

UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER
AD487475
NEW LIMITATION CHANGE
TO Approved for public release, distribution unlimited
FROM Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Critical Technology; JUN 1966. Other requests shall be referred to Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
AUTHORITY
USAEWES ltr dtd 3 Mar 1972

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

AD 487475

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 3-630

ANALOGS OF YUMA TERRAIN IN THE MIDDLE EAST DESERT

Report 4

by

C. R. Kolb

W. K. Dornbusch, Jr.



Volume I

June 1966

Sponsored by

U. S. Army Materiel Command
Project No. 1-V-0-25001-A-131


Conducted by

U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station
CORPS OF ENGINEERS
Vicksburg, Mississippi

ARMY-MRC VICKSBURG, MISS

This document is subject to special export controls and each transmittal to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with prior approval of U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station.

DISCLAIMER NOTICE



THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST
QUALITY AVAILABLE. THE COPY
FURNISHED TO DTIC CONTAINED
A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF
PAGES WHICH DO NOT
REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.

FOREWORD

This study is part of Research and Development Project No. 1-V-O-25001-A-131 entitled "Military Evaluation of Geographic Areas," which was originally assigned to the U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES) by the Office, Chief of Engineers, and is being performed under the sponsorship of the R&D Directorate, U. S. Army Materiel Command. The project is directed by the Area Evaluation Branch of the Mobility and Environmental Division, WES.

This report is a revision of an earlier unpublished report (Analog of Yuma Terrain in the Near East Desert, dated May 1960), which was prepared almost entirely from published reports, maps, and photographs utilizing techniques developed by the Geology Branch, WES. Mr. W. K. Dornbusch, Jr., conducted a supplemental map and literature survey and applied the latest mapping techniques to prepare the folio maps. At various times Messrs. H. K. Woods and J. D. Broughton, Geology Branch, WES, assisted in the assembly of data and revisions and preparation of the final plates. The work was done under the immediate supervision of Dr. C. E. Kolb, Chief, Geology Branch, Soils Division, WES. The text was written by Dr. Kolb and Mr. Dornbusch. Technical assistance in various phases of the work was provided by Mr. W. E. Grabau, Chief, Area Evaluation Branch, and Mr. J. R. Compton, Chief, Embankment and Foundation Branch, WES. The project was under the general supervision of Messrs. W. J. Turnbull, Chief of the Soils Division, and W. G. Shockley, Chief of the Mobility and Environmental Division, WES.

Directors of the WES during this study and preparation of this report were Col. Edmund H. Lang, CE., Col. Alex G. Sutton, Jr., CE, and Col. John R. Oswalt, Jr., CE. Technical Director was Mr. J. B. Tiffany.

CONTENTS

Volume I

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	iii
SUMMARY.	vii
PART I: INTRODUCTION.	1
Background	1
Study Area	1
Purpose and Scope.	2
Sources of Information	3
This Report.	4
PART II: GENERAL COMPARISON OF YUMA AND MCD	6
Factors Used in the Comparison	6
Analogy.	6
PART III: TERRAIN FACTORS AND MAPPING METHODS	8
Bases for Selection of Factors	8
Geometry or Form Factors	8
Ground and Vegetation Factors.	11
Examples of Designations of Yuma Terrain	12
Summary of Mapping Methods	15
PART IV: DEVELOPMENT OF ANALOGS	21
Method	21
Analysis of General Applicability of Analog Technique	25
Problems and Recommendations for Solution.	26
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	31
TABLES 1-4	
APPENDIX A: THE PROBLEM OF TERRAIN COMPARISON	A1
Quantitative Versus Qualitative Approach	A1
Terrain Factors Versus Terrain Effects	A2
Scales and Problems of Generalization.	A4

Volume II

PLATES 1-19

SUMMARY

To evaluate the adequacy and suitability of the Yuma Proving Ground (including the Sand Hills) as a test site representative of world desert conditions, it is necessary to determine the extent of occurrence of Yuma terrain types in other world desert areas (including the Middle East desert (MED). In order that valid comparisons may be made, a uniform system of describing, mapping, and comparing desert terrain must be employed.

In this report both the Yuma Proving Ground and the MED are mapped in terms of general or aggregate terrain, geometry, ground, and vegetation factors. General terrain factors selected for use include physiography, hypsometry, and landform-surface conditions. Geometry, ground, and vegetation factors selected for evaluation are characteristic plan-profile, occurrence of slopes greater than 50 percent, characteristic slope, characteristic relief, soil type, soil consistency, type of surface rock, and vegetation characteristics. Terrain-factor data are synthesized to establish the degree of analogy of a particular MED area with selected portions of the Yuma Proving Ground. This synthesis includes compilation of geometry, ground, and vegetation analog maps--through combinations of their component terrain-factor maps.

A terrain-type analog map is prepared by superimposing the geometry, ground, and vegetation analog maps and stratifying the resulting combinations. Highly analogous MED tracts exhibit exact or closely approximate combinations of terrain-factor mapping units found at Yuma, and the degree of analogy decreases directly as the similarity to such combinations decreases.

Generally speaking, the terrain of the MED is moderately analogous to that found at the Yuma Proving Ground. Approximately 19 percent of the study area is highly analogous, 51 percent is moderately analogous, 24 percent is slightly analogous, and 5 percent is inappreciably analogous to terrain types found in Yuma. Approximately 1 percent of the MED was mapped as nonanalogous.

The techniques used in preparation of these maps permit comparison of terrain in areas mapped at different scales as well as in areas mapped at similar scales, enabling for the first time comparison of all the deserts of the Northern Hemisphere.




Fig. 1. Middle East desert

ANALOGS OF YUMA TERRAIN IN THE MIDDLE EAST DESERT

PART I: INTRODUCTION

Background

1. This report is one of a series comparing the terrain of the U. S. Army Proving Ground* at Yuma, Arizona, with other world desert areas. Three of the earlier reports in the series** (i.e. those which compare the Yuma terrain with the deserts of Northeast Africa, South Central Asia, and Mexico) were prepared in very limited numbers. However, copies are on file at the Waterways Experiment Station (WES) and in the Environmental Sciences Branch, Research Division, Research and Development Directorate, Army Materiel Command. TR 3-630, Report 5, Analogs of Yuma Terrain in the Southwest United States Desert, and Report 6, Analogs of Yuma Terrain in the Northwest African Desert, were printed and distributed in substantial numbers because of the military and scientific interest generated by them. A moderate number of this present report, Analogs of Yuma Terrain in the Middle East Desert, have been published because of current interest in the desert analog studies.

Study Area

2. The location of the study area and its geographic subdivisions are shown in fig. 1. Desert boundaries were based primarily on homoclimatic maps compiled by Dr. Perevil Meigs.^{89†} However, since Meigs' boundary determinations were agriculturally oriented, with temperature and rainfall the most important factors considered, modifications have

* The Yuma Proving Ground was formerly designated as the Yuma Test Station. Because the change in designation was made after the plates in Volume II of this report had been printed; the Yuma maps in Volume II carry the old designation of test station.

** See list on inside of back cover of this report.

† Raised numbers refer to correspondingly numbered items in the Selected Bibliography at end of main text.

been made on the basis of geomorphic, soil, and vegetation data collected in the present study.

Purpose and Scope

3. A primary aim of the overall project is to evaluate the Yuma Proving Ground area (including the Sand Hills) as a test site representing world desert terrain conditions. Obviously, Yuma's suitability and adequacy as such a test site are related to (a) the extent to which Yuma terrain types or conditions occur in other world desert areas, and (b) whether significant desert terrain types occurring elsewhere are lacking at Yuma. To make these determinations, a uniform system of describing, mapping, and comparing desert terrain had to be established. A system which satisfies most of these requirements has been developed and tested through its application to Yuma and several other world desert areas. In addition, comparisons of the climate of the Yuma Proving Ground with that of other world desert areas^{91b} have been made by the Environmental Protection Research Division, U. S. Army Natick Laboratories,* Natick, Massachusetts. The climatic and terrain studies together should provide an evaluation of the suitability of the Yuma area as a testing ground for military operations and materiel under conditions representative of those prevailing in desert areas in other parts of the world. The worldwide distribution of desert terrain types and their relative importance can be determined by examining the other reports of this series (see paragraph 1).

4. This report is primarily concerned with utilizing the established techniques to (a) map the various terrain factors in the Middle East desert (MED), (b) determine the distribution of terrain types found at Yuma within the MED, (c) determine degrees of analogy between the terrain types of the MED and those of the Yuma area, and (d) contribute to an overall evaluation of the suitability of the Yuma Proving

* The Natick Laboratories was called the "Quartermaster Research and Development Center" prior to 1962.

Ground for testing men and materiel for military operations in desert areas of the world.

5. No field surveys were performed in connection with this study. Data used for preparing the terrain-factor maps of the MED and Yuma Proving Ground were restricted to published and unpublished reports and maps.

Sources of Information

6. Approximately 200 references covering MED were reviewed during this study. The most useful of these publications are listed in the Selected Bibliography. The references varied from general reviews concerning the entire area, to travelers' accounts along routes in MED, to detailed descriptions of specific localities. Written data concerning the physiography, landforms, and general terrain features of the MED are relatively scarce. The travelers' accounts have been confined to inhabited areas such as the Hasa Plain, the Hadhramaut, the Asir-Yemen Highlands, the lower Tigris-Euphrates floodplain, the Dead Sea area, and along established routes connecting principal cities. Several explorers, notably Thesiger, Thomas, and Philby, have penetrated the vast, relatively unexplored interior of the area and have contributed valuable written accounts of their experiences.

7. Complete coverage of the area was provided by several sets of small-scale maps. Coverage of the entire area at a scale of 1:1,000,000 was available on USAF World Aeronautical Charts and on General Staff Maps prepared by the Geographical Section, War Office, Great Britain. These maps were used in preparing the geometry-factor maps and the physiography and landform-surface condition maps. A recent physiographic map of the Arabian Peninsula at a scale of 1:2,000,000, prepared by the U. S. Geological Survey under the auspices of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, was utilized in establishing the major physiographic boundaries within the Arabian Peninsula. Complete coverage by the U. S. Department of Agriculture World Soil Maps at a scale of 1:1,000,000 was also available.

8. The legends, definitions, and symbols accompanying these maps

were most useful in determination of basic soil types, soil consistencies, and often rock types. The maps were also of some value in the determination of vegetation types. The vegetation map was compiled from several sources, with the British Admiralty Geographical Handbooks of the area being an important source. The hypsometric map of Yuma was adapted from U. S. Strategic Charts at a scale of 1:500,000, whereas USAF Aeronautical Planning Charts at a scale of 1:5,000,000 were used in preparing the hypsometric map of MED.

9. The principal sources of information concerning the Yuma Proving Ground were the following: A report, Terrain Study of the Yuma Test Station Area, Arizona, prepared for WES by a group from Purdue University in March 1955;⁸⁶ Handbook of Yuma Environment, published by Office, Quartermaster General, in February 1953 (Report No. 200);^{91a} and A Study of Desert Surface Conditions by Thomas Clements and others, published by Quartermaster Research and Development Command in April 1957 (Technical Report KP-53).¹⁶ Sources of the photographs used in the landform and physiographic tabulations (plates 15, 15A, 15B, 19, 19A, 19B, and 19C) are indicated by a credit line under the photographs. Photographs illustrating the landforms were not restricted to the study area; however, the physiographic pictures were restricted to the MED.

This Report

10. This report comprises two volumes--the text (vol I) and a folio of plates (vol II). Except for two sets of plates (15 and 15A, and 19 through 19C) which present tabular descriptions and photographs of the physiography and landform-surface conditions of the Yuma terrain, the folio consists of drawings, most of which show a map of the MED and a map of the Yuma Proving Ground to facilitate comparison. Detailed explanation of the mapping procedures used in preparation of the plates are given in WES Technical Report 3-506.⁹⁰ In general, the legends on the plates are self-explanatory; however, additional explanations of each legend may be found in TR 3-506.

11. The remainder of this volume (vol I) consists of Parts II-IV,

four tables, and an appendix. Part II briefly summarizes the general analogy of the Yuma terrain to that of the MED. Part III describes the terrain factors used to develop the analogy and the methods used in mapping them. Part IV discusses the methods of analog development, and analyzes the mapping technique from the standpoints of its general applicability and deficiencies. Tables 1-3 summarize data on the distribution of Yuma terrain factors within the MED while table 4 summarizes data pertaining to distribution of landscape types in Yuma and the MED and in other world desert areas as given in earlier reports of this series. Appendix A discusses the philosophy of and problems associated with terrain analysis and comparison in general.

PART II: GENERAL COMPARISON OF YUMA AND MED

Factors Used in the Comparison

12. Terrain may be considered to be the aggregate of the physical attributes of an area. Terrain can thus be analyzed and described in terms of numerous component factors. Eight factors, considered to be basic elements of terrain, have been utilized in comparing the terrain at Yuma with that of MED and other world desert areas. These factors fall into three groups: geometry factors, i.e. plan-profile, slope occurrence, slope, and relief; ground factors, i.e. soil type, soil consistency, and surface rock; and vegetation. Plates 1-9 indicate the areal distribution of various ranges of these factors at Yuma and within the MED. Plates 14-19 present general or aggregate terrain factors such as physiography, hypsometry, and landform-surface conditions. The last three factors were not utilized directly in preparing the analog maps (plates 14, 16, and 18). Rather these three factors were mapped primarily to (a) provide a familiar geomorphic sphere of reference or gross terrain picture, and (b) present landscape-terrain factor associations that aided in the mapping, in terms of the eight terrain factors, of regions where little information beyond landform identification is available.

Analogy

13. Each of the terrain-factor maps is, in essence, an analog map. Similarly mapped areas at Yuma and within the MED indicate high degrees of analogy from the standpoint of the particular terrain factor under consideration (see plates 1-9). A synthesis of terrain-factor data and maps, resulting in the establishment of varying degrees of analogy of particular MED areas with portions of the Yuma Proving Ground and Sand Hills, has been attempted in plates 10-13. Plates 10-12 show the degree of analogy of geometry, ground, and vegetation factors, respectively, with Yuma, and plate 13 shows degrees of analogy based on all factors considered. Degrees of analogy are expressed as being highly analogous, moderately analogous,

slightly analogous, inappreciably analogous, and not analogous.

14. Generally speaking, the terrain of the MED is moderately analogous to that found at the Yuma Proving Ground. Approximately 19 percent of the study area is highly analogous, 51 percent is moderately analogous, 24 percent is slightly analogous, and 5 percent is inappreciably analogous to terrain types found at Yuma. Large portions of the Hadhramaut Plateau in southern Arabia and of the Jordan Plateau bordering the Dead Sea, covering approximately 1 percent of the study area, were mapped as nonanalogous.

15. Highly analogous areas are found in all the physiographic units of the MED (plates 13, 14, and 17) except for the plateau regions. Mountainous areas mapped as highly analogous include: The Oman Mountains of eastern Arabia, the Asir-Yemen highlands in southwestern portion of the peninsula, and portions of the Hejaz Mountains of northwestern Arabia, and the Zagros Mountains of western Iran. Nonmountainous areas having high degrees of analogy include the coastal plains along the southern and western shores of the peninsula, desert plains and dune fields of central Arabia, and large portions of the vast Tigris-Euphrates floodplains of southern Iraq.

16. Physiographic regions considered to be moderately analogous include: the extensive crystalline hill complex in western Arabia, vast dune areas of the Rub' Al Khali and the Ad Dahna in southern and central Arabia, and large tracts of desert plains of northern Iraq and Syria.

17. Slightly analogous areas are represented physiographically by large areas in the Hadhramaut Plateaus of southern Arabia, the Tuwayq Plateaus of central Arabia, the An Hafud sand dunes in northwestern Arabia, desert plain and plateau areas in southern Iraq and Syria, and the barren volcanic plateaus of western Arabia, Jordan, and southern Syria.

18. Areas exhibiting inappreciable degrees of analogy include large portions of the Hadhramaut and Jordan Plateaus and major areas in the Tuwayq Plateaus. Small areas unworthy of individual identification are found scattered throughout the study area.

PART III: TERRAIN FACTORS AND MAPPING METHODS

Basis for Selection of Factors

19. The mapping of terrain factors involves the selection of component factors that can be precisely defined, mapped, and compared. Any region can be subdivided into areas identifiable by an array of designations or numbers, each representing a value or value range of a specific terrain factor. The complexity of such a system, of course, depends primarily on the number of terrain factors employed. For example, if 20 terrain factors were considered, each area would be identified by an array of 20 symbols, each designating a particular terrain-factor value or range of values. Although this method is plausible, cartographic problems multiply rapidly if it is necessary to map areas exhibiting the same combination of factors and at the same time identify the component terrain-factor values or ranges. Consequently, in the development of the mapping system used herein, considerable effort was spent in limiting the number of terrain factors and at the same time making sure that factors which were important in terrain descriptions were not disregarded. Much effort was also devoted to selecting terrain factors that, when considered in concert, are readily visualized and depicted with a minimum of cartographic complexity. The terrain factors mapped were chosen chiefly because of (a) the importance of each as a basic element of terrain, (b) their ability, when viewed together, to provide a reasonably complete picture of a given terrain, and (c) their military significance.

20. The selection of mapping units, or the terrain-factor stratification, was based on such considerations as (a) naturalistic breaks, (b) availability of data, (c) military significance, and (d) adaptability of the unit to precise and, whenever possible, quantitative definition.

Geometry or Form Factors

Background

21. Landscape, as used in this terrain study, is defined as the

surface form or configuration (geometry) of an area. Historically, the representation of landscapes or surface geometry in plan progressed from simple pictorial symbols on early maps, to hachuring, to the first contour maps in the middle 1880's. The importance of this last step in quantifying cartography cannot be overemphasized; for the first time commensurable vertical as well as horizontal data were included on maps. Advances since that time seem to have been largely concentrated on shading and improved methods of hachuring or pictorial representation. These methods permit a more readily assimilated bird's-eye view of the terrain, but comparison of one such view with another is largely a matter of individual interpretation. Classification and direct measurement of the component parts of such views are necessary before the problems of objective terrain comparison and a host of similar problems can be resolved.

Geometry factors selected

22. Considerable thought has been given to the selection of factors to be included in landscape description. An attempt was made to keep the number of factors at a minimum while still providing a reasonably complete picture of the terrain. Preference was given those factors that could be numerically expressed and rigidly defined and mapped with the data available. Four surface geometry factors (plates 1-4) were finally selected: slope, relief, dissection or spacing of steep slopes, and a composite factor called plan-profile. Using these factors, a region can be described for example as having hills with slopes ranging between 10 and 20 degrees, spaced from 700 to 1000 ft apart, rising to heights between 50 and 100 ft. A less tangible but equally important property necessary to complete this description is the spatial distribution of these three geometry factors; this distribution is termed plan-profile.

23. The need for the plan-profile factor is readily visualized by considering a hypothetical gently sloping plain dissected by numerous deep, narrow drainageways. Such an area would be mapped as having certain ranges of slopes, relief, and slope spacing. Another gently sloping plain with a series of narrow dikes or ridges crossing it would be mapped

with the same ranges of slope, relief, and slope spacing, but the disposition of features composing the landscape in each instance would be different. Profiles of the two landscapes would appear as $\vee\vee$ in the first instance and as $\wedge\wedge$ in the second. In addition, it is desirable to know whether the ridges or drainageways are parallel or intersecting, continuous or discontinuous, i.e., a plan view of the area is needed. Thus, the characteristic plan-profile is a necessary part of landscape definition.

24. The dimensions of the landscape typified by the plan-profile are indicated by relief and slope-occurrence measurements. For example, alluvial aprons scored by steep-sided, shallow washes are mapped with the same plan-profile as extensive, high-standing, dissected plateaus, although the relief and slope-occurrence value ranges are decidedly different. This is considered not only permissible but desirable because, with unrestricted dimensions, the plan-profile allows a convenient mental image of the landscape to be formed. To such an image, known values of slope, relief, and slope occurrence can be assigned and easily assimilated. In the present study, factor values associated with features exhibiting less than 10 ft of relief were considered as microrelief (paragraph 58) and were not included in the landscape descriptions. Consequently, the landscape description is a generalization of the actual ground surface.

Designations of geometry factors

25. Combining the four basic geometry factors provides a convenient method of mapping terrain or landscape in a fairly quantitative fashion. The method is certainly one of the simplest possible. It permits any landscape to be described by a combination of four numbers or number-letter symbols, each representing a particular range of values of plan-profile, slope occurrence, slope, and relief. The combination 1L//,4,1b,2, for example, defines a plain having characteristic slopes of 1 to 3-1/2 percent and scored by roughly parallel, steep-sided washes from 10 to 50 ft deep which are spaced from 1000 to 5000 ft apart. The landscape type could be sketched as shown in fig. 2.

26. It might be pointed out that the median value or some function (square root, sine, cube root) of the median value of the slope occurrence, slope, and relief units could be substituted for the unit number or

number-letter symbol if a more direct landscape designation is desired. Similarly, actual values could be substituted for the directly measurable components of the plan-profile. (Methods of quantifying the plan-profile are presented in Appendix A of WES

Technical Report 3-506.)⁹⁰ Although this procedure makes the landscape designation more truly quantitative, the necessary expenditure of time in analysis and the paucity of necessarily detailed maps made its use impractical for the present study.




Fig. 2. Landscape representation showing use of number and number-letter symbols to describe surface geometry factors

Ground and Vegetation Factors

27. Although the legends on plates 6-9 are self-explanatory, a point concerning the aggregate nature of the ground and vegetation factors should be mentioned. Each factor is actually composed of several factors or properties that could be defined, stratified, and mapped. Surface rock, for example, could be stratified in quantitative values of compressive strength, abrasion resistance, sphericity of fragments, proportion of free silica, and many other properties. As the ranges of these properties, for the most part, overlap any stratification based on the widely utilized genetic classification of rock, tabulation of these properties within a genetic or descriptive classification is difficult. The alternative of preparing a separate map for each property is, in the light of present knowledge, a formidable if not impossible task. Nevertheless, some method of separate mapping or, preferably, synthesizing through meaningful tabulations must be developed for quantitative ground-factor data before a truly quantitative method of terrain mapping can be devised. In this report, the vegetation tabulation (plate 9) presents some quantitative values for the

mapping units, and the surface-rock tabulation (plate 8) presents property ranges of a more qualitative nature. Although the mapping of ground and vegetation factors used herein is considered adequate for the aims of the present study, it is not considered a final effort in quantitative ground-factor mapping. A more quantitative system is certainly needed and is being used in actual terrain-effect testing programs.

Examples of Designations of Yuma Terrain

28. Although the terrain-type designation provides a reasonably precise and partially quantitative description of a region, it is admittedly difficult to visualize an area by reading a group of numbers or number-letter symbols until the classification system and symbology are thoroughly understood. This capability must, of course, be developed through continued use and familiarization with the terrain-factor ranges designated by the various numbers and number-letter symbols comprising the terrain types. A few of the landscape and terrain types found at Yuma are briefly described in the following paragraphs in an attempt to initiate familiarity with the system in a relatively well-known desert region. The types are also described within the framework of the well-known and widely utilized genetic system of landform classification (plate 18) to provide an even more familiar base.

Mountainous regions

29. Mountainous regions, i.e. basin ranges, occupy slightly more than 18 percent of the combined Yuma Proving Ground-Sand Hills area (plates 5 and 18). Landscape types 4,6,5,7; 4,6,5,6; and 4,5,5,5 are found within the basin ranges. These numbers identify mapping units or value ranges of plan-profile, slope occurrence, characteristic slope, and characteristic relief, respectively. Plan-profile unit 4 indicates that topographic highs (a) occupy more than 60 percent of the area, (b) are crested or peaked, (c) are nonlinear, i.e. length is less than 5 times width, and (d) are randomly arranged (see plate 1). Slope occurrence units 5 and 6 (see plate 2) identify areas where the number of such slopes is 100 to 200 per 10 miles and more than 200 per 10 miles, respectively.

Characteristic slope unit 5 (plate 3) indicates that the most commonly occurring or characteristic slope is between 26.5 and 45 degrees (approximately 50 to 100 percent). Characteristic relief of 100 to 400, 400 to 1000, and more than 1000 ft is indicated by relief units 5, 6, and 7, respectively (plate 4). All the basin ranges (plates 6, 11, and 18) are characterized by soil-rock association unit 1 which identifies a mosaic of bare rock and stony soils with a few scattered patches of coarse- and fine-grained soils. Bare rock and stony soils cover less than 40 percent of the area mapped. The small 4,5,5,5 area immediately south of the White Tank Mountains (plate 5) is characterized by surface rock unit 3a, i.e. true extrusive rocks formed by solidification of molten material that poured out on the surface of the earth, e.g. basalt, dacite, etc. (plate 8). Surface rock unit 4, metamorphic rock, predominates in the 4,5,5,6 areas of the Muggins Mountains; however, areas of true extrusive rock (unit 3a) are also found. In the 4,6,5,7 type mountains south of Growler, Arizona, areas of undifferentiated sedimentary (unit 5) and metamorphic (unit 4) rock are found. This landscape (4,6,5,7) is also found in the Palomas Mountains in association with surface rock unit 2 (intrusive igneous rock). The 4,6,5,6 landscape type is the most widespread of the mountain types at Yuma. In the Trigo and Chocolate Mountains the 4,6,5,6 landscape type is found in areas of metamorphic rock (unit 4) and surface rock complexes of true extrusive rock (unit 3a) and volcanic ejecta (unit 3b). In the portions of the Middle and White Tank Mountains, the landscape type is associated with true extrusive rocks (unit 3a). In the Castle Dome Mountains the 4,6,5,6 landscape type is found in association with the 3a-3b extrusive rock complex, undifferentiated sedimentary rock (unit 5), and metamorphic rock (unit 4). All the basin ranges are characterized by vegetation unit 2 (plates 9 and 18) which indicates a ground coverage of 1 to 5 percent consisting primarily of widely spaced thorny shrubs, bushes, and low trees. It seems rather obvious, then, that once the classification and symbology of the employed method are understood, a designation such as terrain type 4,6,5,6,1,3a,2 can convey a considerable amount of information regarding the area. In contrast, the classical methods of geomorphic or terrain description

would require several paragraphs or pages to convey the same information, and an area described by one person might be unrecognizable as the same area when described by another.

Alluvial fans and aprons

30. Alluvial fans and aprons occupy slightly more than 44 percent of the combined Yuma Proving Ground-Sand Hills area (plates 5 and 18). Landscape types 1L,4,1b,2; 1L,4,2,2; and 7,1,1b,1 characterize the fan and apron regions. Plan-profile unit 1L indicates that topographic highs (a) occupy more than 60 percent of the area, (b) are flat-topped, (c) are linear, and (d) are randomly arranged or nonparallel. Slope occurrence unit 4 identifies areas where the number of slopes steeper than 50 percent ranges from 20 to 100 per 10 miles. Slope units 1b and 2 indicate that the characteristic slope is between 0.5 and 2 degrees and 2 and 6 degrees, respectively. Characteristic relief of 10 to 50 ft is indicated by relief unit 2. The 7,1,1b,1 landscape describes an area exhibiting (a) no pronounced topographic highs or lows, (b) no slopes steeper than 50 percent, (c) a characteristic slope of between 0.5 and 2 degrees, and (d) characteristic relief of less than 10 ft. The 1L,4,1b,2 landscape is the most widespread and is usually associated with soil type unit 6, i.e. sand and gravel mixed with minor amounts of finer material, and soil consistency unit 10, i.e. noncohesive surface layer less than 12 in. thick underlain by a dense layer. The most common vegetation found with this combination of factors is a complex of units 3 and 4 (moderately spaced thorny shrubs, bushes, low scrubby trees, herbs, or clumps and open stands of coarse grass with scattered denser stands of shrubs and scrubby trees). Areas of soil type unit 4 (gravel) with soil consistency unit 9 (crusted surface of noncohesive pebbles or gravels overlying noncohesive materials), and soil type unit 8 (silt) with soil consistency unit 10 (noncohesive surface layer underlain within 12 in. by dense layer) are also found within this landscape type. Vegetation again is usually a 3-4 unit complex. In general, the same ground and vegetation factor combinations are associated with the 1L,4,2,2 landscape type. The 7,1,1b,1 landscape type is characterized by soil type unit 6 (sand and gravel), soil consistency unit 10 (noncohesive surface layer underlain within 12 in. by a dense layer), and

vegetation unit 3. Areas of soil type unit 8 (silt) and soil consistency unit 4 (firm) are also found in association with landscape type 7,1,1b,1 and vegetation unit 3.

Other landforms

31. Examination of plates 5, 9, 11, and 18 provides similar descriptions for the remaining landforms (which comprise approximately 38 percent of the area) found at Yuma. Consolidated and unconsolidated hills, floodplains and terraces, and dunes occupy most of the area not composed of basin ranges or fans and aprons. If the terrain types composing these various landforms are determined from the maps, it will be obvious that, even within a region as small as the Yuma Proving Ground, classical landforms are not homogeneous from the standpoint of terrain types, and the same terrain types can be found within "different" landforms. These are important points that should be borne in mind if any attempts are made to compare regions on the basis of classical geomorphology.

Summary of Mapping Methods

General concepts

32. The mapping methods are reviewed in more detail in the Handbook (WES TR 3-506) cited in paragraph 10; therefore, only a general discussion is presented here. Basically, the primary function of any map is to show the plan distribution of classes of things. These "things" may represent ranges of elevation (as on contour maps), vegetation types, countries, or innumerable other classes or groupings. For accurate mapping, the precision of the methods and techniques employed varies directly as the quantitateness of these classes. For example, fairly qualitative classes such as physiographic units can be mapped with qualitative data and fairly subjective procedures, whereas the accurate mapping of hypsometric, slope, and relief classes requires quantitative data as well as precise and objective mapping techniques.

33. Furthermore, it has been found that great differences in mapping scale exert relatively little influence on subjective procedures, but often produce complications when precise and objective mapping techniques

are utilized. This is especially true in going from large-scale to small-scale mapping and indicates that scalar-determined generalization can be easily handled in mapping qualitative classes with subjective techniques; but this generalization is difficult to describe when precise and objective mapping techniques are utilized. In fact, the scalar generalization resulting when such techniques are employed can only be determined through collection of empirical data in actual mapping at small and large scales. Although some comparative data have been accumulated, in most cases it is currently only possible to estimate scalar effects. In areas such as the Southwestern United States where map coverage at various scales is fairly good, some mapping and scalar correlations or relations can be observed. For example, if objective mapping techniques and 1:25,000 maps with a 10-ft contour interval are employed, many ranges associated with the basin and-range region of the U. S. will include patches of slope units 3, 4, and 5, with unit 4 being areally predominant. If the same techniques and 1:250,000 maps with 100-ft contour intervals are employed, these ranges would be mapped as slope unit 3. Obviously, if large and small regions are to be compared in terms of terrain factors such as slope, these differences cannot be allowed. Thus, all terrain-factor mapping must utilize as a base the same contour interval, sampling area, and scale to ensure that true areally dominant classes will be shown at small scales.

34. Referring again to the U. S. basin-and-range region, let us assume that only 1:250,000 maps with 100-ft contour intervals are available for certain lithologically similar ranges, and the resulting slope when some established objective mapping technique is utilized is unit 3. Empirical data in these type areas permit prediction with some assurance that if maps with a 10-ft contour interval were utilized the predominant slope unit would actually be unit 4. Thus, modification of mapping units from a small-scale to large-scale mapping base can often be made with confidence. Where good map coverage is available at different scales for a region, establishment of these modifying relations is relatively simple though tedious. In other relatively "unmapped" desert areas, subjective estimates must suffice until enough maps and empirical mapping data are available to allow objective determination of scalar effects. Nevertheless,

since ranges of values are used in the mapping scheme employed in this report, subjective estimates can be made with considerable confidence in some areas. Spot-mapping of world desert tracts, for which both large-scale and small-scale maps are available, has also provided numerous landform-terrain factor associations that aid in base-scale (1:25,000) and contour-interval (10 ft) mapping of relatively unknown areas. Many of these associations are indicated in plates 19, 19A, 19B, and 19C.

35. The preceding general concepts are considered in establishing procedures for general mapping of geometry, ground, and vegetation factors. Probably the most important point is that the mapping bases utilized for the various factors, with the exception of physiography and hypsometry, are "large scale" in nature. Therefore, they are closely allied with the Yuma area. Through the areal generalization process just described, the same mapping base was employed in the small-scale mapping of world desert areas. In geometry-factor mapping, a scale of 1:25,000, contour interval of 10 ft, and a 1-mile-diameter sampling circle were employed as the datum, and fairly objective techniques for mapping Yuma and world deserts were established. Areas of geometry factors mapped in this manner are considered to be characterized by a restrictive geometry-factor type. Although the limits of the ground- and vegetation-factor mapping classes were established with all possible precision, fairly qualitative data and subjective techniques were employed in actual mapping of these factors. Existing soils, geologic, agricultural, and vegetation maps, written descriptions, and newly established landform-ground factor associations were necessarily the primary bases for mapping. The objective sampling and mapping techniques required for ground-factor mapping in actual field investigations have been explored but could not be employed in the present study.

Mapping complexes

36. One of the more important concepts in the method employed in terrain-factor mapping is the use of complexes to illustrate dual classifications. Mapping is accomplished within the pertinent area by simply showing the two classifications (mapping units) on either side of horizontal, vertical, or diagonal lines. This results in the fractional or banded

symbolizations illustrated in plates 1-9. Complexes may be either areal or gross-component.

37. Areal complexes indicate the existence of two predominant mapping units within a given area, for example, these complexes are mapped in regions where two major areally restricted soil types occur but cannot be separately delineated because of the smallness of the mapping scale or lack of detailed information. It follows that areal complexes become less important as scales become larger and as the amount of mapping information increases. Terrain-factor complexes represent mosaics of factor classes or mapping units; i.e., they indicate distinct, areally restricted tracts of specific, dominant mapping units rather than mixtures of these units. The legends of plates 1-9 explain the significance of the symbolization utilized in mapping areal complexes. It should be mentioned that for cartographic reasons, areal complexes of geometry factors are mapped only where the plan-profile factor is mapped as an areal complex.

38. The gross-component or gross-restrictive complex is used solely in geometry-factor mapping. The need for such a complex is obvious. As defined in this study, landscapes are semiquantitative descriptions of terrain geometry designated by four numbers or number-letter symbols, each corresponding to mapping units of the four geometry factors. Each landscape, however, is composed of smaller landscapes and is in turn part of a larger or next-order landscape. The lower limit of such landscapes has been set by definition as those exhibiting relief of at least 10 ft, i.e. those generated by a 10-ft contour interval. In most instances this landscape adequately depicts terrain geometry. In some cases, however, such as the situation illustrated in fig. 3, this landscape forms a component part of a larger or gross landscape and must be mapped to obtain an adequate portrayal of the area. Note that in fig. 3 a parallel ridge area with ridges from 2 to 10 miles apart comprises the gross landscape, whereas the plain between these ridges is a component (restrictive) landscape. Two scales of generalization are used in this portrayal. Using the plan-profile factor as an example, the restrictive, or component, plan-profile is determined by utilizing a sampling circle 1 mile in diameter, a contour interval of

10 ft, and a map scale of 1:25,000. At least two characteristic plan-profile types will be found: one for the plains and one for the ridges. The gross plan-profile is determined utilizing a 35-mile-diameter sampling circle and 1:250,000 maps with 100-ft contour intervals. Obviously, a gross plan-profile can be divided into a minimum of two restrictive, component types, either of which can be mapped with the gross plan-profile. Each restrictive plan-profile must exhibit relief of a lower order than the gross plan-profile if a gross type is to be mapped. This qualification explains why many areas are shown on maps with only restrictive plan-profiles, i.e. characteristic relief within a 1-mile circle falls in the same relief class as that within a 35-mile circle.

39. The remaining geometry factors simply provide additional data concerning the plan-profile. The meaning or significance of the




Fig. 3. Schematic relation between gross and component landscapes

symbolization used in mapping the gross-component complex varies somewhat, depending on the geometry factor mapped; however, the legends on plates 1-4 should provide adequate explanation.

PART IV: DEVELOPMENT OF ANALOGS

Method

40. As previously mentioned, each of the terrain-factor maps is actually an analog map. Similarly mapped areas at Yuma and within the MED exhibit high degrees of analogy from the standpoint of the particular terrain factor under consideration (see plates 1-9). Table 1 indicates the terrain-factor value ranges, or mapping units, that are found (a) both at Yuma and within the MED, (b) at Yuma only, and (c) within the MED only.

41. A synthesis of terrain-factor data and maps, resulting in the establishment of varying degrees of analogy of particular MED areas with portions of the Yuma Proving Ground and Sand Hills, has been attempted in plates 10-13. This synthesis involved the preparation of (a) a geometry or form analog map, (b) a ground analog map, (c) a vegetation analog map, and (d) a terrain-type analog map.

42. The geometry analog map (plate 10) is merely a modification of the generalized landscape map (plate 5) which was prepared through superposition of the slope, relief, slope occurrence, and plan-profile maps. If a landscape type designated by a combination of four numbers or number-letter symbols (each representing a specific mapping unit of characteristic plan-profile, slope occurrence, slope, and relief) found at Yuma also occurs in the MED, the area so mapped is considered to be highly analogous to the region exhibiting this landscape type at Yuma. An area in the MED, or any other world desert area, exhibiting three numbers or number-letter symbols out of four found in a combination at Yuma is considered to be moderately analogous, and so on. The analog determinations are indicated in table 2. Note that gross landscapes (mapped utilizing a 35-mile-diameter sampling cell and 100-ft contours) are distinguished from component or restrictive types (mapped utilizing a 1-mile-diameter sampling cell and 10-ft contours). Gross landscapes in one area are compared only with gross landscapes in another, as is also the case with restrictive types.

43. The ground analog map (plate 11) was prepared in a manner very similar to that used in the preparation of the geometry analog map, i.e.

by superimposing the soil-type, soil-consistency, and surface-rock maps. In the Yuma area and in the MED, soil-rock units (soil units 1-3) are always found in combination with surface-rock types, and soil units 4-10 are always found in combination with soil consistency types. Hence, ground analogs are designated by only 2 digits (or 4 digits where a complex is mapped); their determination is outlined in table 3. The vegetation analog map (plate 12) is a slight modification of the vegetation map. The MED areas mapped with vegetation units found at Yuma are considered to be highly analogous to their Yuma counterparts.

44. Note that the identity of the various terrain-factor mapping units has been retained, through utilization of their numbers or number-letter symbols, on the three analog maps. Thus, for example, when a tract within a world desert area exhibits two out of four geometry-factor mapping units found in combination at Yuma, it is possible to identify the units common to both areas. In other words, the units that determine the degree of analogy can be identified.

45. The terrain-type analog map (plate 13) was compiled by superimposing the factor maps and identifying individual terrain types by a series of seven numbers or number-letter symbols, each representing a value range or class of the four geometry factors (plan-profile, slope occurrence, slope, and relief), two ground factors (soil type-soil consistency, and soil type-surface rock), and vegetation. The terrain-type arrays in the MED were compared with the most similar terrain-type arrays at Yuma, and the mapping units or components of geometry, ground, and vegetation were assigned values ranging from 0 to 4, based upon the number of mapping units in common with Yuma. In other words, areas delineated on the terrain-type analog map were designated by three digits. The numbers indicate, in sequence, the number of identical geometry, ground, and vegetation-factor value ranges occurring in the MED terrain type that are also found in combination at Yuma. For example, the series 4,2,1 found in the MED indicates that all seven terrain-factor classes characterizing an area in the MED are found in combination at Yuma. The series 2,1,1 mapped in the MED indicates that two of the four geometry-factor classes, one of the two ground-factor classes, and the vegetation

class are found at Yuma. Totaling each series of numbers results in a value ranging from 0 to 7. This range was then divided into five groups by degree of analogy, and the areas exhibiting these value groupings were outlined on the map. Regions where terrain-type analog values resulted in totals 6-7 were mapped as highly analogous; 4-5.5, moderately analogous; 2-3.5, slightly analogous; 0.5-1.5, inappreciably analogous; and 0, not analogous (see plate 13). In general, highly analogous world desert tracts exhibit, or closely approximate, combinations of terrain-factor mapping units found at Yuma, and the degree of analogy decreases directly as the similarity to a combination of mapping units found at Yuma decreases. Although the identity of the individual terrain-factor mapping units has not been retained on the composite analog map, identification can be made easily through examination of the other analog maps.

46. It should be mentioned that all terrain factors were given equal importance in the analog determinations. No serious effort was made to establish a more suitable "weighting" system because of the difficulty inherent in any attempt to determine the relative importance of any terrain factor from the standpoint of (a) geomorphic considerations or (b) general or universal military application. Furthermore, for reasons of simplicity and universality, no attempt has been made to differentiate between degrees of analogy within specific terrain factors. For example, Yuma landscape type 4,4,3,5 is more analogous to landscape 4,5,3,5 than to 4,6,3,5, but in the method employed each of the world desert areas characterized by these landscapes would be given a value of 3, i.e. considered to be moderately analogous. "Weighting" systems for entire terrain factors or terrain-factor mapping units can be devised for many specific considerations and employed when desired.

47. It should also be noted that analog determinations in areas of complexes are based on independent consideration of specific areal or gross-component types. For example, a region mapped as an areal complex consisting of two landscape types, one highly analogous with a type at Yuma and the other slightly analogous, would be mapped as an areal complex showing each degree of analogy. Thus, in the present system, the analogy in regions of areal or gross-component complexes is based on each landscape or

terrain type. Obviously, different methods could be utilized if it were desirable to recognize the analogy of the entire area.

48. The terrain-type analog map thus delineates areas possessing combinations of geometry, ground, and vegetation factors that, when compared with the most similar combination at Yuma, exhibit the same degree of analogy. Any area on the terrain-type analog map exhibiting a particular degree of analogy (high, moderate, etc.) may consist of either a single characteristic terrain type or a mosaic of several characteristic terrain types; however, each type must exhibit the same degree of analogy when compared with the most similar type or types found at Yuma. Utilizing areas in the MED as examples, the An Nafud dune region has been mapped as a single terrain type and the entire area is shown as moderately analogous on the terrain-type analog map (plate 13). In contrast, almost the entire Asir-Yemen Highlands,³ which is mapped as highly analogous, consists of several terrain types, each of which is highly analogous.

49. Careful examination of the terrain-type analog map and various terrain-factor maps emphasizes some interesting points. First, areas composed of different genetically described landforms often exhibit relatively high degrees of analogy. For example, playas and river-terrace surfaces are moderately analogous. If the classical, qualitative, and genetically based geomorphic descriptions of such areas were employed, this similarity would, for the most part, be ignored. Conversely, it is also common to find many different terrain types within a single physiographic "unit," such as volcanics or dunes, established on the basis of qualitative methods. Second, such examination hints at the almost infinite number of special-consideration or -purpose maps which can be prepared utilizing the terrain-factor and analog maps, for example by combining certain terrain-factor maps such as slope, relief, and soil type. Special maps showing resulting combinations and their distribution can be easily prepared. Analog maps for these special combinations can also be compiled. Only slight modification of existing maps is necessary to show the distribution on other world desert areas of Yuma terrain types, landscape types, or any desired terrain-factor combinations. Conversely, maps showing the distribution at

Yuma of terrain types, landscape types, etc., common in other world desert areas can be easily prepared.

50. Table 4 and plates 10-12 of this report and other desert analog folios provide a wealth of data that can be utilized in (a) evaluating Yuma as a test station for specific activities or overall suitability as a testing site, and (b) locating areas that may be more analogous to aggregate world desert conditions than Yuma, or which, when considered with Yuma, will cover a much more representative range of desert terrain. Although table 4 deals solely with landscape types, examination of it in conjunction with plates 6-13 of this report and the other desert analog folios will indicate (a) landscape and terrain types found in other world deserts which do not occur at Yuma, (b) other areas that can supply the types missing at Yuma, (c) the subareas at Yuma that are representative of conditions found in other world desert areas, and (d) the subareas at Yuma that are anomalous from the standpoint of world desert conditions. It is, of course, also possible to compare the various world desert areas in terms of their landscape and terrain types, and their distribution or relative importance.

Analysis of General Applicability of Analog Technique

51. The following is a brief analysis of the techniques that have been employed in preparing analogs for this series of reports:

- a. The geometry, ground, and vegetation factors selected for mapping define terrain in simple, yet reasonably complete terms.
- b. In the system of mapping used, terrain factors in all world desert areas are mapped utilizing the same units. Hence, the completion of all reports in this series will afford, for the first time, a ready comparison of the terrain of all the deserts of the Northern Hemisphere.
- c. Terrain factors at the Yuma Proving Ground have been mapped using the same units used for other world desert areas, thus permitting ready comparison of Yuma with world deserts.
- d. Mapping generalizations have been areal, and the degree of refinement has varied with the scale. This implies that an area at Yuma delineated as having steep slopes, for

example, may consist of 95 percent or more steep slopes, whereas in some other world desert area, steep slopes may occupy only 50 percent of the region so mapped. This is considered ideal in establishing "testing" analogs since tests within restrictively mapped units at Yuma would be representative of typical situations within a similarly mapped, but more generalized, world desert area.

- e. Terrain geometry has been mapped at a standard topographic envelope (the 10-ft contour interval) regardless of scale. In mapping gross geometry the 100-ft contour interval has been utilized.
- f. Terrain geometry has been reduced to four major factors. One, the plan-profile, is a qualitative framework, the dimensions of which are indicated by three quantitative factors: slope occurrence, slope, and relief. This provides a readily assimilated mental image and a semiquantitative classification of the landscape. The system permits mapping of more than 7000 mathematically possible landscapes, but natural selectivity seems to have limited landscape types in most desert areas to about 100.
- g. All geometry, ground, and vegetation factors are synthesized by superposition into a terrain-type analog map which indicates degrees of analogy or similarity of the mapped world desert areas to the Yuma Proving Ground. Each terrain factor has been given equal weight in this synthesis. "Weighting" systems can be devised for specific considerations.
- h. It is believed that the analog techniques, with modifications and additions, will be applicable in environments other than the desert.

Problems and Recommendations for Solution

52. Three of the most serious problems in connection with the system of classification and mapping employed in this report concern: (a) the qualitateness of the ground and vegetation factors, (b) the overly subjective methods that must be used in mapping areas for which little data are available, and (c) the difficulties involved in integrating microrelief into the present system. The following paragraphs discuss these problems and offer recommendations for steps toward their solution.

Quantitative classification of ground and vegetation factors

53. It is generally agreed that quantitative classifications of the ground and vegetation factors would be most desirable and that studies to quantify these aspects of terrain should be intensified. A preliminary system for describing and mapping vegetation in an almost entirely quantitative manner has been developed and is presently being employed in terrain research programs.⁵⁰

54. A troublesome aspect of the various attempts that have been made thus far to quantify the ground and vegetation factors is that such quantification invariably necessitates consideration of a multitude of quantitative factors to express a single composite factor which is now expressed qualitatively. Although this multiplication of factors should be expected if the benefits of quantification are to be realized, the number must be kept within reasonable and practical limits if the classification is to be integrated into a usable system that fully describes terrain. Otherwise the researcher is soon buried under a profusion of symbols, and his maps are so complex that they become useless. It is reemphasized that although the quantitative approach is desirable, it may still be wise to utilize semiquantitative or qualitative techniques in some cases.

Mapping techniques

55. Considerable progress has been made in preparing a set of rules or instructions for truly objective mapping of the geometry factors in areas mapped with 10- or 20-ft contours; however, these instructions need refining and simplifying. Rigorous techniques should also be developed for mapping the ground and vegetation factors.

56. A regrettable but necessary corollary of mapping poorly known regions is that subjective techniques become increasingly important as the quantity of data decreases. The need for guides to aid the analyst in subjective mapping has long been recognized, and much valuable information exists in the literature which, when properly assembled, could be used to translate raw descriptive data into the classification system utilized in this report. The effects of climate, lithology, and elevation on soil type; the effects of soil type and landform association on relief; and the

consequences of lithology and vegetative cover on terrain geometry in general are examples of the types of studies that serve as excellent guides to mapping in poorly known areas and permit a somewhat objective approach. Preliminary studies along these lines were made preparatory to mapping the world deserts in the various reports of this series. An example of this work is the chart of landform-geometry factor associations in plate 19. However, much additional work is needed on methods of disciplining subjective mapping.

57. Another approach to establishing guides, particularly for mapping the geometry of poorly known regions, is through detailed study of a hierarchy of terrain envelopes. Preliminary studies indicate that valid and pertinent inferences can be made of the geometry of a particular region from maps with scales as small as 1:1,000,000 and a 500-ft contour interval. Reasonably valid relations can be established, for example, between slopes measured directly from such a map, slopes measured from 1:250,000 maps with a 100-ft contour interval, and those measured from a 1:25,000 map with a 10-ft contour interval. Detailed studies should be conducted to compare and graph the various quantitative geometry factors in areas covered by maps employing these scales. Relations between the hierarchy of envelopes could then be compared in all the areas mapped and hypotheses developed and tested concerning significant variations in these relations, which may be dependent upon lithology and climate.

Surface roughness (microrelief)

58. Surface roughness, or microrelief, is an important aspect of terrain geometry that was not integrated per se with the description of terrain presented in this report because it is concerned with those features of terrain geometry having relief of less than 10 ft. It is recognized that microrelief is extremely important; however, there are excellent reasons for disregarding these minor features in mapping the terrain factors previously discussed. In the first place, a reasonable lower limit had to be placed on the scale of generalization. Consideration of very minor features would have hopelessly complicated the system. Secondly, although travelers' accounts, available maps, landform ties and associations, and a liberal infusion of judgment permit reasonably consistent

delineation of the terrain as generated by the 10-ft contour interval, delineation of microrelief within the vast uncharted areas of some of the world deserts considered would result in excessive subjectivity. Furthermore, areas of homogeneous microrelief, i.e. areas throughout which a single microrelief feature prevails, are normally of small extent and thus could not be shown at the scales of one to several millions used in portions of this study.

59. Major difficulties in microrelief consideration lie not only in its classification, but also in developing a reasonably objective approach to mapping this factor and fitting it into the scheme of overall terrain analogy. A possible solution is to accept the fact that our present knowledge of the variations in microrelief is too limited for reasonably accurate classification and mapping of this factor, and to search for a method of improving estimates of microrelief considerations in unmapped areas. At present, such estimates must be based on landform-lithologic-soils associations. The much-less-qualitative terrain-classification scheme represented by the geometry, ground, and vegetation factors utilized in this study consequently provides a more adequate base for detailed studies of microrelief. For example, a 1L,4,1b,2 landscape type with a unit 6 soil type, unit 10 soil consistency, and a 2-4 vegetation complex can be examined either in the field or on detailed, large-scale maps if available. It seems almost inevitable that distinctive groups of microrelief features will be associated with such distinctive terrain-factor combinations. Groups of microrelief types could be cataloged as characteristic of various terrain-factor combinations and used as a basis of analogy. Determination of these associated microrelief types would, of course, involve a detailed and long-range mapping program. Short of this, the existence or lack of terrain types (specific combinations of geometry, ground, and vegetation factors) and, by inference, their associated microrelief groups is the best indication of the degree to which Yuza does or does not compare with other world deserts from the standpoint of microrelief. Conveniently, the degree of analogy as determined in the terrain-type analog map (plate 13) automatically considers this relation. For these reasons no attempt was made in the present study either to map

microrelief or to determine its effect on the terrain-type analog map. It is believed that synthesis of the ground, geometry, and vegetation factors determines the effect of microrelief on overall terrain analogy as well as it can presently be determined.

60. While the above-mentioned terrain type-microrelief association seems adequate to indicate the presence, lack, and distribution of microrelief types at Yuma and in world deserts, it is certainly not adequate for determining the effect of microrelief on various military activities or materiel in tests at Yuma. A quantitative system of describing, classifying, mapping, and comparing microrelief is needed in this case, and studies have been⁷⁴ and are presently (1966) being conducted in this vein to produce an acceptable method to portray these features.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "Afrique Septentrionale et Occidentale, Part 2, Sahara and Afrique Occidentale." Geographie Universelle, vol XI, Paris, France, 1939.
2. Atwood, W. W., The Physiographic Provinces of North America. Ginn and Company, New York, N. Y., 1940.
3. Bagnold, R. A., Sand and Sand Dunes.
4. _____, "Sand formations in southern Arabia." The Geographical Journal, vol 117, Part 1, London, England (March 1951), pp 78-86.
5. _____, The Physics of Blown Sand and Desert Dunes. Methuen and Co., Ltd., London, England, 1941.
6. Beadnell, H. J. L., The Topography and Geology of the Fayum Province of Egypt. Survey Department, Egypt, National Printing Department, Cairo, Egypt, 1905.
7. Bent, J. T., "Southern Arabia." The Geographical Journal, vols 4 and 6, London, England (1894 and 1895).
8. British Admiralty, Syria. Geographical Handbook B. R. 513, Naval Intelligence Division, London, England, April 1943.
9. _____, Western Arabia and the Red Sea. Geographical Handbook B. R. 527, Naval Intelligence Division, London, England, June 1946.
10. Brown, Glen F., The Geology and Ground Water of Al Kharj District, Nejd, Saudi Arabia. M.S. Thesis, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., 1948.
11. Capot-Rey, Robert, L'Afrique Blanche Francaise, Tome Second, Le Sahara Francais. Quatrieme Serie: Geographie De L'Union Francaise, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, France, 1953.
12. Caton-Thompson, G., and Gardner, E. W., "Climate, irrigation, and early man in the Hadhramaut." The Geographic Journal, vol 93, No. 1 (January 1939), pp 18-38.
13. Chapman, V. J., Salt Marshes and Salt Deserts of the World. Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1960.
- 14a. Cheesman, R. E., "The deserts of Jafura and Jabrin." The Geographical Journal, vol 65, No. 2, London, England (February 1925), pp 112-141.
- 14b. Clapp, Frederick G., "Geology and bitumens of the Dead Sea area, Palestine and Transjordan." Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, vol 20, No. 7 (July 1936), pp 881-909.
15. Clements, T., and others, Terrain Factor Mapping of the Mexican Desert. June 1958 (unpublished).
16. Clements, Thomas, and others, A Study of Desert Surface Conditions. Technical Report EP-53, U. S. Army Quartermaster Research and Development Command, April 1957.

17. Cochran, R. A., "An air reconnaissance of the Hadhrumant." The Geographical Journal, vol 77, No. 3, London, England (March 1931), pp 209-216.
18. Congres Geologique International, XIIIe - Alger 1952, Atlas Photographique D'Algerie, Paris, France, 1952.
19. Cornish, W., "On the formation of sand dunes." The Geographical Journal, vol 9, London, England (1897), pp 278-309.
20. Cornwall, P. B., "Ancient Arabia: Explorations in Hasa, 1940-41." The Geographical Journal, vol 107, Nos. 1 and 2, London, England (January-June 1946), pp 28-50.
21. Cosby, S. W., "Notes on a map of the Laguna Salada Basin, Baja California, Mexico." Geographical Review, vol 19, No. 4 (October 1929), pp 613-620.
22. Courteau, J. Y., "Calypso explores for underwater oil." National Geographic Magazine, vol 108, No. 2, Washington, D. C. (August 1955), pp 155-184.
23. Cox, Percy, "Some excursions in Oman." The Geographical Journal, vol 66, No. 3, London, England (September 1925), pp 193-227.
24. Ferguson, F. F., "Famine and water supply in western Rajputana." The Geographical Journal, vol 93, No. 1, London, England (January-June 1939), pp 39-53.
25. Fox, C. S., The Geology and Mineral and Other Resources of Dhufar Province and Other Parts of the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman, South-east Arabia. Muscat, 1947.
26. Glueck, Nelson, "An aerial reconnaissance in southern Transjordan." American Schools of Oriental Research, No. 66 (April 1937), pp 27-28 and No. 67 (October 1937), pp 19-26.
27. _____, "The geography of the Jordan." National Geographic Magazine, vol 86, No. 6, Washington, D. C. (December 1944), pp 719-744.
28. _____, "Wadi Sirhan in north Arabia." American Schools of Oriental Research, Bulletin No. 96, New Haven, Conn. (December 1944).
29. Hamilton, R. A. B., "Six weeks in Shabwa." The Geographical Journal, vol 100, No. 3 (July-December 1942), pp 107-123.
30. Harrison, J. V., "Coastal Makran." The Geographical Journal, vol 97, No. 1, London, England (January 1941), pp 1-17.
31. Hayyim, Habshush, Travels in Yemen, Jerusalem. 1941.
32. Helfritz, Hans, "The first crossing of southwestern Arabia." Geographical Review, vol 25, No. 3, New York, N. Y. (July 1935), pp 395-407.
33. Hinds, N. E. A., Geomorphology, Evolution of Landscape. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1943.

34. Hogarth, Dr. D. G., "Gertrude Bell's Journey to Hayil." The Geographical Journal, vol 70, No. 1, London, England (July 1927), pp 1-21.
35. Holm, D. A., "Dome-shaped dunes of central Nejd, Saudi Arabia." Congres Geologique International, Comptes Rendus de la Dix-Neuvieme Session, Section VII, Fascicule VII (Sect 7, Fasc 7), 19 Con Alger (1952), pp 107-112.
36. Horsfield, Agnes, "Journey to Kilwa, Transjordan." The Geographical Journal, vol 102, No. 2, London, England (August 1943), pp 71-77.
37. Horsfield, George, and Conway, Agnes, "Historical and topographical notes on Edom: with account of the first excavations at Petra." The Geographical Journal, vol 76, No. 5, London, England (November 1930), pp 369-390.
38. Hume, W. F., "The Egyptian wilderness." The Geographical Journal, vol 58, No. 4, London, England (October 1921), pp 252-276.
39. Ingrams, W. H., "Hadhramaut: A journey to the Seir country and through the Wadi Masaila." The Geographical Journal, vol 88, No. 6, London, England (December 1936), pp 524-551.
40. _____, "The exploration of the Aden protectorate." Geographical Review, vol 28, No. 4, New York, N. Y. (October 1938), pp 635-651.
41. _____, "The Hadhramaut: present and future." The Geographical Journal, vol 92, No. 4, London, England (October 1938), pp 289-312.
42. _____, "Unexplored regions of the Hadhramaut." Royal Central Asian Society Journal, vol 23, London, England (July 1936), pp 378-412.
43. Institut Geographique National, Relief Form Atlas. Paris, France, 1956.
44. Lees, G. M., "The geology and tectonics of Oman and parts of south-eastern Arabia." Geological Society of London Quarterly Journal, vol 84, Part 4 (1928), pp 585-670.
45. _____, "The physical geography of south-eastern Arabia." The Geographical Journal, vol 71, No. 5, London, England (May 1928), pp 441-470.
46. Lewis, Norman, Sand and Sea in Arabia. Routledge and Sons, Ltd., London, England, 1938.
47. Lobeck, A. K., Geomorphology, an Introduction to the Study of Landscapes. 1st ed., 8th impression, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, N. Y., and London, England, 1939.
48. Longwell, C. R., Knopf, A., and Flint, R. F., Outlines of Physical Geology. 2d ed., 12th printing, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1944.
49. Mackie, J. B., "Hasa; an Arabian oasis." The Geographical Journal, vol 63, No. 3, London, England (March 1924), pp 189-207.

50. Marshall University, The Physiognomy of Vegetation: A Quantitative Approach to Vegetation Geometry Based on the Structural Cell Concept as the Minimum Sample Size, two vols. Huntington, W. Va., May 1964.
51. Melton, F. A., "A tentative classification of sand dunes." Journal of Geology, vol 48 (1940), pp 113-174.
52. Merriam, Richard, and Holwerda, James G., "Al Uchaimin, a crater of possible meteoritic origin in western Iraq." The Geographical Journal, vol 123, No. 2, London, England (June 1957), pp 231-233.
53. Meulen, D. van Der, Aden to the Hadhramaut. John Murray, London, England, 1947.
54. Musil, Alois, The Northern Hegaz, a Topographical Itinerary. American Geographical Society--Oriental Explorations and Studies No. 1, 1926.
55. Philby, H. St. J. B., Arabia. 1930.
56. _____, Arabia of the Wahhabis. 1928.
57. _____, "Jauf and the northern Arabian desert." The Geographical Journal, vol 62, No. 4, London, England (October 1923), pp 241-259.
58. _____, The Empty Quarter. H. Holt and Company, New York, N. Y., 1933.
59. _____, "Across Arabia: From the Persian Gulf to the Red Sea." The Geographical Journal, vol 56, No. 6, London, England (December 1920), pp 446-468.
60. _____, The Heart of Arabia; a Record of Travel and Exploration, two vols. Putnam's Sons, New York, N. Y., and London, England, 1923.
61. _____, "The land of Sheba." The Geographical Journal, vol 92, No. 1 (July 1938), pp 1-21.
62. _____, "The land of Sheba." The Geographical Journal, vol 92, No. 2, London, England (August 1938), pp 107-132.
63. _____, "Rub' Al Khali." The Geographical Journal, vol 81, No. 1, London, England (January 1933), pp 1-26.
64. _____, "Southern Najd." The Geographical Journal, vol 55, No. 3, London, England (March 1920), pp 161-191.
65. Pike, Ruthven W., "Land and peoples of the Hadhramaut, Aden Protectorate." Geographical Review, vol 30, No. 4 (October 1940), pp 627-648.
66. Purdue University Engineering Experiment Station, Terrain Study of the Yuma Test Station Area, Arizona. Joint Highway Research Project, Airphoto Interpretation Laboratory, Lafayette, Ind., March 1955.
67. Rendel, Geraldine, "Across Saudi Arabia." Geographical Magazine, vol 6, London, England (November 1937-April 1938).
68. Rutter, Eldon, "A journey to hail." The Geographical Journal, vol 80, No. 4, London, England (October 1932), pp 325-331.

69. Rutter, Eldon, "The Hejaz." The Geographical Journal, vol 77, No. 2, London, England (February 1931), pp 97-109.
70. Scott, Hugh, "A journey to the Yemen." The Geographical Journal, vol 93, No. 2, London, England (February 1939), pp 97-125.
71. Stark, Freya, "An exploration in the Hadhramaut and journey to the coast." The Geographical Journal, vol 93, No. 1, London, England (January 1939), pp 1-17.
72. _____, "Two months in the Hadhramaut." The Geographical Journal, vol 87, No. 2, London, England (February 1936), pp 113-126.
73. Stein, Aurel, "An archaeological journey in western Iran." The Geographical Journal, vol 92, No. 4, London, England (October 1938), pp 313-342.
74. Stone, R. O., and Dugindji, J., A Study of Microrelief: Its Mapping, Classification, and Quantification by Means of a Fourier Analysis. Prepared by University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif., under Contract DA 22-079-eng-261 for U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss., 31 October 1963.
75. Strahler, A. H., Physical Geography. 2d ed., John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1960.
76. Thesiger, Wilfred, "Across the empty quarter." The Geographical Journal, vol 111, Nos. 1-3, London, England (January-March 1948), pp 1-21.
77. _____, "A further journey across the empty quarter." The Geographical Journal, vol 113, London, England (January-June 1949), pp 21-46.
78. _____, "A journey through the Tihama, the 'Asir, and the Hejaz Mountains." The Geographical Journal, vol 110, Nos. 4-6, London, England (October-December 1947), pp 190-200.
79. _____, "A new journey in southern Arabia." The Geographical Journal, vol 108, Nos. 4-6, London, England (October-December 1946), pp 129-145.
80. _____, Arabian Sands. E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1959.
81. _____, "Desert borderlands of Oman." The Geographical Journal, vol 116, Nos. 4-6, London, England (October-December 1950), pp 137-171.
82. _____, "Sands of the empty quarter." Geographical Magazine, vol 21, No. 8, London, England (December 1948), p 312.
83. _____, "Studies in the southern Nejaz and Tihama." Geographical Magazine, vol 21, No. 1, London, England (May 1948), p 8.
84. _____, The Marsh Arabs. E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1964.

85. Thomas, Bertren, "A journey into Rub' Al Khali - the southern Arabian Desert." The Geographical Journal, vol 77, No. 1, London, England (January 1931), pp 1-37.
86. _____, Arabia Felix. C. Scribner's Sons, 1932.
87. Thornbury, W. D., Principles of Geomorphology. 5th printing, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1960.
88. Twitchell, K. S., "Water resources of Saudi Arabia." Geographical Review, vol 34, No. 3 (July 1944), pp 365-386.
89. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Review of Research on Arid Zone Hydrology, 1952.
90. U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Handbook, A Technique for Preparing Desert Terrain Analogs, by J. R. Van Lopik and C. R. Kolb. Technical Report No. 3-506, Vicksburg, Miss., May 1959.
- 91a. U. S. Army, Office of the Quartermaster General, Research and Development Division, Environmental Protection Branch, Handbook of Yuma Environment. Report No. 200, Washington, D. C., February 1953.
- 91b. U. S. Army, Headquarters, Quartermaster Research and Development Command, Quartermaster Research and Development Center, Analogs of Yuma Climate in the Middle East, Report No. 1, 1954; Analogs of Yuma Climate in Northeast Africa, Report No. 2, 1954; Analogs of Yuma Climate in Northwest Africa, Report No. 3, 1955; Analogs of Yuma Climate in South Central Asia, Report No. 4, 1955; Analogs of Yuma Climate in Soviet Middle East, Report No. 5, 1955; Analogs of Yuma Climate in Chinese Inner Asia, Report No. 6, 1955; Analogs of Yuma Climate in East Central Africa, Report No. 7, 1956; Analogs of Yuma Climate in North America, Report No. 8, 1957. Environmental Protection Research Division, Watick, Mass.
92. U. S. Department of the Air Force, Air Weather Service, Climatic Conditions of Southwestern Asia. Report No. 111, 1942.
93. U. S. Geological Survey, Photographic Library, Federal Center, Denver, Colo.
94. Warner, W. H. Lee, "Notes on the Hadhrumaut." The Geographical Journal, vol 77, No. 3, London, England (March 1931), pp 217-222.
95. Williams, Kenneth, "British and the Persian Gulf." Geographical Magazine, vol 14, No. 1 (November 1941), pp 1-11.
96. Wilson, Arnold, "The delta of the Shatt al' Arab and proposals for dredging the bar." The Geographical Journal, vol 65, No. 2, London, England (1925), pp 225-239.

Table 1

Distribution of Terrain-Factor Mapping Units

Secondary-Factor Units	Restrictive or Component Units Occurring in			Gross Units Occurring in		
	MED Only	Yama Only	Both Areas	MED Only	Yama Only	Both Areas
Plan-profile	1,3,4//,5,6,6L	--	1,4,4L,4L//.7	1,1L,2,2L//,3,5,5L//,6,6L//,5L	--	5L//.5L
Slope occurrence	2,3	--	1,4,5,6	2,3,4	--	1
Slope	--	--	1a,1b,2,3,4,5	4,6	--	3,5
Relief	3	--	1,2,4,5,6,7	6	7	5

Ground-Factor Units	Restrictive Units Occurring in		
	MED Only	Yama Only	Both Areas
Soil type	2,3,7,9,10	--	1,4,5,6,8
Soil consistency	5,6,11	--	1,3,4,9,10
Surface rock	1*,3*,6*,7*,8*,9	--	2,3a,3b,4,5*

Vegetation Factor

Vegetation	1,4a,6,7	5a	2,3,5,5a,9,10
------------	----------	----	---------------

* At Yama, surface rock unit 5 (sedimentaries undifferentiated) includes units 6, 7, 8 (sandstone, siltstone, and shale, respectively), and in the MED unit 1 (igneous undifferentiated) includes units 1a, 1b, 2 (intrusives, true extrusives, and rocks formed by secondary cementation of extrusives, respectively).

Table 2

Landscapes Found at Yuma and in the Middle East Desert
Analogy Determination

<u>Middle East Landscape Array*</u>	<u>Yuma Landscape Array</u>	<u>Degree of Analogy</u>	<u>Middle East Landscape Array</u>	<u>Yuma Landscape Array</u>	<u>Degree of Analogy</u>
<u>Restrictive or Component Landscapes</u>			<u>Restrictive or Component Landscapes (Cont'd)</u>		
1,3,1b,2	1L,4,1b,2	Slightly	4,6,4,5	4,6,4,5	Highly
1,4,1b,2		Moderately	4,6,5,5	4,6,4,4	Highly
1L,3,1b,2		Moderately	4,6,5,6	4,6,5,6	Highly
1L,4,1b,2		Highly			
7,2,1b,2		Slightly			
7,3,1b,2		Slightly			
1,3,2,2	1L,4,2,2	Slightly	4,6,5,7	4,6,5,7	Highly
1,4,2,2		Moderately	4//,6,5,7		Moderately
1L,3,2,2		Moderately	7,1,1a,1		Highly
1L,4,2,2		Highly	7,1,2,1	7,1,1a,1	Moderately
2,1,2,3		Moderately	7,1,2,2**		Slightly
3,1,2,3		Slightly			
6,4,2,2		Moderately	7,1,1b,1		Highly
7,2,2,2		Slightly	7,1,1b,2	7,1,1b,1	Moderately
7,3,2,2		Slightly	7,2,1b,1		Moderately
4,3,2,3		Slightly			
4,4,3,4	4,5,3,4	Moderately	<u>Cross Landscapes</u>		
4,5,3,4		Highly	1,3,5,5**		Slightly
4,4,3,4		Slightly	1L,2,5,5**		Slightly
4//,5,3,4		Moderately	1L,4,5,5**	5L//,4,5,7	Slightly
4//,5,3,4		Moderately	2,2,5,5**		Slightly
5,3,3,4		Slightly	2,3,5,5**		Slightly
4,5,3,5	4,5,3,5	Highly			
4,4,3,5	4L//,4,3,5	Moderately	1,4,4,4		Not
5,4,3,4**		Slightly	1L,4,4,4		Not
4,4,4,5	4,5,4,5	Moderately	2,2,4,5		Slightly
4,5,4,5		Highly	2,3,4,5		Slightly
4L,4,4,5		Slightly	3,2,4,5	6L,1,3,5	Slightly
4L,5,4,5		Moderately	4//,3,4,5		Slightly
4L,5,4,6**		Slightly	4,3,3,5		Slightly
			4,3,5,5**		Slightly
			5,4,3,5		Slightly
4,5,5,5	4,5,5,5	Highly	4L,4,3,5		Slightly
4L,5,5,5		Moderately	4//,4,3,5		Slightly
			4//,2,3,5		Slightly
4L,5,5,6	4,5,5,6	Moderately	4//,3,3,5		Slightly

* Lightface type indicates the units found in the closest corresponding array at Yuma. Units shown in boldface type are not found at Yuma in combination with the remaining units of the array.

** In a particular array it may be possible to choose different sets of lightface or boldface units to indicate the maximum degree of analogy. In such instances units are compared in the order given in the array, e.g. the MED array 3,4,3,4 was compared with the Yuma array 4L//,4,3,5 rather than 4,5,3,4.

Table 3

Ground-Factor Arrays* Found at Yuma and in the Middle East DesertAnalogy Determinations

<u>MED Ground-Factor Array**</u>	<u>Yuma Ground-Factor Array</u>	<u>Degree of Analogy</u>	<u>MED Ground-Factor Array</u>	<u>Yuma Ground-Factor Array</u>	<u>Degree of Analogy</u>
1,1†		Highly	4,9	4,9	Highly
2,1†	1,2	Partially	5,1	5,1	Highly
3,1†		Partially	5,10††		Partially
3,2		Partially			
1,3†	1,3a	Highly	6,1	6,10	Highly
1,3a		Highly	6,2		Partially
2,3†		Partially	6,4		Partially
3,3†		Partially	6,10		Highly
			7,10		Partially
1,4	1,4	Highly			
2,4		Partially			
3,4		Partially	10,3	8,3	
1,5	1,5	Highly			
1,6†		Highly			
1,7†		Highly	7,4		Partially
1,9		Partially	7,11		Not
2,5		Partially	8,4	8,4	Highly
2,6†		Partially			
2,7†		Partially			
2,9		Partially	8,10		Highly
3,5		Partially	9,5	8,10	Not
3,6†		Partially	10,6		Not
3,7†		Partially	10,7		Not

* Ground-factor arrays are two symbols indicating mapping units. Soil-rock units (soil units 1,2,3) are always found in combination with surface-rock types, and soil units 4,5,6,7,8,9,10 are always found in combination with soil-consistency types.

** Lightface type indicates the units found in the closest corresponding array at Yuma. Units shown in boldface type are not found at Yuma in combination with the remaining units of the array.

† At Yuma surface rock unit 5 (sedimentaries undifferentiated) includes units 6,7,8,9 (sandstone, limestone, shale, and evaporites, respectively), and in the MED unit 1 (igneous undifferentiated) includes units 2,3a,3b (intrusives, true extrusives, and rocks formed by secondary cementation of loose deposits of volcanic ejecta, respectively), therefore, where those units are mapped in the MED, they are designated by lightface symbols.

†† In a particular array it may be possible to choose different sets of lightface or boldface units to indicate the maximum degree of analogy. In such instances units are compared in the order given in the array, e.g. the MED array 5,10 was compared with the Yuma array 5,1 rather than 6,10.

Table 1

Distribution of Landscape Types Within World Desert Areas

Landscape Description			Desert Regions												Total	
Landscape Type	Area (sq. mi.)	Percentage of Total Desert Area	Desert Regions												Total Area (sq. mi.)	Percentage of Total Desert Area
			North America	South America	Europe	Asia	Africa	Oceania	Antarctica	Arctic	Alpine	Mountain	Coastal	Maritime		
Desert	1,000,000	10.0%	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	1,000,000	10.0%
Steppe	2,000,000	20.0%	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	2,000,000	20.0%
Shrubland	3,000,000	30.0%	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	3,000,000	30.0%
Forest	4,000,000	40.0%	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	4,000,000	40.0%
Mountain	5,000,000	50.0%	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	5,000,000	50.0%
Coastal	6,000,000	60.0%	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	6,000,000	60.0%
Maritime	7,000,000	70.0%	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	7,000,000	70.0%
Arctic	8,000,000	80.0%	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	8,000,000	80.0%
Alpine	9,000,000	90.0%	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	9,000,000	90.0%
Mountain	10,000,000	100.0%	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	10,000,000	100.0%

(Continued)

Table 4 (Continued)

Area of Interest		Present and Actual Area Occupied by Landscape Type or Array	
Area of Interest	Type I Type II	Present and Actual Area Occupied by Landscape Type or Array	
		Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
North America	Type I Type II	Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
		Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
South America	Type I Type II	Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
		Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
Europe	Type I Type II	Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
		Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
Africa	Type I Type II	Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
		Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
Asia	Type I Type II	Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
		Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
Australia	Type I Type II	Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
		Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
Antarctica	Type I Type II	Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
		Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
Total	Type I Type II	Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.
		Present Area sq. mi.	Actual Area sq. mi.

(3 of 6 sheets)

(Continued)

Table 4 (Continued)

Landscape Description			Aerial Importance Percent and Actual Area Computed by Landscape Type or Array									
Landscape Type	Landscape Code	Landscape Name	Characteristic (see Plate I)		Characteristic (see Plate II)		Total Area sq. mi.	Percent of Total Area	Actual Area sq. mi.	Percent of Total Area	Actual Area sq. mi.	Percent of Total Area
			Type I	Type II	Type I	Type II						
Forest and Shrubland	1	Forest and Shrubland	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Grassland and Pasture	2	Grassland and Pasture	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Desert and Shrubland	3	Desert and Shrubland	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Water	4	Water	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Urban and Developed	5	Urban and Developed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Barren and Open	6	Barren and Open	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Total	7	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

(1 of 4 sheets)

(Continued)

Table 5 (Continued)

Landscape Description										Area Importance Percent and Actual Area Occupied by Landscape Type or Army										
Type	Name	Code	Type	Code	Type	Code	Type	Code	Type	Code	Type	Code	Type	Code	Type	Code	Type	Code	Type	Code
Army										Actual Area										
Total Area										Percent										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										
Actual Area										Actual Area										
Percent										Actual Area										

APPENDIX A: THE PROBLEM OF TERRAIN COMPARISON

1. The following comments on the philosophy, purpose, and problems associated with terrain analysis and comparison are based, to a considerable extent, on material included in Technical Report 3-506.^{90*}

Quantitative Versus Qualitative Approach

2. Terrain studies and classifications may be either qualitative or quantitative. The qualitative approach to geomorphic description consists primarily of written descriptions of terrain and landforms dealing extensively with the genesis of various landforms and surfaces. The approach depends almost entirely on the skill of the analyst, both as an analyst and as a master of descriptive prose. Such terrain description can be vivid and penetrating, conveying to the reader a clear mental image of the landscape. Alternatively, depending on the skills or backgrounds of both the analyst and reader, it can be poor and misleading. In any case, it is patently unsuited for objectively comparing one landscape with another.

3. As previously mentioned, terrain may be considered to be the aggregate of the physical characteristics of the land. A quantitative terrain description is simply one that uses numerical values rather than words to define terrain or its component factors. It is usually less vivid than the qualitative approach, but has obvious advantages in its objectivity and in the fact that terrain factors and their subdivisions can be rigorously defined. A more subtle but even greater advantage is that terrain factors which are stratified in a quantitative manner may be manipulated mathematically so that the effects of individual terrain factors, or of factors acting in concert, can be determined. Drainage densities, for example, can be expressed in terms of the ratio of the sum of channel lengths to the drainage basin area. The product of drainage density and relief, in turn, is a proposed measure of basin ruggedness. In most

* Raised numbers refer to correspondingly numbered items in Selected Bibliography at end of main text.

instances such quantitative systems have evolved from studies aimed at determining (a) terrain effects in specific fields such as hydrology and agriculture, and (b) a method for describing a single terrain factor such as slope or relief. As a result, quantitatively expressed factors useful in presenting an aggregate or entire picture of terrain have not been explored to any great extent. It should also be pointed out that qualitative terms are usually expressions of a group of factors that could be expressed in a more quantitative and precise manner; however, precision is usually gained at the price of simplicity. While the quantitative approach is not propounded as a magic cure-all, and while admittedly it may be wise, or necessary, to utilize qualitative techniques in many cases, quantitative methods must be favored in objective terrain classification, and in investigations of the effects of terrain on military activities.

4. The techniques on which the MED study was based follow a middle course between the qualitative and quantitative approaches. It was recognized that a quantitative approach was ideally suited for terrain analog or comparison purposes, and every attempt was made to quantify. Where attempts at quantifying terrain factors resulted in overcomplexity, however, a qualitative system was employed. Soils, for example, are expressed in standard qualitative terms, i.e. silt, clay, sand, etc., rather than in quantitative terms such as median grain diameter, cohesive strength, etc. It was also apparent that the quantitative approach had heretofore been applied to small homogeneous areas for which large amounts of terrain data were available or obtainable. The scarcity of such data for larger areas precluded the utilization of strictly quantitative systems for describing and mapping various terrain factors. Consequently, a middle course between the quantitative and qualitative approaches was the only one consistent with the goal of determining, with available data, the suitability of the Yuma area as a desert test site.

Terrain Factors Versus Terrain Effects

5. Terrain factors and terrain effects were considered for utilization as a base in establishing a uniform system of describing, classifying,

mapping, and comparing terrain. One system would involve the mapping of ranges of selected terrain factors, such as slope, relief, soils, etc., and comparing areas so mapped. The other system would involve the describing and mapping of areas in terms of the effect of terrain factors on such military considerations as cross-country movement, weapons employment, earth construction, radio communications, and cover and concealment.

6. Preliminary studies convincingly showed that comparison of terrain based on its effects on military activities is impractical except for specific usage. Entirely different terrain types, or associations of terrain factors, may have the same total impact on a particular military activity. Conversely, the same terrain type will have different effects on different military activities. Thus, before classifying terrain in terms of "go" or "no go" for trafficability considerations, "good," "fair," or "poor" for chances of survival, etc., an orderly classification of basic terrain elements or factors which create these conditions should be made. Analyzing and recombining data incorporated in such effect classifications for actual terrain comparison would be a hopeless task. It follows that tests aimed at determining terrain effects should be conducted in areas where quantitative measurements are available for basic factors comprising the terrain. Empirical determinations of the impact of a qualitatively or subjectively described terrain type on a particular activity do not provide data that can be objectively transferred or utilized in other regions.

7. A somewhat intermediate approach to terrain evaluation would be to map and compare values of terrain factors that are critical to specific military considerations. However, it soon becomes apparent that no system of classification can hope to satisfy the requirements of all military activities. Several considerations that militate against the scheme of classifying and comparing areas in terms of critical values of various terrain factors are:

- a. Single terrain factors do not necessarily have independent critical values, e.g. the critical slope value for a given vehicle varies directly with the soil strength of the slope surface.

- b. Critical values of a given terrain factor may vary greatly with various military activities, e.g. the density of vegetation when considered in relation to foot movement as against signal communication. In addition, variations may occur within a general class of materiel, e.g. critical slope values are different for different vehicles.
- c. Critical values are not presently known for many activities and items of materiel.
- d. Critical values are not constant, but change with technological advances.

8. It was therefore concluded that a system should be developed for classifying basic terrain factors or elements so that areas could be mapped and compared in common terms. Although available data on the military significance of terrain are an important consideration, they have not been unduly emphasized in the system developed for classifying, mapping, and comparing terrain factors. This approach is consistent with the immediate purpose of furnishing responsible agencies involved in testing with factual evidence on whether terrain conditions at the Yuma Proving Ground are widespread or limited throughout world deserts, and whether significant terrain types found in other world deserts are present or lacking at Yuma.

Scales and Problems of Generalization

9. Cartographic problems, availability of data, and other considerations demand that information on large-scale maps be generalized in order that it can be shown on small-scale maps. The existence and need for such generalization in mapping are well known and universally accepted. For example, the Castle Dome Mountains at Yuma mapped at a scale of 1:400,000 contain areas of "gentle," "moderate," "declivitous," and "steep" characteristic slopes with "steep" slopes predominating. At a scale of 1:2,500,000 these mountains can be shown as having only "steep" characteristic slopes. Similar generalizations could be cited in other world desert areas.

10. Generalization of the Yuma and world desert maps incorporated in this and other reports primarily reflects a variation in the spatial

distribution or density pattern of established area units which have been defined in terms of narrow ranges of specific properties. By definition, the system dictates that if an area at Yuma exhibits a certain combination of terrain factors, more than 50 percent of a similarly mapped tract in a world desert area will also possess this combination of factors. Areas mapped as silty soil at Yuma and in world deserts are characterized by an areal predominance of silty soils, but because of the scale difference the percentage of surface covered by silty soil within the area so mapped at Yuma is typically greater than that of the area so mapped in world deserts. The important point is that silty soil in areas so mapped is areally predominant. At Yuma this predominance might be on the order of 90 percent, and in world deserts, only 70 percent. In other words, the degree of generalization employed in mapping Yuma is considerably less than that used in mapping world deserts.

11. In this connection, it should be emphasized that since the objective is to determine the suitability of Yuma as a test station, more detailed mapping of the Yuma area is required than of the world deserts with which it is being compared. It is important to know that Yuma possesses a fairly complete range of slopes, vegetative types, etc., even if these ranges of terrain factors cover only very limited areas. Conversely, terrain-factor mapping in the world deserts can justifiably be areally generalized, as this will indicate the most characteristic or modal condition existing within the area being mapped. Consequently, a vehicle tested at Yuma on a certain soil of a certain consistency on a certain slope is being tested against a similar combination of terrain factors that is characteristically or areally predominant in a region so mapped in a particular world desert.

12. In summary, an attempt has been made to establish a more descriptive, useful, and simple system of developing terrain analogs which will be consistent with the paucity of data concerning the vast areas being mapped. In this system of terrain comparison, an effort has also been made to steer a middle-of-the-road course between (a) qualitative and quantitative approaches to terrain description, (b) natural and military significance, and (c) availability of data and a reasonably complete definition

of terrain. It is believed that this course is the only practical one in view of our present knowledge of the relative significance of terrain factors in diverse military considerations. It is also believed that as this knowledge expands the developed analog system will be flexible enough to accommodate additional data.

Unclassified
Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - RSD		
(Security classification of this body of abstract and indexing information must be entered when the overall report is classified)		
1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate symbol) U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station Vicksburg, Mississippi		2. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified
3. REPORT TITLE ANALOGS OF YUMA TERRAIN IN THE MIDDLE EAST DESERT		4. REPORT NUMBER
5. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) Report 4, in 2 vols: vol I, text; vol II, plates		
6. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial) Kolb, Charles R. Dornbusch, William K., Jr.		
7. REPORT DATE June 1966	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES vol I, 55; vol II, 31	7b. NO. OF REFS 98
8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. a. PROJECT NO. 1-V-O-25001-A-131		9. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) Technical Report No. 3-630
		10. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)
11. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTES This document is subject to special export controls and each transmittal to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with prior approval of U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station.		
12. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		13. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY U. S. Army Materiel Command Washington, D. C.
14. ABSTRACT To evaluate the adequacy of the Yuma Proving Ground as a test site representative of world desert conditions, the extent of occurrence of Yuma terrain types in the Middle East desert (MED) and other world desert areas must be determined. In order to make valid comparisons, a uniform system of describing, mapping, and comparing desert terrain must be employed. In this report both the Yuma and MED are mapped in terms of general or aggregate terrain, geometry, ground, and vegetation factors. General terrain factors include physiography, hypsometry, and landform-surface conditions. Geometry and ground factors are characteristic plan-profile, occurrence of slopes greater than 50 percent, characteristic slope, characteristic relief, soil type, soil consistency, and type of surface rock. Terrain-factor data are synthesized to establish the degree of analogy of a particular MED area with selected portions of the Yuma Proving Ground. Ground and vegetation analog maps were prepared in similar fashion. A terrain-type analog map is prepared by superimposing the geometry, ground, and vegetation analog maps and stratifying the resulting combinations. Highly analogous MED tracts exhibit or closely approximate combinations of terrain-factor mapping units found at Yuma, and the degree of analogy decreases directly as the similarity to such combinations decreases. The techniques used in preparing these maps permit comparison of terrain in areas mapped at different scales as well as in areas mapped at similar scales, enabling for the first time comparison of all the deserts of the Northern Hemisphere.		

DD FORM 1473

Unclassified
Security Classification

Unclassified
Security Classification

KEY WORDS	LINE A		LINE B		LINE C	
	ROLE	BT	ROLE	BT	ROLE	BT
Asian desert						
Deserts						
Middle East desert						
Terrain						
Yuma terrain						

INSTRUCTIONS

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (corporate author) issuing the report.

2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. GROUP Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, where applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. REPORT TITLE Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parentheses immediately following the title.

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. AUTHOR(S) Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. REPORT DATE Enter the date of the report as day, month, year, or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7a. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES The page count should follow normal pagination procedure. Enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. NUMBER OF REFERENCES Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER If appropriate, enter the appropriate number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b. & 8c. PROJECT NUMBER Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system number, task number, etc.

9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S) If the report has been assigned any other report number (either by the originator or by the sponsor), also enter this number(s).

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

- (1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."
- (2) "For/As announced and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."
- (3) "U.S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through _____."
- (4) "U.S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through _____."
- (5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through _____."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Use for additional planetary notes.

12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (paying for) the research and development. Include address.

13. ABSTRACT Enter an abstract group brief and factual summary of the document indicative of an report even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall be preceded with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as TS, S, C, or U.

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 100 to 225 words.

14. KEY WORDS Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that a security classification is required. Words such as equipment, in the designation, trade name, etc., are not key words. Key words may be used as key words in a report, but they are not key words in a report. The assignment of key words and phrases is optional.

Unclassified
Security Classification