that the operator can accomplish two tasks, first as the surveyor to ensure that the planned mission is successfully implemented and completed and second, as the Lidar system operator to monitor system status during the mission to ensure that the system operates within expected parameters. The main indicator of survey status and progress is from real-time depths provided to the operator at 100 Hz. These real-time depths are not corrected for tides or water surface waves, but they do provide an estimate of project depths to within approximately +/- 1 m.

3.2.4 The ACDS also provides survey navigation information to the pilot such as the required altitude, speed, and position along a selected survey line, necessary to conduct the planned mission and produce the desired sounding density. The operator selects the flight line and the ACDS converts

its position and other flight parameters to navigation information and presents this to the pilot on a small video monitor mounted in the cockpit.

3.2.5 The Transceiver is mounted over a window in the belly of the aircraft. The main component is the laser, which operates at 400 Hz. There are four receiver channels, two for detecting the water surface and two for detecting the sea bottom. The two water surface channels include the IR return from which the surface location is determined. The second channel is to ensure a water surface return by detecting the Raman scattering. The two bottom channels are used to detect returns from shallow and deep depths.

3.2.6 Included is a gyro-stabilized scanner, which directs each laser pulse to a predetermined location on the sea surface. An inertial reference system provides aircraft attitude information allowing the scanner to compensate for aircraft motion and measures accelerations necessary for accurately resolving the sea surface location during post-flight data processing. The width of the scan is nominally equal to half the altitude of the aircraft. At a speed of 120 knots and an altitude of 200 m, this yields a uniform sounding spacing of 4 m x 4 m. the sounding density can be altered by flying higher/lower and faster/slower and also by selecting a different scan width.  
Aircraft Positioning And Auxiliary Sensors Sub-System (APASS).

3.2.7 The APASS consist of DGPS and a video camera. DGPS is used for horizontal positioning of the aircraft and the differential correction is available through Fugro's Omnistar system. The other function of the APASS is to record a video image of the area being scanned by the laser. This provides a visual and audio record of each survey mission and a record for the data processor/hydrographer conducting the data processing to check or evaluate any anomalies that may be encountered during data processing, such as algae on the water surface or over-flight of an island.

### 3.3 SHOALS System Calibration

3.3.1 To ensure accuracy of the system, SHOALS requires both a hard target test and a calibration flight for calibration of the system. The hard target test is accomplished through firing the laser against a known baseline distance. The test is performed for each receiver of the surface and bottom channels. Any observed error is nulled out through adjustment of appropriate parameters.

3.3.2 The SHOALS system undergoes an in-flight calibration for the determination of the small offsets of the scanner mirror frame relative to the optical axes of the system, in the roll, pitch and heading directions as defined by the Inertial Navigation System. Critical to this calibration is locating and flying a calm, flat area in the field. To calculate the angular offsets an average of the water surface is derived by the system, then a special calibration program developed by the National Ocean Service derives these small angular offsets assuming that the sea surface is flat. The offsets are folded back into the collected standard data and the successful plotting of a flat-water surface shows that the angles were correctly derived.

3.3.3 In the first six years of SHOALS operation, a standard survey line was used to derive these small angular offsets. In early 2000 it was thought that a wider excursion of the scanner forward angles would result in better calibration values and a raster scanner pattern became the standard operational procedure. Either procedure raster or standard pattern is acceptable as long as the resulting angular corrections produce a flat-water surface. (Carswell; Optech, Inc. 2002)

3.4 **SHOALS Positioning Quality Control.** The operator continuously monitors position quality in the air. Flight lines are re-flown if any of the following specifications are exceeded:

PDOP exceeds 4. The PDOP is recorded as a field within the data.

The semi-major axis of the positional error ellipse exceeds 3.5m at the 95% confidence level.

The DGPS correction age exceeds 10 seconds.

The minimum number of satellites being tracked for continued sounding is less than 4 healthy SV's.

The minimum elevation for SV is less than 10° angle from the horizontal.

3.5 **SHOALS Lidar data processing system.** Hydrographic Data Processing utilized the SHOALS data processing suite; data tapes from the aircraft are read in and the depth derived from the processed laser pulse. The algorithms utilized in the SHOALS processing suite were developed at NOAA by Gary Guenther, et al. Time tagged position and depth, the \*.out file and laser waveform files were then transferred to the NAVOCEANO system. Data quality control, additional editing and validation were carried out using the NAVOCEANO Area Based Editor running under LINUX. Upon return to NAVOCEANO, the data underwent further analysis and refinement using 3D visualization tools (Fledermaus) and application of NOAA verified tides.

3.5.1 **Ground Processing Environment** All processing, cleaning and product generation is carried out on off-the-shelf NT workstations using software developed by Optech, Inc. specifically for SHOALS.

3.5.2 **Processing Of Data, General Principles.** All survey data collected are field processed, verified and validated concurrent with survey operations. Verification methods include comparison of collected data to existing charts and prior surveys. Discrepancies discovered in field processing are resolved immediately. Discrepancies requiring significant additional operational time and effort to resolve are brought to the attention of the Operations Manager, for decision.

3.5.3 **Post Processing Lidar Data.** SHOALS Lidar data is processed by an NT-based automated processing software package that includes automated post-flight depth extraction

procedures, various calculation and utility programs, and a manual processor operator interface that provides access to individual waveforms for display and editing. The suite maximizes throughput by recognizing and handling most problems routinely, minimizing the amount of human interaction with the raw data.

3.5.4 After the data is extracted from the flight tape and input into the database, it is processed by an automated routine consisting of a lidar waveform processor and sounding position determination algorithm. The main function of the automated processor is to obtain inputs from the raw data; calculate depths, positions, and other products; correct for tides and waves; and write the outputs back to file database. It runs at a 1:0.1 time ratio with data collection and data processing.

3.5.5 All data is then manually edited for obvious anomalies. Where such anomalies are clearly due to fish, or similar causes, they will be flagged as invalid returns; any other anomalies resembling bottom hazards will require investigation of the waveform in order to determine whether the feature is real and should be retained in the data set. In cases of doubt, such features will be marked for further investigation through re-flight of the area in question. The processed data is then output as an ASCII (\*.xyz) file which can either be input directly into Hypack, or converted to Fugro Binary Format (\*.fbf) for input into Starfix.Proc for review, QC and ultimately subsequent mapping and product generation. This process is outlined in Figure 6.




Figure 6: Data Processing Flow

**3.5.6 Data Review and Inspection.** Output xyz data from the processor is transformed to the appropriate projection using Corpscon or GeoCoordinator and then input into Starfix.Proc where the process of spatial review and comparing each data set to expected values is performed. Each dataset is compared with any available pre-existing charts, maps or other information data; overlapping datasets are also compared to each other to make sure each falls within the systems limitations. The data is then plotted out on paper with a contour interval 1 or 2 m in order to identify any further anomalies that may not have been apparent from inspection of individual flightlines and only become evident in a broader spatial context. Any such anomalies will then be resolved through reference back to the waveforms.

**3.5.7 Second Depth Description and Methodology.** The laser waveform from the bottom return is capable of having two valid returns (second depths) for a single sounding. Multiple returns can be from any object suspended in the water column, sharp drops in the bottom topography, or objects rising above the bottom. The initial processing of the data picks the more shallow depth for that particular sounding. The post processing software allows for viewing of all soundings with multiple returns and evaluation by the hydrographer to determine the validity of the return. The hydrographer is allowed to keep, swap or kill the return based on the waveform analysis and review of the surrounding and overlapping data. The keep option will keep the sounding as it was initially calculated by the post processing algorithm. The swap option allows the hydrographer to change the sounding to the second of the valid returns calculated by the software. The kill option allows the hydrographer to kill the sounding so that the sounding is not reported in the final cleaned xyz data. A report of this process is output from the post processing software and details the status of each second depth return as either keep, swap, or kill. See appendix "F" for second depth report for this project. Soundings reviewed here are kept unless there is valid evidence to support change.

**3.5.8 Flier Description and Methodology.** Possible fliers are listed within Starfix.Proc and output to a log file. The timestamps listed in this log file are then reviewed in the post processing software by the hydrographer to determine the validity of the return. The analysis is similar to that of the second depths in that adjacent and overlapping data are reviewed in conjunction with the waveform. A report of these fliers is then compiled with the action taken (either keep or kill) for each sounding. See appendix "G" for the flier report. As with the second depths all soundings are kept unless valid evidence exist to support killing of the sounding.

**3.5.9 Area Investigation and Review.** In areas where soundings are killed due insufficient energy return, or areas where the second depth and / or flier review produce questions to the validity of the sounding, re-flights are performed. The field hydrographer is responsible for determining which areas are to be re-flown based on the client's maximum gap in coverage requirements.

**3.5.10 Data Mapping.** The final cleaned xyz files are then binned using a 4m by 4m bin size to help reduce the size of the files. This file is the final delivered xyz file. The final mapping is performed using MicroStation and Inroads. These programs produce maps in DGN format. The contour files produced by Inroads where derived from a reduced data set of xyz files. The reduced

data set was produced by HyPack's point reduction program. After mapping in the DGN format the files were exported to a DXF format for the final deliverable.

#### 4.0 **Calibrations**

4.1 **Positioning Systems.** No formal calibrations of the Ashtech Z-12 receivers operating in the DGPS mode were conducted in the field. However, internal accuracy (precision) of the system was monitored by the SHOALS system utilizing standard positional QC (HDOP, PDOP, SNR data) techniques. Overall accuracy was not checked against independent (terrestrial) nav aids, but crossline, swath overlap and multiple flights over features such as pier ends/corners and NAV AIDs and comparison checks on the sounding data did allow a high degree of trust in positional integrity to be reached. Fugro/Chance personnel received daily solar storm forecasts and activity reports. Data collection during periods of high solar activity was avoided. During processing, graphical analysis of LOP data indicated no problems with the positioning system. With the vast majority of cross-checks and overlapping swaths showing good agreement however, both sounding reduction and navigational accuracy were assessed as adequate for the survey.

4.2 **SHOALS System Calibration.** To ensure accuracy of the system, SHOALS requires both a hard target test and a calibration flight for calibration of the system. The hard target test is accomplished through firing the laser against a known baseline distance. The test is performed for each receiver of the surface and bottom channels. Any observed error is nulled out through adjustment of appropriate parameters.

4.2.1 The SHOALS system undergoes an in-flight calibration for the determination of the small offsets of the scanner mirror frame relative to the optical axes of the system, in the roll, pitch and heading directions as defined by the Inertial Navigation System. Critical to this calibration is locating and flying a calm, flat area in the field. To calculate the angular offsets an average of the water surface is derived by the system, then a special calibration program developed by the National Ocean Service derives these small angular offsets assuming that the sea surface is flat. The offsets are folded back into the collected standard data and the successful plotting of a flat-water surface shows that the angles were correctly derived.

4.2.2 In the first six years of SHOALS operation, a standard survey line was used to derive these small angular offsets. In early 2000 it was thought that a wider excursion of the scanner forward angles would result in better calibration values and a raster scanner pattern became the standard operational procedure. Either procedure raster or standard pattern is acceptable as long as the resulting angular corrections produce a flat-water surface. (Carswell; Optech, Inc. 2002)

4.3 **Survey System Offsets/Alignment.** The laser system and motion sensors are optically aligned and the offsets measured with respect to the phase center of the GPS antenna. This is done at every system or component installation. The measured offsets are contained in what is

called the "STATIC" file. This file is written to the survey plan and, during initialization of the data collection system, written to the daily data tape. During processing the offset values are stripped from tape along with the data applied during post processing (SHOALS NT processor). During processing tide corrections are applied. In the event of a kinematic survey the KGPS derived positions and ellipsoid to MSL offset is also applied. For surveys covered in this report no kinematic data collection was conducted.

#### 4.4 Deep Bias Offset Correction

4.4.1 There has been a suspected deep bias present in SHOALS 400 data. This bias has never been quantifiable due to a lack of suitable ground truth data. The SHOALS-400 algorithm applied a constant bias to make the SHOALS derived depths shallower by 12 cm. This was based on the original Sarasota data and also the later Tampa Bay data. Recent testing of the follow-on Lidar system, SHOALS 1000, or CHARTS, the NAVOCEANO term for the system, at the South Florida Test Facility (SFTF) operated by the Naval Surface Weapons Center off Dania Beach Florida has allowed for the quantifying of this deep bias error. True, the deep bias error has been quantified with the SHOALS 1000 system, it is applicable to the SHOALS 400 system because the physics involved is the same as are the algorithms utilized to derive depth from the laser shots.

4.4.2 All of the SHOALS 400 data has been corrected for a depth bias that was discovered during the ground truth tests for the CHARTS system at the South Florida Test Facility. The equation used is as follows:

```
if (out.au.reported_depth > 7.0)
{
    correction = 0.17235 - 0.02485 * out.au.reported_depth;

    out.au.tide_cor_depth -= correction;
    out.au.reported_depth += correction;
    out.au.result_depth += correction;
    out.au.sec_depth += correction;
}
```

4.4.3 The equation represents the difference between the historical depth bias corrector (SHOALS-400) that was applied to the data and the new depth bias corrector taken from the SFTF data. The equation was derived by Grant Cunningham of Optech. This information came in an email (10/10/03) from Paul LaRocque of Optech. Note that the 12cm bias mentioned in the email was not depth dependent and was not removed from the data.

0 cm effect at 7 m

8 cm effect at 10 m  
20 cm effect at 15 m  
32 cm effect at 20 m  
57 cm effect at 30 m  
82 cm effect at 40 m.

The SHOALS-400 algorithm applied a constant bias to make the SHOALS derived depths shallower by 12 cm. This was based on the original Sarasota data and also the later Tampa Bay data. The following new recipe will make the SHOALS-400 data even shallower by the amounts stated in table above.

To apply the newest depth bias corrector to older (i.e., SHOALS-400) data, the following equation should be used:

$\text{delta\_depth} = 0.0 \text{ m, for reported\_depths} < 7 \text{ meters}$   
 $\text{delta\_depth} = [ 0.17235 - (0.02485 * \text{reported\_depth}) ] \text{ m, for}$   
 $\text{reported\_depths} \geq 7 \text{ meters}$

This delta\_depth should be ADDED to the older values of the reported\_depth, as below:

$\text{new\_reported\_depth} = ( \text{old\_reported\_depth} + \text{delta\_depth} )$

Therefore, at 40 meters old\_reported\_depth this will make the new\_reported\_depth shallower by about 82 cm.

This bias offset was proven and quantified after the first data delivery to NOAA. Subsequently, the above described procedure was applied to ALL Hawaii data and the data was re-submitted to NOAA. All Hawaii data currently held by NOAA Pacific Hydrographic Branch has been corrected for this bias.

## 5.0 Side Scan Sonar

5.1 **Requirements.** No side scan sonar requirement was defined for Hawaii.

5.2 **Equipment.** N/A

5.3 **Coverage.** N/A

## 6.0 Tides and Water Levels.

6.1 **General Requirements.** Tidal zoning shall be constructed and tidal data observed and recorded such that derived tidal corrections to the sounding data meet 0.5 meter accuracy standards. The survey area shall be sufficiently zoned and tide gauges strategically located to ensure tidal corrections meet accuracy requirements.

## 6.2 Tidal Data Collection, Scope of Work.

6.2.1 The primary NOAA tide Gauges. Also NOAA CO-OPS was responsible for posting preliminary unverified tidal data on the CO-OPS web site, tidal data processing and verification, posting of verified data to the web site and tidal zoning.

## 6.3 Tide Gauges

NOAA-maintained automatic tide gauges are at the following locations:

Honolulu Harbor, Oahu  
Mokuoloe, Oahu (northern Kaneohe Bay)  
Nawilili, Kauai  
Kawaihae, Hawaii

6.2.3 **Additional Gauges.** NAVOCEANO installed backup gauges on Oahu at the Barbers Pt. Harbor and the Waianae small craft harbor. On Kauai NAVOCEANO installed a tide gauge at a small craft harbor just south of PMRF between Kekaha and Waimea. NOAA gauges supporting the zoning were located on the windward side of the islands, well away from much of the survey area. The NAVOCEANO installed gauges were installed as a backup to the NOAA gauges. Furthermore, the data from the NAVOCEANO installed gauges were used to confirm the NOAA tide-zoning scheme.

## 6.4 Preliminary Tidal Zoning.

6.4.1 Tide zones were developed by NOAA CO-OPS based on historical data from the above mentioned gauges.

## 6.5 Tide Zone Accuracy

6.5.1 Results of comparing zone HAW213 (Oahu west coast from Barbers Pt. harbor to Kepuhi Pt. and including Waianae) referenced to NOAA's Honolulu gauge and the installed Waianae gauge are as follows:

Maximum difference:	0.35 meters
Mean difference:	0.15 meters
Standard Deviation:	0.179 meters

## 6.6 Final Tidal Zoning.

6.6.1 Tidal No adjustment was made to the NOAA CO-OPS zone scheme. Tidal time series from the NAVOCEANO gauges and tidal time series for the appropriate NOAA tide zone agreed very well. No adjustment to the NOAA zones was necessary.

## 6.7 Application of Tides.

6.7.1 The NAVOCEANO processing system does not utilize “tide correctors”, per se. The NOAA CO-OPS zoning scheme partitioned the survey areas into zones referenced to a reference tide gauge. For each zone there is a phase and amplitude correction, also referenced to the reference tide gauge. NAVOCEANO’s processing system handles tide correction by creating a tide file for each zone by applying zonal corrections to the reference gauge tides. The processing software identifies in which zone a sounding falls and applies that zone’s tide to the sounding. Tide correctors are applied during post processing, just prior to data editing and validation.

## 6.8 Currents and Tidal Streams

See Appendix E for a summary of Hawaiian currents from published literature. *Informational for Tactical Products.*

### 6.8.1 Large-scale Currents

Source: [www.atftp.soest.hawaii.edu](http://www.atftp.soest.hawaii.edu).

The average currents around the Hawaiian Islands form a large Gyre centered at about 32N. The geostrophic basin scale clockwise circulation sweeps the islands roughly east to west and intensifies southward. At and near the surface, currents driven by the wind combined with the geostrophic currents result in more complicated flow patterns.

South of Hawaii, the surface North Equatorial Current (NEC) reaches an average westward speed 0.35 knot at 13 N, and gradually decreases towards the islands. Between 18 N and 22 N, the currents are strongly influenced by the islands. The NEC forks at Hawaii; the northern branch becomes the North Hawaiian Ridge Current (NHRC), and intensifies near the islands with a typical speed of 0.5 knots. West of the islands, two elongated circulations appear. A clockwise circulation is centered at 19 N, merging to the south with the southern branch of the NEC. A counter-clockwise circulation is centered at 20-30 N. Between them is the narrow Hawaiian Lee Counter

Current(HLCC). Surface currents over the western islands and north east of the NHRC are variable. Current variability shown below indicates numerous eddies or swirls in the lee of the islands.




Figure 2. Large-scale ocean circulation around the Hawaiian Islands.




Figure 3. Large-scale ocean circulation variability around Hawaii indicates numerous eddies and swirls which obliterate slower average circulation.

### 6.8.2 Regional currents

The island chain affects the ocean by two important mechanisms:

interactions of the islands with the large scale ocean currents, and wind speed variations in the lee of the islands.




Figure 4. Regional current formation due to the modifying effect of land masses on large-scale circulation.

At the northern and southern boundaries of each island, the trade winds with speeds of 22-44 mph are separated from the calmer lee by narrow wind shear lines. Locally, the depth of the surface mixed layer depends on wind speed: in the channels, deep mixed layers are observed; in the lee, stirring by the wind is not sufficient to mix down solar heating and intense daytime warming of the ocean surface results. Sharp surface temperature fronts, sometimes reaching a difference of 4 C, are often associated with these wind shear lines.

Variations of wind have subtle effects on current patterns. When wind blows for many days over a surface mixed layer, the water moves to the right of the wind in the Northern Hemisphere due to the earth's rotation. Water therefore moves away from the northern shear line. To compensate for this divergent surface motion, water upwells from greater depths, appearing as a cold spot at the surface. Similarly, water moves towards the southern shear line, resulting in a deepening of the thermocline there.

Geostrophic currents result from these variations of thermocline depth, in the form of intense counter-clockwise eddies under northern shear lines, and somewhat less intense clockwise eddies under southern shear lines. This process is quite dramatic -- the depth of the mixed layer in the lee of the island of Hawaii can vary from less than 20 m in the counter-clockwise eddy, to more than 120 m in the clockwise eddy. The large counter-clockwise average circulation is believed to result from the repeated occurrence of eddies spun up by the shear lines of the islands of Maui and Hawaii.

Eddies can also be generated when intense currents such as the NEC impinges on the islands. The large clockwise circulation south west of the island of Hawaii appears to be caused by many such clockwise eddies repeatedly formed near South Point.

### 6.8.3 Tidal Currents and other Oscillations

On scales of oceanic basins, tides exist as very long waves propagating in patterns determined by their period and the geometry of the basin. The figure below shows the response of the North Pacific to the tidal period of 23 h 56 min, the largest diurnal component. Phase lines along which high tide occurs at the same time converge to an amphidrome point west of Hawaii where the tidal range is zero. Phase lines rotate counter-clockwise around this amphidrome, so that the offshore diurnal tide reaches the Hawaii island first, then sweeps across Maui, Oahu and finally Kauai.

Local bathymetry affects the ranges and phases of the tides along the shore, as the tidal waves wrap around the islands. For example, high tide at Haleiwa on the north shore of Oahu occurs over an hour before high tide at Honolulu Harbor.

Tidal currents result from tidal variations of sea level, and near shore are often stronger than the large scale circulation. Current meter records collected off Oahu, Maui and Hawaii (below) show that semi- diurnal and diurnal tidal currents tend to be aligned with the shoreline.




Figure 5. Response of the North Pacific to the longest duration tidal component (23h 56m) and the effect of the Hawaiian land mass.




Figure 6a. Representative tidal current flow around the Hawaiian Islands. Diurnal and semi-diurnal tidal flows tend to be aligned with the shoreline. Strong eddies are often found around points and headlands.




Figure 6b. Representative tidal current flow around the Hawaiian Islands. Diurnal and semi-diurnal tidal flows tend to be aligned with the shoreline. Strong eddies are often found around points and headlands.

Due to high variability of tidal currents around the islands, however, this statistical representation may not correspond to the flow at a particular time -- tidal currents cannot be predicted as precisely as sea level. Strong swirls often result from tidal currents flowing around points and headlands, and present hazards to divers.

Variations of sea level and currents at periods of 1.5 to 3 days are also observed around the Hawaiian islands. Although they manifest themselves as oscillations just like tides, they are not forced by gravitation, but by time-varying winds and possibly swells. They displace the sea surface by only a few centimeters, but the depth of isotherms by tens of meters. Such oscillations, usually occurring during the winter, may be associated with currents up to 1 knot, and horizontal water displacements of 8 km (5 miles).

## **7.0 Data Collection and Field Work**

**7.1 Units.** All soundings are in meters.

**7.2 Corrections to Soundings.** Alignments, offsets and verified tides were applied during appropriate stages of data collection and processing.

## **7.3 Hydrography**

**7.3.1 Source of Shorelines.** The shoreline source was initially generated from the vector shoreline used in the DNC of the area; this should be revised using high resolution shoreline derived from the zero contour obtained from the LIDAR datasets as the charted shoreline accuracy could use some improvement.

## **7.4 Sounding Development and Coverage**

120-meter swath at 4x4 meter spot density. Greater than 200% coverage in Navy areas separated by a time span of several hours. USGS areas were covered at 4x4-meter spot density at 100% coverage. USGS areas along Oahu's south coast were covered at 200% because of their small size and proximity to Navy areas. USACOE areas were covered at 8x8-meter spot density and 100% coverage. This is also discussed in 1.1.13.1 and 1.1.13.2.

**7.5 Sounding Selection.** NAVOCEANO area-based, shoal-biased sounding selection algorithm.

## **7.6 Seabed Topography and Texture**


Seabed topography is derived from the LIDAR data. No bottom samples were collected.

## 7.7 Near Shore Seabed Topography.

Numerous coastal areas in the Hawaiian Islands are exposed to a Predominately northerly Swell for most of the year. During the winter months the swell becomes quite significant. As a result the beaches and near shore areas are quite dynamic. Oahu north shore beaches undergo re-sculpting during the winter months. The same occurs along the leeward west coast where the beaches and near shore of Makua and Makaha are significantly altered. Along Kauai's northwest Na Pali coast the beaches completely erode in winter, then reappear in the spring. Along Barking Sands, and Majors Bay (Waiokapua Bay) Kauai, north and south of PMRF, beaches and near shore are quite dynamic during any time of high swell and rough surf.




Figure 7. Barking Sands, Kauai. Near shore seabed topography.




a




b



c



d



e

Figure 8. Series of near shore seabed to beach profiles from the area of Barking Sands, Kauai depicted in Figure 7. Insets a-d are west to east cross sections. Inset e is from the north east to southwest along the full length of the near shore.







Figure 9. Majors Bay (Waiokapua Bay) Kauai showing near the shore seabed.




a



b



c



d

Figure 10. Series of near shore seabed to beach profiles from the area of Majors Bay (Waiokapua Bay) Kauai depicted in Figure 9. Insets a-d are west to east cross sections. Colors represent datasets from different days. These cross sections cover a time span of 6 weeks.

## 7.8 Data Quality Control

**7.8.1 Processing Methodology.** Graphical examination/evaluation of LOP time series data and deletion of bad data. Graphical examination/evaluation of roll, heading, vertical acceleration time series. 3D visualization of data as a sun-shaded surface colored by depth, line or file. Visualization of data with color and gray scale palette. Visualization of data from any view angle, elevation or lighting position. Visualization of the sun shaded statistical, minimum, average and maximum surfaces. Area based editing of data. Data can be rotated. Multiple and overlying data can be compared. Complete 3D editing capability through the Area Based Editors. Overlay of GeoTif chart images with sounding sheets.

### 7.8.2 Cross check/swath overlap agreements

Standard crosscheck lines were not run. All Navy areas required two- flight coverage, with the second flights flown some time after the first flights (4 hours to several days). This survey development technique and adjacent line overlap proved more than sufficient to identify any positional or tide correction problems.

Tide correction problems were identified early in the survey. The problem was not with the tides themselves, but with application of the tide correctors. There were three primary problems. (1) Extraneous and unprintable (viewable) ASCII characters contaminated some tide corrector files such that the tide would not apply when APPLY\_TIDES was run, and no error message issued. These were identified early and resolved. (2) A data file time stamp problem was identified in the OPTEK airborne software. When the day changed over at midnight GMT a bit is supposed to be set in the \*.fl file. This didn't always happen. However, the time stamp was not reset to zero, just continued. As ping time is derived from the ping counter, the tide correctors were being applied from the wrong day. (3) Four data file format changes occurred of which NAVO was never informed. Three of these affected data time. Addition to these main three problems, a couple of errors were discovered in the tide zone polygon definition files. One polygon was not closed and another had an extraneous point that caused the polygon to cross several others. These errors were all corrected and tides re-applied at NAVOCEANO. Currently, there are no discrepancies in the tide corrections and all soundings are properly corrected.

## 7.9 Agreement with Existing Charts

See Appendix C for a synopsis of chart and data comparison. The highly detailed LIDAR data show more features. Numerous wrecks indicated along Oahu's south coast were not detected in the LIDAR data. Status and/or existence of these wrecks is unknown.

## 7.10 Agreement with Prior Surveys

Due to the short-notice nature of the tasking and rapid generation of the definitive report, previous survey data were not made available and therefore neither a critical nor favorable comparison can be made.

## 7.11 Navigational Aids

Nav aids were not positioned during the course of this survey. No tasking for this was designated and no suitable equipment was available. Discussions, however, with the Honolulu Harbor Master, Hawaii Ports and Harbors Commission, Harbor pilots and the USCG district revealed no discrepancies with charted nav aids and the Notice to Mariners.

The only nav aids positioned were a Navy-maintained buoy off PMRF Kauai and the observation tower at the Makua Training Area, Oahu.

Buoy designated "TANGO"	Position:	N 22 00.330'	W 159 47.557'
Tower, Makua	Position:	N 21 31' 43.56"	W 158 13' 37.81"

## 7.12 Shoreline

The shoreline source was initially generated from the vector shoreline used in the DNC of the area. This should be revised where possible using high-resolution shoreline derived from the zero contour obtained from the LIDAR datasets.

## 8.0 Accuracy and Resolution of Soundings

### 8.1 LIDAR Positional Accuracy

8.1.1 The error budget discussed below pertains to the positioning system operating in differential mode.

Based on the following:

System measurement circular error:	1.0 m
Slope error (variable, 1.0 m flat bottom)	1.0 m
Navigational System accuracy:	4.0 m
Heading error	0.5 m
Roll/Pitch error (beam pointing error)	0.26 m
(less than 0.05 degrees, less than 26 cm @ 300 meters altitude)	

8.1.2 The cumulative effects of the above errors (RMS) would be: +/- 4.16 meters: allowing for the navigational accuracy of +/- 5 meters, the total RMS value for sounding positional accuracy is +/- 5.13 meters.

8.1.3 IHO Positional Accuracy (Order 1) requires +5m +5% of depth, which equates to an allowable error of:

5.25 m	in 5 m depth
5.50 m	in 10 m depth
5.75 m	in 15 m depth
6.00 m	in 20 m depth

IHO 1st order positional accuracy is therefore considered to have been met in all areas throughout the survey. In areas of steeply sloping or high bottom variability deeper than 15 m IHO 1st order positional accuracy is considered to have been met.

## 8.2 Accuracy of Soundings - Assessment and Evaluation

8.2.1 **LIDAR.** Assessment of the accuracy of LIDAR soundings entails an evaluation of the following:

a. LIDAR zero mark (water surface)	+/- 0.10 m
b. Depth measurement (system accuracy)	+/- 0.10 m
c. Laser propagation velocity error	+/- 0.05 m
d. Roll, pitch, heading	+/- 0.00 m
e. Vertical motion (heave)	+/- 0.00 m
f. Tidal Measurement	+/- 0.02 m
g. Co-tidal corrections	+/- 0.10 m
h. seabed slope	+/- 0.0 – 0.25 m

8.2.2 **LIDAR zero mark** (a) The zero or reference mark for Lidar data is not the platform or sensor, it is the water surface while operating in DGPS mode or the GPS antenna while operating KGPS mode. The accuracy of the zero reference is very dependent on the surface model utilized to compensate for wave and swell. The accuracy of the surface reference is considered to be 0.1 meters on a normal ocean surface. The surface reference accuracy improves over calm seas and in protected waters. A nominal value of 0.10 meters has therefore been accepted as typical.

8.2.3 **Depth Measurement error** (b) (Instrument Accuracy/Error). System accuracy (depth resolution) for the LIDAR is 0.1 meters RMS. A nominal value of 0.10 meters has therefore been accepted as typical, given the relatively shallow water nature of this survey.

**8.2.4 Speed of Light Correction.** (c) In any medium light travels more slowly than it does in a vacuum. The velocity of light in a medium is equal to the velocity of light in a vacuum divided by the refractive index of the medium. The refractive index of light in air is 1.00028 and, for our purposes, is not significantly different from that in a vacuum, 1.00 by definition. The refractive index of water, though it varies slightly with temperature, salt concentration and wavelength, may be regarded as 1.33 for all natural waters. Assuming a velocity of light in a vacuum of 300,000,000 m/s, the velocity in water is about 225,000,000 m/s. The refractive index variability in natural waters is negligible, as is the speed. Therefore variation in light speed is not a limiting factor for LIDAR data and errors attributed to velocity of light variability can be considered non-existent.

**8.2.5 Roll, Pitch, Heading** (d) Roll, Pitch and Heading are sensed by an onboard POS/AV. Roll, pitch and heading are fully compensated for in real time through direct interfacing to the laser/scanner servo control system. Servo compensation within the limits of +/- 20 degrees of motion ensures the scanning mirror is referenced to nadir at all times. All out-of-tolerance motion results in system warnings and discarded Lidar pulses. Roll, pitch and heading errors are considered negligible.

**8.2.6 Vertical Motion Corrections.** (e) Not applicable for LIDAR data because the zero reference is not the platform or sensor, it is the water surface (when operating in DGPS mode) or the GPS antenna (when operating in KGPS mode). However, aircraft platform motion is compensated for by an aircraft mounted inertial motion system (POS/AV). This resolves undulations in the flight path. Aircraft movement outside of normal parameters result in "jerk" flags and rejected data.

**8.2.7 Tide corrections.** (f), (g) Tide correction errors consist of the actual observation errors at the tide gauge and any errors resulting from a tidal zoning schema or cotidal analysis. Observation errors from the NOAA tide gauges are known to be very low. The estimated error for observed tides is 0.025 meters (1 SIGMA). A similarly small margin of error for co-tidal corrections (0.35 meters) was calculated from comparison of a gauge installed on the leeward sides of Oahu and Kauai and the zone corrected reference tide station data. The standard deviation between the observed tide at these locations and the tide derived from the zoning was 0.179 meters. A similarly small margin of error for co-tidal corrections is based on the range and extent of the survey area in relation to the reference tidal stations and minimal shallow water effects due to the deep surrounding ocean water.

8.2.7.1 Incidentally, the three-day period when there was 0.35 meter difference between the observed tide and the NOAA COOPs cotidal zoned tide on the west coast of Oahu, no data was being collected in the area at this time. This error was strictly an observation and part of the tidal zone validation.

8.2.8 **Sea bed slope (h)** Slope error is normally related to footprint size at the sea floor. Directly related to beam spreading, the Lidar footprint is approximately 0.5 times the water depth. In 25 meters of water the footprint size is about 8 meters across. Normally, this would induce significant error on a sloping bottom due to the shallower part of the footprint reflecting back before the deeper edge of the footprint. This error is significantly reduced with the use of a narrow field-of-view (FOV) receiver telescope. The Lidar receiver telescope FOV is approximately 1.0 meters in diameter. Regardless of the actual beam spreading, only the 1 meter diameter area in the center of the beam is actually received. The leading edge of the return pulse, that which would be received from the shallowest part of the footprint, is not where the depth is computed. Depth determination utilizes a centroid of mass method within the 1 meter receiver FOV. Induced error estimates due to seafloor slope are based on the narrow receiver FOV footprint size.

### 8.3 SHOALS Lidar Sounding Error Budget

The resultant theoretical error budget is tabulated below representing typical shallow, mid-water and deepest values in the survey area

Source of Error	At 10m	At 25m	At 50m
a LIDAR zero reference (surface mark)	0.10	0.10	0.10
b system measurement accuracy	0.10	0.10	0.10
c laser propagation velocity error	0.05	0.05	0.05
e roll, pitch (this is positional error)	0.0	0.0	0.0
f tidal measurements	0.025	0.025	0.025
g co-tidal corrections ( maximum 0.35m, STDEV 0.179m)	0.179	0.179	0.179
h seafloor slope 0	0.0	0.0	0.0
seafloor slope 1:4	0.0625	0.0625	0.0625
seafloor slope 1:2	0.125	0.125	0.125
seafloor slope 1:1	0.25	0.25	0.25
Combined total ( $\Sigma(a^2 + \dots + l^2)^{1/2}$ )			
flat bottom	0.235	0.235	0.235
1:4 bottom slope	0.25	0.25	0.25
1:2 bottom slope	0.354	0.354	0.354
1:1 bottom slope	0.500	0.500	0.500
IHO Cat 1 Requirement [ $\pm(a^2 + (b*d)^2)^{1/2}$ ]	0.502m	0.509m	0.542m
Standard Met?	YES	YES	YES

8.3.1 As an adjunct to the standard calibration procedures approximately 200 tide corrected lead line observations were collected over a flat sand bottom and flat seas. Comparison of the lead line data to LIDAR data indicated agreement within a maximum of 0.06 meters with a mean agreement of 0.04 meters. Very close agreement with the lead line observations allows a very high confidence in the accuracy of LIDAR soundings.

8.3.2 **IHO Standards.** The accuracy for Order 1 allowable error (95% or 2 SIGMA) for depths from 0 to 50 meters is +/- 0.5 meters to +/- 0.542 meters. The calculated error for the motion-corrected LIDAR data and observed tides (see comments above) for this survey has a maximum value of approximately 0.354 meters and is therefore within the IHO accuracy limits for Order 1 surveys. As has been discussed, it is considered that the accuracy's estimated are both realistic and pragmatic; in no way do they negate the quality of the survey data so rendered nor do they serve to provide critical comment on the methods and equipment used in the survey. Indeed, the error could probably be reduced a bit with tide gauges installed on all sides of the islands.

8.4 **SHOALS Lidar Target Detection** Theoretically, based on target detection probability curves produced by NOAA, all Navy areas meet IHO Order 1 target/object detection requirements at the 95% confidence level for depths from 7m to 20m with single-flight coverage. At depths deeper than 20m signal-to-noise ratio limitations greatly reduce target detection capability, particularly for small objects less than 2 meters (Figure 1). Multiple-flight coverage will theoretically improve the confidence of target detection capability in the depth range of 2m to 7m, and possibly down to 20m. Subsequent testing of the follow-on CHARTS system utilizing the same operating principles and algorithms, targets of 2 meters and larger were detected 100% of the time in depths of 5 to 30 meters. Based on actual tests the LIDAR system meets IHO Order 1 target detection requirements. Multiple coverage greatly improves this capability.

8.4.1 Subsequent testing of the follow-on CHARTS system, utilizing the same operating principles and algorithms and a lower power laser, at 4x4 spot spacing, targets of 2 meters were detected 100% of the time in depths of 5 to 30 meters. Based on these actual tests the LIDAR system meets IHO Order 1-target detection requirements. Multiple coverage provides a degree of redundancy for this capability. The results of these tests have not yet been formally documented.

9.0 N/A

## 10.0 Navigational Aids

10.1 Navigational aids were not positioned during this survey due to a lack of available equipment during the survey period.

## 11.0 Sailing Directions

11.1 **General.** Not verified due to the nature of the survey.

### 11.2 Coastal Pollution

None noted although water quality in the harbors is somewhat degraded in comparison to that of the open ocean, primarily as a result of increased turbidity due to vessel activity and reduced circulation. Local environmental awareness, however, results in minimal pollution.

11.3 **Anchorage and Moorings.** N/A\

11.4 **Photography.** Photographs of selected areas of shoreline were taken in support of future STOIC production in Navy exercise areas. Areas that were photographed are the Makua Training Area, Pokai Bay, Waimanalo Bay (Bellows AFS), Kahuku, MCBH Hawaii at Kaneohe (east of Pyramid Rock), PMRF and Majors Bay, Kauai.

12.0 **Charted and Uncharted Wrecks and Obstructions.** Targets are listed in Appendix D. Other than what is listed, no other wrecks, objects or targets, charted or uncharted, were detected or observed with the LIDAR system.




Figure 11. Wrecks and wreckage off Oahu's leeward west coast between Maili Pt. and Waianaae. Charted as fish haven and wrecks. One of these is believed to be the "Mali", a popular dive spot.




Figure 12. Offshore oil terminal pipelines off Barbers Pt, Oahu.



Figure 13. Barbers Pt, Oahu. Offshore oil terminal

13.0 **Ancillary Observations**

13.1 **Water Clarity Observations**

See Appendix F

13.2 **Meteorological Observations**


N/A

13.3 **Biological Observations**


N/A

APPROVAL SHEET  
W00105 - W00112

Evaluated by:

Br   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bonnie Johnston  
Physical Scientist (Hydrographer)  
Pacific Hydrographic Branch


Review by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LTJG Abigail Higgins  
Hydrographic Team Leader


**Cartography**

The evaluated survey has been inspected with regard to delineation of the depth curves, development of critical depths, cartographic symbolization, and verification or disproval of charted data

Compiled by:


  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Russ Davies  
Cartographer  
Pacific Hydrographic Branch

Reviewed by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bruce Olmstead  
Cartographer  
Pacific Hydrographic Branch

**Approval**

I have reviewed the data, and reports. Data are suitable for nautical charting except where specifically recommended in this report.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CDR/NOAA  
Donald W. Haines  
CDR, NOAA  
Chief, Pacific Hydrographic Branch

