Port of Hood River

Hood River Bridge Geophysical Survey SUMMARY REPORT

APRIL 2021

Prepared for:

Port of Hood River 1000 E. Port Marina Dr. Hood River, OR 97031

Prepared by:

MARINE SERVICES

David Evans and Associates, Inc. 2801 SE Columbia Way, Suite 130 Vancouver, WA 98661 (360) 314-3200

Port of Hood River Hood River Bridge Geophysical Survey SUMMARY REPORT

APRIL 2021

Prepared by:

Nicholas Lesnikowski, LG, CH David Evans and Associates, Inc. Senior Associate

__

Reviewed by:

Gregory P. Baird, PLS, CH David Evans and Associates, Inc. Senior Associate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Hood River Bridge Target List Appendix B: Additional Cross River Data

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

David Evans and Associates, Inc. (DEA), Marine Services Division, conducted a geophysical survey on the Columbia River near Hood River, Oregon, from March 8 to March 11, 2021. The survey was conducted in support of archeological investigations around the northern end of the potential new bridge site, being planned just west of the existing bridge. A variety of marine geophysical survey instruments were utilized to try to assess the existence of targets or anomalies, which may possibly represent cultural artifacts. This report summarizes the survey operation and presents the results of the various remote-sensing instruments used, including multibeam bathymetric sonar, side scan sonar, sub-bottom profiler and marine magnetometer.

2.0 DATUMS AND PROJECT CONTROL

The survey was conducted using Real-Time Kinematic Global Navigation Satellite System (RTK-GNSS) positioning with corrections provided by the Washington State Reference Network (WSRN), based on North American Datum of 1983 with the 2011 realization (NAD83(2011)). The horizontal projection used was Washington State Plane, South Zone, with units in U.S. survey feet. The vertical datum is North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88) using Geoid 2012b.

2.1 Positioning Accuracy Verification

Several checks were made in the field to confirm the accuracy of the navigation setup being utilized for the project and the RTK-GNSS corrections obtained from the Washington State Reference Network (WSRN). Initial checks were made to an existing Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) monument, GP20141-24, in White Salmon, Washington, using the WSRN correctors and a portable Trimble SPS-985 RTK-GNSS rover system to occupy the monument; the monument is situated along a very busy road, where it was not possible to position the survey vessel. The check-in difference on GP20141-24 were 0.03 feet in northing, 0.02 feet in easting, and 0.02 feet in elevation. After verifying that the WSRN setup was correct, an existing monument at the top of the Port of Hood River (POHR) boat ramp, Oregon State Marine Board (OSMB) 1401-01, was occupied with the same portable RTK-GNSS rover system using a three-minute occupation to establish a check-in point for the survey vessel. The survey vessel was then maneuvered to occupy the OSMB 1401-01 monument with the survey vessel's RTK-GNSS system and geodetic settings in the Hypack acquisition software. (See Table 1 for survey control used.) The survey vessel's navigation and positioning system was checked at the OSMB 1401-01 monument as established with RTK-GNSS corrections from the WSRN each day prior to launching the vessel. The purpose of the checks was to verify system geodetic parameters settings and positional accuracy of the survey vessel acquisition software. The average difference values from record positions for horizontal were 0.04 feet and the average difference for vertical was 0.07 feet.

3.0 HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY METHODOLOGY

3.1 Survey Vessel and Instrumentation

The vessel used for this survey was the *River Hawk*, DEA's 19-foot custom-built survey vessel with a 105-HP jet drive outboard configured for working in rivers and near structures (Figure 1). The primary equipment on the vessel included an Applanix POS/MV-320 version 5 (Positioning and Orientation System for Marine Vessels) combined inertial and RTK GNSS, Trimble SPS-851 RTK-GNSS system, a Teledyne T50P multibeam sonar, an EdgeTech 4200 dual-frequency (300 kHz Low, 600 kHz High) side scan sonar, an Edgetech 3200/512i chirp sub-bottom profiler and a Marine Magnetic SeaSpy magnetometer.

Figure 1. Survey vessel *River Hawk.*

Due to the size of the various survey equipment, the survey was run in stages in order not to overload the vessel. During pre-survey planning, it was established with the Port that it may not be safe or feasible to survey the entire site due to the existence of very shallow water mud flats, designated as

less than 3-feet deep on National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) chart 18532, at the northern third of the site. Coordination with the Bonneville Dam operations team prior to the survey resulted in the pool elevation being raised by several feet to help facilitate surveying over the very shallow flats toward the north.

3.2 Geophysical Data Acquisition

On Tuesday, March 8, the multibeam bathymetric survey was conducted. The multibeam operation gave the crew a good overview of the work area and they were able to assess the extent to which it was feasible to conduct the survey into the extreme shallows of the site. Figure 2 shows the extent of multibeam coverage relative to the survey site outline.

Figure 2. Multibeam bathymetric coverage relative to planned survey area. NOAA chart 18532 in background.

On Wednesday, March 10, side scan sonar operations were conducted. The sonar towfish was deployed from a davit on the starboard side of the vessel and kept at a fixed tow depth just below the surface due to the very shallow water. The system was set to operate the high-frequency channels (600 kHz) using an 82-foot (25 meter) range and the low frequency (300 kHz) at 114-foot (35 meter) range. Due to numerous clusters of piles, in addition to exposed rock outcrops and bridge piers, the survey crew had to make field adjustments so transects were placed in locations deemed safe to navigate the vessel. Figure 3 shows the various sonar transects.

Figure 3. Side scan sonar survey transects; yellow outline is planned survey area.

On Thursday, March 11, 2021, the large chirp sub-bottom profiler was mobilized to the site. Due to the weight of the towfish (450 lbs. in air), which was too much for the 19-foot survey vessel, a set of floats were rigged to support the towfish and then secured to the starboard side of the vessel as shown in Figure 4. This arrangement proved very effective and did not impact the maneuverability of the survey vessel. Multiple test lines were collected to assess the optimum frequency band of the chirp signal based on the relatively shallow depth of interest below the riverbed. The initial subbottom survey was conducted using a 700 Hz-12 kHz, 20 millisecond (ms) output chirp signal and 4 pings per second. Figure 5 shows the initial chirp sub-bottom transects.

Figure 4. Large 512i chirp sub-bottom towfish supported by pontoons and secured to the starboard side of the survey vessel.

Figure 5. Initial chirp sub-bottom profiler (700 – 7200 Hz, 20 ms) transects; yellow outline is planned survey area.

On the afternoon of Thursday, March 11, 2021, while preparing for magnetometer survey with the subbottom system still rigged alongside the vessel, it was decided to log additional sub-bottom data using a very high-resolution setting. The sub-bottom was changed to a 1-10 kHz, 5-ms chirp output signal and 5 pings per second. Because the magnetometer needs to be deployed at a good distance behind the vessel to remove it from the magnetic signature of the boat, the slightly negative towfish would drag on the riverbed in the shallower areas and degrade the data. To avoid this, a float was rigged to the sensor, which allowed it to remain horizontal and just slightly below the surface of the water. This arrangement worked very well and reduced the chance of snagging the sensor on the numerous hazards in the area. The magnetometer was deployed behind the survey vessel at a distance of 57.5 feet (17.5 meters). The magnetometer data was recorded using Chesapeake technology SonarWiz acquisition software. Figure 6 shows the tracks of the combined magnetometer and second iteration sub-bottom profiler survey.

Figure 6. Magnetometer and secondary chirp sub-bottom profiler (1-10 Hz, 5 ms) transects; yellow outline is planned survey area.

3.3 Positioning and Navigation

Horizontal positions were acquired with a Trimble Applanix Position and Orientation System for Marine Vessels (POS/MV-320 version 5) combined inertial and RTK-GNSS. The POS/MV system integrates two GNSS receivers with a motion reference unit. This system not only provides motion information (heading, roll, pitch, and heave) to compute X , Y , Z data from the multibeam sonar measurements, it also provides accurate inertial navigation through GNSS outages for up to 30 seconds. RTK corrections were received from the Washington State Reference Network (WSRN) using broadcast to each survey vessel from a Trimble SPS851 GNSS base station.

To improve position accuracy, the PosPac® (raw GNSS and inertial) logged data file aboard the survey vessel was post-processed using Applanix POSPac-MMS software version 8.6, to generate a Post-Processed Kinematic (PPK) solution that is tightly coupled with inertial data using Applanix PosPac® software for a Smoothed Best Estimate of Trajectory (SBET).

A SmartBase network solution was used to post-process the SBET. The GNSS stations are automatically imported by POSPac-MMS from GNSS stations maintained by National Geodetic Survey (NGS) Continuously Operating Reference Stations (CORS) and University NAVSTAR Consortium (UNAVCO), referenced in the World Geodetic System 1984 (WGS84)/International Terrestrial Reference Frame 2014 (ITRF14). After post-processing, the SBET was exported and transformed from POSPac-MMS to NAD83(2011) reference frame and imported into CARIS. The exported NAD83(2011) SBET was differenced in POSPac-MMS relative to the RTK-GNSS positions from the WSRN and were within agreement relative to system and network accuracies.

Position data were used in real-time to provide navigation information to the vessel operator and were time-tagged and logged with multibeam and other ancillary data. The actual survey tracks were displayed with multibeam swath coverage in real-time on a monitor located at the helm to aid in a systematic survey of the area.

3.4 Vertical Positioning

All bathymetric data were time-tagged and recorded relative to the vertical reference point of the survey platform, which is relatively close to the water surface. Using a fixed vertical reference for both the sonar and RTK-GNSS systems, as opposed to using the water surface and making water surface observations, provides improved vertical accuracy as it considers dynamic changes in draft and local water surface variations in the vicinity of the survey. The sonar fixed draft was used to reference the soundings to the project vertical datum. Vertical reference point measurements, which approximately represent the water surface elevation, were obtained using each navigation system: the Trimble Applanix POS/MV 320 and the Trimble SPS851 RTK-GNSS receiver. After editing, a 60-second average of RTK-GNSS observations were computed to remove wave-induced vertical motion, which was accounted for with heave measurements from the POS/MV and applied as a "tide" file to correct multibeam soundings. All bathymetric data is relative to NAVD88 GEOID12B elevations.

3.5 Bathymetric Data Acquisition

The multibeam hydrographic survey equipment consisted of a single Teledyne Reson SeaBat T50P multibeam bathymetric sonar, Applanix POS/MV combined inertial and RTK-GNSS positioning and motion reference system, a secondary Trimble SPS851 RTK-GNSS rover receiver, HYPACK/HYSWEEP navigation and acquisition software and an AML Oceanographic Smart•X sound speed profiler.

The S/V Riverhawk was equipped with a single high-resolution Teledyne Reson SeaBat T50P dualfrequency multibeam sonar, capable of operating at 200 to 400 kHz, and an integrated AML MicroX with an SV exchange sound speed sensor. The Teledyne Reson SeaBat T50P sonar was deployed over the starboard side of the vessel and secured with a custom mount and was operated at 400 kHz, while mechanically tilted 30 degrees outboard, producing a 210-degree combined swath of 512 equal angle overlapping beams, with each beam using a 0.5-degree across-track angle and 1.0-degree along-track angle.

The Trimble Applanix POS/MV motion reference sensor was utilized to measure and record vessel position, heading (yaw), heave (vertical movement from seas), pitch and roll. By utilizing vessel speed over ground and heading data provided by GNSS, the POS/MV can isolate horizontal accelerations from vessel turns and provide highly accurate motion data. The POS/MV data were used to derive sonar beam orientation and position individual soundings.

The navigation and survey acquisition system was utilized via a personal computer running HYPACK/HYSWEEP version 2020 software. HYPACK/HYSWEEP software was used for multibeam and sensor data acquisition and allowed the swath bathymetric data to be displayed as a painted color image on the navigation screen. This real-time display gave the hydrographer immediate indications of data quality and coverage.

4.0 MULTIBEAM EQUIPMENT CALIBRATION

4.1 Calibration Tests

To confirm alignment of the multibeam sonar relative to position and attitude sensors and verify delay times applied to the time-tagged sensor data, a calibration test was conducted. This consisted of a series of lines run in a specific pattern, which were used in pairs to analyze roll, pitch, and heading alignment angles for the multibeam sonar head as well as latency (time delays) in the time tagging of the sensor data. Table 2 lists the applied correctors for sensor bias determined through analysis of the patch test data. The latency was zero.

4.2 Multibeam Bar Check

To confirm the draft of the multibeam sonar head, a bar check was performed during each deployment by lowering a flat plate to a known distance from the water surface and placing it under the sonar head.

The recorded sound velocity-corrected sonar depth was then compared to the known depth of the bar. The bar check conducted showed agreement between measured values relative to the known bar depth and was within 0.00 feet on the multibeam sonar.

4.3 Sound Speed

Detailed measurements of the sound speed profile (SSP) through the water column are crucial in multibeam surveys. Changes in the SSP will not only affect acoustic distance measurements but can also cause refraction or bending of the sonar path as it passes through layers in the water column with different velocities. An AML Oceanographic Smart•X was used to measure the speed of sound of the water column and the depth at which the SSP was measured. Casts were taken during survey operations over both a temporal and spatial distribution to track sound speed profile changes. In total, four SSP measurements were collected and applied to the multibeam data.

5.0 DATA PROCESSING

5.1 Multibeam Bathymetry

Processing of multibeam data was conducted utilizing Caris Hydrographic Information Processing System (HIPS) version 11.3.8 multibeam analysis and processing software and EIVA NaviModel Producer version 4.3.1.

In Caris HIPS, the patch test data was analyzed, and alignment corrections were calculated and applied during processing. Trimble Applanix POS/MV True Heave® was applied to correct for wave-induced vertical motion. In addition, the real-time navigation solution was overwritten with the post-processed Smoothed Best Estimated Trajectory (SBET) solution, which included updated heading, attitude, and navigation. Sound speed profiles from the numerous profiles acquired while the vessel was underway were used to correct multibeam slant range measurements and compensate for any ray path bending. The algorithm used to apply casts was nearest in time. In the Caris subset editor, a set of lines was reviewed together for line-to-line comparison to ensure agreement to one another in a Caris session.

The full-resolution, corrected, and partially edited data was exported from Caris and imported into EIVA NaviModel Producer for the final analysis and editing of the erroneous data points and fliers. Where needed for subtle surface cleaning, in areas of relatively level seafloor, a subset of the data was selected and the EIVA EC-3D algorithm was implemented. In this method, points falling within a one-meter sphere are compared to the average surface within the same sphere and flagged if the points exceeded a user set limit of approximately +/- 0.15 feet from the average surface. During this process, the hydrographer views the statistics and points to make experience-based decisions on adjusting the statistical values, by use of a slider bar to adjust the parameters for the acceptance or rejection of data points.

5.2 Side Scan Sonar

Side scans operate by emitting a fan-shaped acoustic pulse that radiates outward from the sonar towfish in a direction perpendicular to the heading of the instrument, to the "side," port and starboard. The fanshape of the pulse is oriented so that only a very narrow strip of the seafloor receives any energy. As the transmitted energy encounters the seafloor and objects on it, some energy is reflected back and received at the sonar transducer, which converts the returning acoustic pressure wave into electrical voltage, which is recorded relative to the elapsed time from the initial transmission. This roundtrip of the acoustic pulse is commonly referred to as a "ping." The faster the ping rate, the shorter the distance that can be mapped before the process is repeated for the next ping. Stronger reflections from the seabed or objects create higher voltages or signals; conversely, when no energy returns due to the pulse being blocked from advancing outward by objects proud of the bottom, no signal is returned and an acoustic shadow is created. Acoustic shadows are an important component in understanding a side scan sonar image as they can help lend a sense of vertical dimension.

The side scan sonar data for this project was processed using Chesapeake Technologies' SonarWiz (V7.07.04) sonar processing software. Each side scan sonar transect was imported, bottom-tracked, and gain adjusted. Layback corrections and heading offsets were adjusted subtly, on a line-by-line basis, to help register the imagery to the multibeam data, which established target positions with a high degree of accuracy. Although both high (600 kHz) and low (300 kHz) data was recorded, only the high-frequency data was used for interpretation due to the higher detail and resolution it provided. Data was acquired on both the 25- and 35-meter (75- and 100-foot, respectively) ranges for the main transects; however, a few transects were run with wider swath settings (100 meter; 330 foot) to provide an overview of the area, as shown in Figure 7.

5.3 Sub-Bottom Profiler

Sub-bottom profilers are low-frequency acoustic systems designed to penetrate bottom material and provide a cross-sectional profile of the seafloor or riverbed beneath the survey transect. The lowfrequency aspects of these systems limit their resolution; but, in general, they may show regions of anomalous return off of objects which may be of archaeological interest. Due to the relatively broad beam widths, sub-bottom profilers can detect pipes, wreckage, or other objects that may exhibit a cylindrical, or partially cylindrical, profile to the direction of the survey transect, by receiving acoustic returns from the normal faces of the targets as the instrument approaches, passes over, and moves away from the object. This return is typically displayed as a hyperbolic shape with the apex of the hyperbole defining the closest point of approach the instrument made to the target.

The sub-bottom profiler data was also processed using Chesapeake Technologies' SonarWiz (V7.07.04) sonar processing software. The data was imported, bottom tracked, and gain adjusted before being reviewed for anomalous features.

5.4 Magnetometer

A marine magnetometer is an instrument that can measure the Earth's total magnetic field, which is influenced by many things, including the presence of objects containing ferrous material.

The magnetometer data was also processed in Chesapeake Technologies' SonarWiz (V7.07.04) processing software. The software applied the 17.5-meter (56.5-foot) layback offset to the magnetic readings and allowed the data to be reviewed with filters applied to remove the broad, high-level readings and accentuate the residual readings of smaller local objects. The data was adjusted by removing the average total field observed within the survey area on May 10, 2021, which was approximately 52,000 nT (nanoTesla or gamma). The data was gridded at a 5-foot interval using a nearest neighbor method. A color zone and 10-nT contour interval image, Figure 8, were created and compared to the other datasets — multibeam, side scan, and sub-bottom — for target correlation.

Figure 7. Side scan overview line River-X1. 100 meters per side (330 feet); 200-meter total swath (660-feet). Bright yellow represents strong acoustic return; dark brown/black equals weak or no return.

David Evans and Associates, Inc., Marine Services Division 12

Large Piles (enlarged); note acoustic shadows.

Small Piles (enlarged); note acoustic shadows.

6.0 INTERPRETATION AND RESULTS

After careful review of the multibeam, side scan, sub-bottom and magnetometer datasets, over 300 targets were identified. A concerted effort was made to reconcile any targets which may have been identified multiple times due to overlapping data or detection by various types of equipment; however, due to the density of targets, some redundancy may exist. In addition to the numerous targets listed in Appendix A, several morphological features are worth noting, which, due to their geometry, may represent man-made features, such as access ramps for construction, and are shown in Figure 9.

The survey data acquired by all four geophysical sensors were of good quality, but the nature of the survey area made certain datasets more useful than others for assessing possible features of interest in support of the archaeological assessment of the site. The proximity of basalt outcrops and the steel bridge structure limited the magnetometer's effectiveness to some degree, although a few isolated targets were noted. The sub-bottom profiler data showed no strong anomaly presenting the classic hyperbolic return signature that may be expected from large debris and wreckage, although some minor hyperbolic targets were logged.

The majority of the targets delineated appear to be piles, either from the old exit ramp from the first bridge, or possibly associated with construction staging when the bridge was retrofitted and new bridge piers built. Figures 10 and 11 show the distribution of pilings found within the survey area.

Of the three distinct magnetometer anomalies, anomaly 2 correlates with an apparent large tire, which is well mapped in the side scan and bathymetric data. Due to the extremely shallow water, the magnetometer came very close to this target, which would explain the strong signature collected on two separated transects. The magnetometer anomaly 3 correlates with an apparent pile of material just upstream from a new bridge pier and may represent something buried within the material (Figure 12).

Figure 12. Tire in side scan (left) and multibeam bathymetry (right) associated with magnetic anomaly-2. Rubble mound associated with magnetic anomaly-3 can be seen in the side scan image toward the bottom.

The sub-bottom profiler data showed a very distinct reflector running through most of the data, at a depth below the river bottom of approximately 2-5 feet, that may represent the pre-impoundment ground surface (Figure 13).

Figure 13. Sub-bottom line 2335 showing strong subsurface reflector, which may represent the old ground surface prior to flooding by the Bonneville Dam. Horizontal scale lines at 5-foot.

The multibeam data also clearly defined some large sections of relic nets streaming downstream from some of the piles under the existing bridge (Figure 14). No floats or lines were noted above the water in these areas.

Figure 14. Oblique view of multibeam data looking North showing large section of relic net (white arrow) streaming from abandoned piles under the existing Hood River Bridge.

Figure 9. Map view (left) and oblique (below) hillshade images of the multibeam bathymetric data showing several interesting geomorphic shapes. These features are located on the western, downsteam side of the survey area and may represent man-made features such as an access

David Evans and Associates, Inc., Marine Services Division 18

David Evans and Associates, Inc., Marine Services Division 19

7.0 SUMMARY

A successful geophysical survey was conducted near the Hood River Bridge in March of 2021 to assess possible targets or anomalies in support of archeological studies supporting the planning of the new bridge. Over 300 targets were catalogued, and a comprehensive dataset of various sensors was recorded, which could be useful for other project applications in the future.

It may be useful to investigate some of the features highlighted by this survey by using a small, remotely operated vehicle (ROV) to obtain photographic or video imagery of features of interest.

APPENDIX A

Hood River Bridge Target List

Hood River Bridge Target List, Washington SPCS – S Zone, USFT

Large Pile Small Pile

Large Pile

Small Pile

Small Pile

Small Pile Small Pile

Small Pile

Small Pile

Small Pile Small Pile

Small Pile

Small Pile

APPENDIX B

Additional Cross River Data

APPENDIX B – ADDITIONAL CROSS RIVER DATA

Additional data was collected during transits between the Port of Hood River Marina, on the Oregon side of the Columbia River, and the primary survey site on the Washington side of the river. The transects were run generally along, or close to, the currently planned alignment of the new Hood River Bridge. These transect lines were used for adjusting and checking the systems, as well as to gain some more regional context for understanding bottom condition in the area. The data could be evaluated at a higher detail level at a later time, as part of a separate contract, if needed. The attached images, Figures 1-4, display the bathymetric, side scan and sub-bottom data collected across the river. Magnetometer data was not collected due to the sensor being set up for shallow water work in the primary survey area.

Figure 1: Additional multibeam bathymetric data collected across the Columbia River during March 2021 geophysical survey for the Port of Hood River. View looking NW.

Figure 2: Additional multibeam bathymetric data collected across the Columbia River during March 2021 geophysical survey for the Port of Hood River. View looking SE.

Figure 3: Additional side scan sonar data collected across the Columbia River during March 2021 geophysical survey for the Port of Hood River. Range is 300 feet per side, total swath is 600 feet. Bridge piers from existing bridge are clearly visible (white arrow, TYP). Large sand waves dominate the image (yellow arrow, TYP).

Figure 4: Additional chirp sub-bottom profiler collected across the Columbia River during March 2021 geophysical survey for the Port of Hood River.

Top: Line 1831, 0.4-4.0 kHz 40ms pulse, Scale 5-foot/division Bottom: Line 0017 0.7-12 kHz 20ms pulse, Scale 5-foot/division Boring locations B1-B3 are approximate and for general reference only.

