



REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM	
REPORT NUMBER 2. GOVT ACCESS	SION NO. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER	and a rest of a
N/A /10-/4117.5=	30 <sup>1</sup> . , N/A	13 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 -
TITLE (and Subtitle)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED	
Standardization of Map Symbology		
	5. PERFORMING UKG. REPORT NUMBER	
AUTHOR(s)	B. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(#)	ST IN DISERSE
Delaws D. Jacobon In Madan HCAR		390 (1997) 390 (1997)
Robert r. Jacober, Jr., major, USAr	N/A	Pre ( Preservaços)
	10 BROCHAN ELENENT BROJECT TASK	
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS	
Defense Mapping Agency Aerospace Center		•
St. Louis AFS, MO 63118	N/A	
I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE	
Defense Mapping Agency	June 1982	
Washington, DC 20305 '	13. NUMBER OF PAGES	THE PERMIT
A MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESSIL different from Controlling	Office) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)	
a. Munti Uniko kosissi kinika a nuonessiit Billatan kum suntoling		
	Unclassified	
	15a, DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)		
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dif	Terent from Report)	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if dif	revent from Report)	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if dif	terent from Report)	
DESTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract entered in Block 20, if dif	revent from Report)	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 df. 5. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 df. 5. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for presentation at the fall convent:	forent from Report) ion of the American Society of	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dif . SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during the	ion of the American Society of the period 19-23 September 1982.	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dif . SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during ti	ion of the American Society of he period 19-23 September 1982.	
DESTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dft Distribution Unlimited Distribution Statement (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dft B. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during ti E. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block	forent (rom Report) forent (rom Report) ion of the American Society of he period 19-23 September 1982. t number)	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dff . SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during ti . KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block Symbology, standard, standardize, standardize	interent from Report) Herent from Report) H ion of the American Society of the period 19-23 September 1982. H t number) tion, map, map symbology,	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 df . SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during ti . KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if necessary and identify by block Symbology, standard, standardize, standardiza engineering scale maps.	ion of the American Society of he period 19-23 September 1982.	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dff . DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dff . SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during ti . KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block Symbology, standard, standardize, standardiza engineering scale maps.	forent from Report) forent from Report) ion of the American Society of he period 19-23 September 1982. t number) tion, map, map symbology,	
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dff . SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during ti . KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block Symbology, standard, standardize, standardiza engineering scale maps.	forent (rom Report) forent (rom Report) ion of the American Society of he period 19-23 September 1982. t number) tion, map, map symbology,	
DESTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 df . SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during ti . KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary and identify by block Symbology, standard, standardize, standardize engineering scale maps.	tion of the American Society of the period 19-23 September 1982.	
DESTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 df Supplementary notes Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during ti KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block Symbology, standard, standardize, standardiza engineering scale maps. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block In order to effectively communicate, man must	form: Werent from Report) Werent from Report) H ion of the American Society of the period 19-23 September 1982. A number) tion, map, map symbology, number) have a common language. In the	
DESTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 difference of the abstract entered in Block	forent from Report) ferent from Report) in of the American Society of the period 19-23 September 1982. t number) tion, map, map symbology, from ber) have a common language. In the this axiom is no less true. Sym-	
DESTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dff Differentiation Unlimited Differentiation Statement (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dff Supplementary NOTES Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during the KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block Symbology, standard, standardize, standardiza engineering scale maps. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block In order to effectively communicate, man must conventional or digital cartographic sphere, for bols form the language of cartography. Ideal Symbols would solve many of the communication	(remeter) formular is no less true. Sym- ly, a worldwide standard set of problems, But, this ideal solu-	
DESTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if dif . DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if dif . SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during ti . KEY WORDS (Centinue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block Symbology, standard, standardize, standardiza engineering scale maps. . ABSTRACT (Centinue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block In order to effectively communicate, man must conventional or digital cartographic sphere, for bols form the language of cartography. Ideal symbols would solve many of the communication tion is not technically feasible. However, with	Terent (rom Report) Terent (rom Report) Terent (rom Report) Terent (rom Report) Tion of the American Society of the period 19-23 September 1982. A number) tion, map, map symbology, Trumber) have a common language. In the this axiom is no less true. Sym- ly, a worldwide standard set of problems. But, this ideal solu- ithin scale families of maps.	
DESTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 df Supplementary notes Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during ti Symbology, standard, standardize, standardiza engineering scale maps. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde 11 necessary and Identify by block In order to effectively communicate, man must conventional or digital cartographic sphere, for bols form the language of cartography. Ideal symbols would solve many of the communication tion is not technically feasible. However, wistandard symbology should be sought, especial	Therent from Report) Therent from Report) Therent from Report) The period 19-23 September 1982. A number) tion, map, map symbology, There a common language. In the this axiom is no less true. Sym- ly, a worldwide standard set of problems. But, this ideal solu- ithin scale families of maps, ly in computer cartographic appli-	
DESTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dff The tribution Unlimited The tribution STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 dff Supplementary notes Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during ti NEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block Symbology, standard, standardize, standardiza engineering scale maps. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block In order to effectively communicate, man must conventional or digital cartographic sphere, for bols form the language of cartography. Ideall symbols would solve many of the communication tion is not technically feasible. However, wis standard symbology should be sought, especially cations. This paper addresses the need for a	Thereast from Report) Thereast from Report) Thereast from Report) The period 19-23 September 1982. The p	
DESTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 difference	(romber) have a common language. In the this axiom is no less true. Sym- ly, a worldwide standard set of problems. But, this ideal solu- ithin scale families of maps, ly in computer cartographic appli- standard for map symbology, particu- tandard.	
DESTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 differences of the state of the	Terrent (rom Report) Terrent (rom Report) Terrent (rom Report) Terrent (rom Report) Tion of the American Society of the period 19-23 September 1982. A t number) tion, map, map symbology, The this axiom is no less true. Sym- ly, a worldwide standard set of problems. But, this ideal solu- ithin scale families of maps, ly in computer cartographic appli- standard for map symbology, particu- tandard. UNCLASSIFIED	
DISTRIBUTION CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 differentiation 11 minutes) The tribution STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, 11 different for presentation at the fall convent: Prepared for presentation at the fall convent: Photogrammetry at Hollywood, Florida during to EXEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde 11 necessory and identify by block Symbology, standard, standardize, standardize engineering scale maps. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde 11 necessory and identify by block in order to effectively communicate, man must conventional or digital cartographic sphere, to bols form the language of cartography. Ideal symbols would solve many of the communication tion is not technically feasible. However, wist standard symbology should be sought, especial cations. This paper addresses the need for a larly large scale maps, and suggests such a st P 1 JAN 72 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 55 IS OBSOLETE SECURE	Therent from Report) Therent from Report) Therent from Report) The period 19-23 September 1982. The peri	
DESTRIBUTION CONTROL OF LARGE SECONDERTE Appreval for public relation of the abeliact entered in Block 20, 11 difference of the abeliact entered is a standard symbology should be sought, especial is cations. This paper addresses the need for a larly large scale maps, and suggests such a standard symbology for the off the abeliact entered for a larly large scale maps, and suggests such a standard symbology aboliact entered for a larly large scale maps, and suggests such a standard standard entered for the standard symbology abolia difference of the abeliact entered for a larly large scale maps, and suggests such a standard symbology aboliact entered for a larly large scale maps, and suggests such a standard symbology aboliact entered for a larly large scale maps, and suggests such a standard symbology aboliact entered for a larly large scale maps, and suggests such a standard symbology aboliact enteres entered	Therent from Report) Therent from Report) Therent from Report) The period 19-23 September 1982. The peri	
DESTRIBUTION CONTROL OF LAW OF	(rerent from Report) (rerent from Report) ion of the American Society of he period 19-23 September 1982. t number) tion, map, map symbology, (number) have a common language. In the this axiom is no less true. Sym- ly, a worldwide standard set of problems. But, this ideal solu- ithin scale families of maps, ly in computer cartographic appli- standard for map symbology, particu- tandard. UNCLASSIFIED HTY CLASSIFIED HTY CLASSIFIED	

State State

# THE STANDARDIZATION OF MAP SYMBOLOGY

Robert P. Jacober, Jr. Major, United States Air Force Cartographic/Geodetic Staff Officer Defense Mapping Agency Aerospace Center Advanced Systems Branch St. Louis AFS, MO 63118

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Robert Jacober is a Major in the U.S. Air Force, and is currently working in the Advanced Systems Branch of the Defense Mapping Agency Aerospace Center as a Cartographic/ Geodetic Staff Officer. He earned his Masters Degree in Geodetic Science from the Ohio State University in 1979. Major Jacober is a member of ASP and is serving on the Photogrammetric Standards Committee. He is a technical advisor to the Committee on Cartographic Surveying, Surveying and Mapping Division, of the American Society of Civil Engineers. Major Jacober has also been asked to serve as member of the National Committee for Digital Cartographic Data Standards, sponsored by the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping, to help determine the national standard for the symbology used on large scale maps, as a part of the overall national digital cartographic data base.

#### ABSTRACT

In order to effectively communicate, man must have a common language. In the conventional or digital cartographic sphere, this axiom is no less true. Symbols form the language of cartography. Ideally, a worldwide standard set of symbols would solve many of the communication problems. But, this ideal solution is not technically feasible. However, within scale families of maps, standard symbology should be sought, especially in computer cartographic applications. This paper addresses the need for a standard for map symbology, particularly large scale maps, and suggests such a standard.

### INTRODUCTION

"It now appears...we need to work our way back to the simple universality of an understandable symbology..." (Dreyfuss, 1972)

"Here in the United States it is almost impossible to compare drawings prepared by different draftsmen, not only because they may be of different scales, but because the symbols used are often as far apart as the poles." (Wilkins, 1948)

"The kind of mapping that makes up at least 90% of the civil mapping is...the topographic and planimetric mapping for civil engineering, urban planning (micro), and architectural mapping...This supping is done at scales of 1"-40"

t.aour.ud

By Distribution/ Availability 1:4.5 M #=

2887 L

(1:480), 1"=50' (1:600), 1"=100' (1:1200) mostly...In the literature, there are a few chapters on mapping, and to make the work complete, there will usually be a page devoted to the reproduction of a list of cartographic symbols used on U.S. Geological Survey topographic quadrangles. As you know, the largest scale in the U.S.G.S. quads is 1"=2000' (1:24,000). It is easy to see that symbols for use at 1"-2000' are simply not applicable to scales 20 to 30 times larger..." (Steakley, 1977)

All three quotes strongly state the need for a set of symbols to unambiquously transmit an idea from a sender to a receiver. Mr. Dreyfuss addresses the need for worldwide standardization of symbols in general. Walter Blucher, in Mr. Wilkins' book, narrows the field to map symbology, and Mr. Steakley specifically identifies the symbology for very large scale maps. The phrase "very large scale maps" or "engineering scale maps" is defined by the author as maps from the scale 1"=20' (1:240) through 1"=400' (1:4800).

This paper will iterate the need for standard symbology used on very large scale maps and suggest a solution. The author has developed a prototype standard set of large scale map symbology and is exhorting the American Society of Photogrammetry (ASP) and the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping (ACSM) to adopt this standard as a point of departure, to modify and build on it as necessary, and push to have it accepted by the National Bureau of Standards (NBS) and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) as a national consensus standard.

### WHY STANDARDIZE?

In order to effectively communicate, man must have a common language. In the conventional or digital cartographic sphere, this axiom is no less true. Symbols form the language of cartography. Ideally, a worldwide standard set of symbols would solve all of the communication prob-While it will go a long way, this ideal solution is lems. not entirely feasible. On maps of scale 1"=40' (1:480). a large building, industrial complex or airport would be drawn to scale and not symbolized, where as lamp posts, fire plugs, manhole covers and curbside storm drains could be shown as symbols. Reduce the scale + 1.000' (1:12,000) and the features represented by symbols h large scale oc town. The map probably would not (nor should they) features that were drawn to scale at 1:480 would be sym-When the scale is reduced further to 1"=2000' bolized. (1:24,000), the airports, large industrial complexes, etc. cannot even be symbolized without drastically displacing other features on the map from their "true" locations. Though desirable, a single set of symbols will not always work. However, within scale families of maps; e.g., engineering scale maps as previously defined by the author, a standard set of symbols should be developed. Why hasn't this been done?

The absence of a standard set of symbols might, in part, be attributed to the absence of a federal organization that produces very large statements or has jurisdiction over the many producers. Maps at the engineering scales are normally produced for the state, county, city, and private organizations; primarily for planning, construction, and maintenance at the local level, not at the continental level. Each organization has its own set of symbols. In many cases, city legends differ from county legends, which differ from the state legends. Each organization designs its own. That this multiplicity of symbols does, in fact, exist can easily be demonstrated by showing how many symbols the author found that represent lamp posts:



Figure 1. Free Standing Lamp Posts

or by listing all of the features the author found that are symbolized by a small open circle: manhole, light post, chimney, oil or gas well, sump, tanks of all types, airport taxiway light, tower, mill, and proposed location for trees. These two examples were compiled by examining a small sample of 103 legends.

### DIGITAL REPRESENTATION

Large scale maps serve two general purposes. They are extremely efficient data storage media and they communicate facts. (Robinson and Petchenic, 1976). Automated (computer) cartography has tremendously increased the map's abilities to store and transmit information. The cartographic information may be stored in "layers" to facilitate retrieval, editing, updating, and displaying. Thus many paper maps may be composited into a single "digital map" in a computer's memory. For example, the digital display of utility systems within a city could include the water distribution system, electrical distribution grid, storm drain and sewer system, gas distribution network, cable TV routing, telephone network, and perhaps the roads and alleys. When displaying the separate layers, a fire plug, electrical tower, storm drain, manhole, cable TV tie in, telephone pole, and traffic signal all could be depicted as a small open circle without confusion. But, on a display of the combined "digital map", unless each network were coded in a different color, the symbols would have to be different or utter confusion would prevail. Additionally, separate symbology would have to be used to differentiate existing from proposed from abandoned or destroyed features.

The electronic map has the added benefit of being easily transmitted, nearly instantaneously, in digital format. As more and more producers and users of maps go digital, this quick and easy ability to interchange data will stimulate just such exchanges between cities, counties, states, educational facilities, and private organizations and will reinforce the need for standard symbology. Exclusive of the format of the information, a manhole represented by a circle in Cincinnation and be depicted by a circle in New York, San Francisco, etc. Whether the computer is IBM, APPLE, UNIVAC, etc.; the software FORTRAN, BASIC, COBOL, etc.; the information binary, hexadecimal, octal, etc.; the depiction on the CRT (cathode ray tube) or hardcopy map generated from the digital data base must be the same, regardless of where or how the map is displayed. The need to transmit and use a different legend with each map reduces that map's effectiveness. Familiarity with a standard set of symbols increases the speed and reliability of map interpretation. As computerization progresses, automated scanning of hardcopy maps and automated pattern recognition of features on maps will become commonplace. The digital results will then be used as data bases from which to feed other map scales/requirements. This requirement for a standard data set alone makes the development imperative.

# EFFORTS TOWARDS STANDARDIZATION

Many organizations and individuals have long and loudly voiced the need for a standard set of symbols to be used on the engineering scale maps. The Committee on Abbreviations and Symbols of the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping (ACSM), in 1979 reached the conclusion, "...that a complete interprofessional and interdisciplinary approach to the subject be obtained. This would have to be done by a fairly large, dedicated group, with proper funding. It could entail two or more years effort to compile the material, plus the preparation of a text or manual, with indices, cross-indices, and references. This would be a rather expensive undertaking". (Hammarstrom, Crudale, and Lewis, 1979).

Now the National Bureau of Standards has tasked the USGS to develop digital cartographic data standards. Since digitized data is essentially scaleless, very large scale map symbology will have to be addressed. The ACSM is working under a grant from the USGS to bring together representatives from the national, military, and educational communities and from the professional cartographic societies to ultimately develop a national Digital Cartographic Data Base. (Moellering, 1982). This initiative provides an appropriate framework within which to accomplish the standardization we see as necessary. One of the stated goals of the efforts should be a standard for the symbology used on very large scale maps.

## A PROTOTYPE

As mentioned earlier, the beginnings of such a standard already exists. The author has been working on a prototype standard for engineering scale maps for the last four years. The initial research, including a recommended list of symbols and their use, is documented in the author's master's thesis. (Jacober, 1979). The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) has selected an updated version of this prototype legend for its member's use as an ASCE recommended standard. (Feldsoner, 1980). The symbols and suggestions for their use will be printed in an upcoming ASCE publication, "Manual to the base, Scales and Accuracies for Engineering and Associated Purposes." Chapter V of this manual is devoted to the prototype standard. (Jacober, 1980). This ASCE accepted version of the symbology is being put forth by the author, as a first step in the development of a national standard. It is by no means all inclusive or final. But it is a start, and it does offer suggestions on how many of the technical problems of implementing and using the standard can be overcome. Such a national standard will have to remain dynamic and flexible to accommodate the new symbols needed to represent the new features that technology will develop (e.g., space shuttle fuel storage tanks, interplanetary navigation aids, etc.) and that surveyors, engineers, and cartographers will have to portray.

I feel the new standard can be implemented rather easily. With the many years accumulation of irreplaceable manuscripts in files across the United States, recompiling maps using the new standard would be cost prohibitive and unnecessary. As long as legends are available for the filed maps, they remain valuable documents. But as new maps are produced, or old maps are revised or recompiled, the standard symbols should be used, especially on maps that are being compiled in digital format. Thus over a period of years, the new standard would be systematically implemented. (Jacober, 1981).

### RECOMMENDATION

The first step has been taken. A prototype has been designed. We in the American Society of Photogrammetry can recommend the prototype be accepted as the standard for the symbology used on very large scale maps. Several committees, most notably the Photogrammetric Standards Committee, will have a voice in preparing the Digital Cartographic Data Base standards, of which symbology is a The need for the standard exists. The vehicle to part. solve the problem is at hand. All we need do is climb aboard and collectively push for a standard that will be useful to the entire community. This is not to say the final solution will be easily obtained. Problems still remain to be faced. But the fact that a multiorganization committee now exists and is examining the problems gives hope. To implement the ASCE adopted symbology as a national standard will take the cooperation of the organization representatives on the committee and the backing of us all.

#### REFERENCES

Dreyfuss, H. 1972, <u>Symbol Source Book</u>, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Féldscher, C.B. 1980, A New Manual on Map Uses, Scales and Accuracies, Journal of the Surveying and Mapping Division, Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Vol. 106, No. SUL, NOV, pp. 143-148. Hammarstrom, C., Crudale, A.R., and Lewis, M.A. 1979, Abbreviations and Symbols, A Committee Report, <u>Bulletin</u> of the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping, No. 67, NOV, pp. 13-14.

Jacober, R.P., Jr. 1979, <u>Standardization of Map Symbology</u> for Large Scale Maps, thesis presented to the Department of Geodetic Science, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

Jacober, R.P., Jr. 1980, Map Content and Symbols, Chapter V of Proposed Manual on Map Uses, Scales, and Accuracies for Engineering and Associated Purposes, Journal of the Surveying and Mapping Division, Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Vol. 106, No. SU1, NOV, pp. 41-72.

Jacober, R.P., Jr. 1981, Standard for Symbology on Engineering Scale Maps, Journal of the Surveying and Mapping Division, Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Vol. 107, No. SUI, NOV, pp. 21-24.

Moellering, H. 1982, The Challenge of Developing a Set of National Digital Cartographic Data Standards for the United States, <u>Technical Papers of the American Congress on Sur-</u> veying and Mapping, Denver, 14-20 March, pp. 201-212.

Ormeling, F.J., Jr. 1978, <u>Proceedings for Standardization</u> <u>in Cartographic Representation</u>, presented at the 9th International Conference on Cartography, International Cartographic Association, July 26-August 2, College Park, Maryland.

Robinson, A.H. and Petchenik, B.B. 1976, <u>The Nature of</u> <u>Maps, Essays Toward Understanding Maps and Mapping</u>, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Steakley, J. 1977, Large Scale Mapping, Communication from Readers, <u>The American Cartographer</u>, Vol. 4, No. 1, p. 96.

Wilkins, E.B. 1948, <u>Maps for Planning</u>, Public Administrative Service, Chicago.

