

U. S. COAST & GEODETIC SURVEY LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES

MAY 13 1935

	1.1	
cc.	No.	

For Rev. I		
ARTMENT	OF	COMMERC

DEP COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY R. S. PATTON, DIRECTOR

DESCRIPTIVE REPORT

Topographic | Sheet No. T-5480 Hydrogrophic

Florida

LOCALITY Vicinity of Vensacola Bay

Fastern Extremity as East Bay Prince Hast Bay River to Longitude 860591

1934

CHIEF OF PARTY

M. H. Reese

applied to Chart 871 - July 11, 1946

TOPOGRAPHIC TITLE SHEET

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

Field No.. 9

REGISTER NO. T-5480

State	Florida	**-*-*	**********
9	licinity of Pansacol	a Bay	
General locality	East=Bay	4 / 1 	
Locality	East-Pay-Divon to	I construde 860 501	Haller and Vicinitis
Scale 1:10,526	Date of survey.	July 11 & Oct. 31,	19.34.
Warrant Air Photo Co	mpilation Party 1	Io. 24, Pensacola,	Fla
Chief of party	M. H. Reese.	***************************************	
Surweyed by	See data sheet in	the descriptive r	eport.
Inked by	H. C. Moore		
Heights in feet above	veto	ground to tops of	trees
Contour, Approximate	e contour, Form 1	ine interval	Ceet
Instructions dated	Jun	e.7,	1934.
Remarks: Compiled	on scale of 1:10,	526 and enlarged a	nd
printed on scale of	1:10,000 by Phot	olithography. Sca	ale
factor 0.95.	Q PO		
	•	g, at	
}			
	Kelley		
	Killey 3 cords y	hlod on 52	4
	,	18 gg	
	ı	00	

- STATISTICS -

on

SHEET, F	IELD NO. 9 , REG.				
PHOTOS, NO.	16 (U.S.N.A.S.) 99 (A.S.C.)	TO NO. 1	20 (&		
DATE OF PHOTOGRAPHS	10/31/34 7/11/34	TIME	2:00 7:30	p.m. a.m.	
	ВУ		DA FROM	TO TO	
ROUGH RADIAL PLOT_	R. E. Wagner		10/	11/34	_
SCALE FACTOR (0.95)	R. E. Wagner	4	10/	11/34	
SCALE FACTOR CHECKED	E. P. Hernandez,	-	10/	11/34	
PROJECTION	E. P. Hernandez	r.	10/	18/34	
PROJECTION CHECKED	R. E. Wagner		10/	18/34	
CONTROL PLOTTED	M. B. Gill, Jr.	1 B. G.M.	h 10/	19/34	
CONTROL CHECKED	111	amirt	10/	20/34	
TOPOGRAPHY TRANSFERRED					
TOPOGRAPHY CHECKED					
SMOOTH RADIAL LINE PLOT	M. B. Gill Jr.		10/22	- 10/31/	34
RADIAL LINE PLOT CHECKED	E. P. Hernandez,	fr.	10/	['] 31./34 _.	
DETAIL INKED	H. C. Moore		$\frac{11}{5}$ $\frac{11}{22}$	- 11/12/ - 12/11/	
PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF SHEE	T E. P. Hernandez	Jor.	12/	29/34 ,	
TOTAL AREA OF SHEET 25.6	sq. Statute Miles				
AREA OF DETAIL INKED 19.55	sq. Statute Miles		(Land	Area)	
AREA OF DETAIL INKED	sq. Statute Miles	(Shoa	ls in	Water Ar	ea)
LENGTH OF SHORELINE (more	than 200 m. from ne 14.7 Statute M	earest opp iles	osite	shore)	
LENGTH OF SHORELINE (river	s and sloughs less 11.1 Statute h		m. wid	le)	
GENERAL LOCATION East Ba	y				
LOCATION East Bay River t	o Longi tude 86059				
DATUM North American 1	927 (Unadjusted)			04 504	138.7
		atitude_	30°26	7.610 "	(142.2 m.)
STATION Roge 1934 (us	respected)	ongitude_	86°57	41.927	(1125.3 m.)

COMPILER'S REPORT

FOR

PHOTO TOPOGRAPHIC SHEET NO. T-5480

FIELD NO. 9

I. GENERAL INFORMATION:

Instructions dated June 7, 1934.

The information used in the compilation of this sheet was obtained from notes and sketches on the field photographs and from members of the field inspection party in areas in which the draftsman could not determine the exact nature of the detail from the photographs.

The names appearing on the overlay sheet were taken from old charts of this area, and from the notes made by the field inspection party.

The area covered by this sheet consists of East Bay, East Bay River and the town of Holley as the most important features. The rest of the area consists of sandy land covered with pine, scrub oak, round-leaved trees, and grass. There are a number of farms and orehards along Florida State Highway No. 10.

The portion of the sheet south of East Bay is mostly cut over land, and grass. There are marshy spots along the shore of East Bay, East Bay River, and along some of the streams and bayous.

The range of normal tide for this area is about one foot, and the difference between the high and low water lines is so slight that only the high water line was used in tracing.

The area covered by this sheet was traced from photographs made by the Aero Service Corporation's five-lens camera #HUI-33: Photos Nos. 99 to 117, taken at 7:30 a.m., July 11, 1934, running approximately east and west along Latitude 30°27'. A supplementary single lens flight made by the U. S. Naval Air Station, taken at 2:00 p.m., October 31, 1934, was used to check the shoreline from a little south of Station Roge to Station Cedar, as this area was far out on the wing prints of the five-lens flight.

There was a change in the shoreline at the mouth of Tom King Bayou that occurred after the five-lens flight had been taken. This portion was traced direct from the U. S. Naval Air Station pictures as it showed up clearly on them.

There was no overlapping flight north or east of this sheet, so detail in that area had to be traced from the wing prints with no check as to its accuracy. As Photo No. 99 was the last of the flight at the east end of the sheet, there were too few radial cuts

to determine accurately the radial points in this area, and as there was considerable distortion due to the tilt of this photograph and those adjacent, the detail is subject to some error.

II. CONTROL:

(A) Sources.

The following sources of control were used in the compilation of this sheet:

(a) Triangulation by M. H. Reese, 1934.(b) Transit traverse by G. B. Grunwell, 1933

The geographic nositions of all stations were

The geographic positions of all stations were computed directly on the North American 1927 Datum.

(B) Errors.

The control used for this sheet was adequate and no errors were found.

(C) Discrepancies.

There were no discrepancies found on this sheet.

III. COMPILATION:

(A) Method.

The usual five lens radial line method of plotting was used in the compilation of this sheet.

(B) Adjustment of plot.

The scale of the photographs was fairly uniform, although there was a good deal of distortion due to tilt, necessitating considerable adjustment of photos.

Some difficulty was encountered in plotting the shoreline from Station Cedar to a little south of Station Roge. This was probably due to the fact that Roge could only be picked in the five-lens flight on the extreme end of the wing print of Photo No. 111. The radial intersection fell consistently inward from the water area as the shoreline approached Roge, which would have placed the plotted position of Roge on the celluloid about 25 meters in the water.

To correct this, a single lens flight taken by the U. S. Naval Air Station of this portion of the shoreline was used, a radial plot being drawn using

definite points from the five-lens flight as control for the northern part, and points transferred from field sheet No. 5 for control for the southern portion. The shoreline was traced from Tom King Bayou to a short distance north of Roge from Photo No. 111; around Roge, from the single lens flight. While this shoreline is probably accurate to within five meters in most parts, there might be an error of almost 15 meters in one or two spots. There is a doubt that Station Roge is picked correctly on the photographs due to indefinite location on the field sketch. This may contribute to state lage the possibility of error, along with the fact that the shoreline of this area has not been shown on any of the eftire limits of fath flights and through the thought field prints.

(C) Interpretation.

Only the graphic symbols as approved by the Board of Surveys and Maps (1932) were used in the compilation of this sheet, except for the symbol (?) used to denote brush. A single broken line denotes sand trail; broken double line shows passable motor roads; and a full double line, good motor roads.

(D) Information from other sources.

None.

(E) Conflicting names.

On U.S.C. & G.S. Chart No. 1265 the eastern part of East Bay between Longitude 86°52 430" and 86°56' is indicated as East Bay River. In local use this is accepted as East Bay, East Bay River starting at 86052:30" going east.

The following names were obtained from local inhabitants by the field inspection party and are mentioned on the overlay sheet: Tom King Bayou, Hiawatha, and Deer Creek.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER SURVEYS: IV.

The junctions of this sheet with sheet No. T-5478 to the south and sheet No. T-5481 to the northwest are satisfactory.

A close comparison with the previous survey as shown on Chart No. 1265 is difficult due to difference of scale. The general shoreline is substantially the same, the main difference being the roads that have been built since the previous chart. Florida State Highway No. 10 is the main new, paved road through the district.

V. LANDMARKS:

Landmarks of value for navigation purposes are submitted on form 567, by Lieut. I. E. Rittenburg's party. Many submitted

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER SURVEYS:

To the best of my knowledge, this sheet is complete in all detail of importance for charting purposes, and no further survey is deemed necessary.

Submitted by: H. C. Moore,

Approved by M. H. Reese, Chief of Party.

This complation is between to have a probable wood of 0.3 to 0.5 mm for interested prints and 0.3 to 0.8 mm for are other detail

9-21-35.

1399.

The shore line and the topographic features in the vicinity of the shore line on this sheet were transferred to the aluminum topographic sheet of Lieut. Rittenburg's. Lieut. Rittenburg instructed his plane table party to check the shore line and other features at each set-up and each signal located. A very few small errors were discovered by the plane table party and these have been rectified. The shore line from Station Roge to Station Cedar, which was in question as mentioned in the descriptive report, has been verified by the plane table party. Therefore, it is considered that the shore line, as shown on this sheet, is correct.

This sheet was originally compiled using the triangulation computed from the field computations of the first order arc. When the adjusted positions of the first order arc were received, it was discovered that there was a considerable change between the field positions and the adjusted positions. The projection of the compilation has been shifted to the datum obtained from the adjusted computations. The manner in which the factor was obtained is given below:

STATION	N.A. 1	927 FINAL (UNADJUST		CORR'N	N.A. 1927 FIELD POSITION
Bayou, East Bay		48.407 40.008	1490.6 1067.1	-3.7 -6.8	1494.3 1073.9
Grilla		48.327	1488.1	-3.7	1491.8
1934		47.178	1258.8	-6.4	1265.2
Ceder		14.862	457.6	-3.7	461.3
1934		10.887	290.5	-6.5	297.0
Ròge		04.504	138.7	-3.5	142.2
1934		41.927	1118.8	-6.6	1125.4
Escribano .		49.689	1530 . 1	-3.9	1534.0
1934		53.565	1428 . 2	-6.9	1435.1

(Average Correction: Lat. -3.7; Long. -6.6)

M. H. Reese.

Chief of Party, C. & G. S.

ė,

GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

Date. June	18.	1935

Survey	No. <u>T-5480</u>
Chart I	No.1265
Diagram	No

FLORIDA

Approved by the Division of Geographic Names, Department of Interior. \bigstar Referred to the Division of Geographic Names, Department of Interior. R

Under investigation. Q

Status 3	Name on Survey	Name on Chart	New Names in local use	Names assigned by Field	Location
11	· East Bay	Same			
			Same		
✓ √	Holley				
	Hiawatha		Same		
V	Derryczek De	an CV. = v.c.6.B.	Accision Same	5/8/42	
	East Bay River	Same			
1	Miller Bayon	(un sheet = U.S Trib. Miller Bayon from N.E. nearmout	6.6. B. Leuis	io- 5/814	<u> </u>
- 1	Poplar creek	From N.E. nearmout)	••	
	Miller Pt	Just W. of 1	Willer B	ayoù.	
				added	
			3 numes 6/3/42.	L. Heck	
,					
				١	
		<u> </u>			
		APPROVED NAMES			
		M Hoods.			(M-136)
					(M-136)

Review of Air Photo Compilation T 5480

Scale 1:10,000

Comparison with graphic control sheet

(a) T 6320 a (1935), scale 1:20,000

Covers entire area. No discrepancies in shore line. The entire shoreline of T 5480 was transferred to T 6320 a prior to the plane table survey.

There are several docks along the eastern arm of East Bay which are not shown on T 6320 a.

There is a difference of about 10 m. in the position of the eastern of two docks at 30° 26.7', 86° 54.3'. Examination of the photographs substantiates the position as shown on T 5480.

All detail on T 6320 a within the limits of the compilation is shown on T 5480 except temporary stations and the magnetic meridian.

Comparison with previous topographic surveys

(a) T 2161 (1894), scale 1:10,000

Covers entire area except for a small portion in the extreme western part.

The change in the shoreline has not been great, not being over about 40 m. at the most except at the entrance to the eastern arm of East Bay where changes have taken place in the south shore ranging up to about 125 m.

None of the docks shown on T 2161 is now in existence.

All bluffs now in existence are shown on T 5480.

T 5480 is considered adequate to supersede T 2161 for the area covered.

(b) T 797 (1860), scale 1:20,000

Covers western part of area and only that adjacent to water.

Considerable change in the shoreline along East Bay has taken place ranging up to about 200 m. in some places.

The small bayou at 30° 27.8', 86° 55.7' is called Perillo Bayou on T 797.

T 5480 is sensidered adequate to supersede T 797 for the area covered.

Comparison with contemporary hydrographic survey

H 5834a(1935), scale 1:20,000

No conflicts with hydrography were found.

There are some small docks (and piling) along the eastern arm of East Bay which are not shown on H 5834 a. to which the verifiers attention has been called.

Comparison with charts

Chart No. 1265, scale 1:80,000

Covers only that portion of area adjacent to water.

For further discussion see page 4 of descriptive report of T 5480 and comparison with previous topographic surveys in this review.

Landmarks and Aids to Navigation

There are no landmarks or aids to navigation in this area on the chart and none have been submitted.

Approved
K.T. Adams

Holded H. D. REED Bygones

REVIEW OF AIR PHOTO COMPILATION NO. T-5480

Chief of Party: M. H. Reese Compiled by: H. C. Moore

Project: Florida Compilation Instructions dated: June 7, 1934

- 1. The charts of this area have been examined and topographic information necessary to bring the charts up to date is shown on this compilation. (Par. 16a, b,c,d,e,g and i; 26; and 64) (a) Low water line not shown. (b) Yes. (c) No bridges of importance to navigation. (d) Yes. (é) Yes. (g) Yes. (1) Yes.
- -2. Change in position, or non-existence of wharfs, lights, and other topographic detail of particular importance to navigation which affect the chart, is discussed in the descriptive report. (Par. 26; and 66 g,n)
 There have been no changes of importance to navigation since previous surveys.
- 3. Ground surveys by plane table, sextant, or theodolite have been used to supplement the photographic plot where necessary to obtain complete information, and all such surveys are discussed in the descriptive report. (Par. 65; and 66 d,e)

 No such additional surveys were necessary.
- 4. Blue-prints and maps from other sources which were transmitted by the field party contain sufficient control for their application to the charts. (Par. 28)

None were submitted.

5. Differences between this compilation and contemporary plane table and hydrographic surveys have been examined and rectified in the field before forwarding the compilations to the office and are discussed in the descriptive report.

No contemporary planetable or hydrographic charts are available.

6. The control and adjustment of the photo plot are discussed in the descriptive report. Unusual or large adjustments are discussed in detail and limits of the area affected are stated. (Par. 12b; 44; and 66 c,h,i)

Yes.

7. High water line on marshy and mangrows coast is clear and adequate for chart compilation. (Par. 16a, 43, and 44)

Yes.

NOTE: Strike out paragraphs, words or phrases not applicable and modify those requiring it. Paragraph numbers refer to those in the Topographic Manual. Refer also to the pamphlet "Notes on the Compilation of Planimetric Line Maps from Five Lens Air Photographs."

on sand bars

8. The representation of low water lines, reafexxeenaxxeefsxend
reaks, and legends pertaining to them is satisfactory. (Par.
36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41)

Except for sand bars, the low water line was too close to the high to be shown.

9. Recoverable objects have been located and described on Form 524 in accordance with circular 30, 1933, circular letter of March 3, 1933, and circular 31, 1934. (Par. 29, 30, and 57)

Submitted by Lout. I. E. Rittenburg.

- 10. A list of landmarks was furnished on Form 567 and instructions in the Director's letter of July 16, 1934, Landmarks for Charts, complied with. (Par. 16d, e; and 60)

 Submitted by Lieut. I.-E. Rittenburg.
- 11. All bridges shown on the compilation are accompanied by a note stating whether fixed or draw, clearance, and width of draw if a draw bridge. Additional information of importance to navigation is given in the descriptive report. (Par. 16c)

Yes.

12. Geographic names are shown on the overlay tracing. The accepted local usage of new names has been determined and they are listed in the report, together with a general statement as to source of information and a specific statement when advisable. Complete discussion of place names differing from the charts and from the U.S.G.S. Quadrangles is given in the descriptive report, together with reasons for recommendations made. (Par. 64, and 66k)

Yes.

- 13. The geographic datum of the compilation is N. A. 1927 Uname and the reference station is correctly noted.

 adjusted.
- 14. Junctions with adjoining compilations have been examined and are in agreement. (Par. 66j)
- 15. The drafting is satisficatory and particular attention has been given the following:

 Yes...
 - 1. Standard symbols authorized by the Board of Surveys and Maps have been used throughout except as noted in the report.
 - 2. The degrees and minutes of Latitude and Longitude are correctly marked.

- 3. All station points are exactly marked by fine black dots.
- 4. Closely spaced lines are drawn sharp and clear for printing.
- 5. Topographic symbols for similar features are of uniform weight.
- 6. All drawing has been retouched where partially rubbed off.
- 7. Buildings are drawn with clear straight lines and square corners where such is the case on the ground.

(Par. 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48)

- 16. No additional surveying is recommended at this time.
- 17. Remarks:

18. Examined and approved;

M. H. Reese Chief of Party

19. Remarks after review in office:

Reviewed in office by: Frank G. Echine 189. Jones

Examained and approved:

And Chief, Section of Field Records

Chief, Division of Charts

The d. L. Veacock Chief, Section of Field Work

Acting Chief, Division of Hydrography and Topography.