

ILLUSTATIONS

Figure	Page
1.1 Location of Petersburg, Virginia	2
1.2 Section of the Dimmock Line	2
1.3 Federal line near Fort Morton (National Archive # 4a39636r)	4
1.4 Aerial view of Union Fort Fisher (digitized engineer's drawing)	5
1.5 General profile of an entrenched field fortification. A B C D E F = Parapet, G H I J = Ditch	6
1.6 Fort Haskell, Battery XIII, and the continued line connecting them	7
2.1 Generalization of GIS data structure	18
3.1 Generalized flowchart of predictive map layer development	22
3.2 Enlarged section of Michler map number 38	23
3.3 Extent of the USGS DEMs (outlined in red) in relation to the eight Michler Maps (gray areas)	24
3.4 Dependent variable grid of Michler map 38	26
3.5 Elevation grid of Michler map 38	26
3.6 Slope grid of Michler map 38	26
3.7 Aspect grid of Michler map 38	27
3.8 Visibility from Confederate forts and batteries	27
3.9 Visibility from main Confederate earthworks	27
3.10 Grid of distance from historic structures	27
3.11 Grid of distance from Confederate forts and batteries	27
3.12 Grid of distance from main Confederate earthworks	27

3.13	Grid of distance from historic railroad lines	27
3.14	Grid of distance from historic roads	28
3.15	Grid of distance from water	28
3.16	Graph of internal accuracy of the logistic regression model using different cutpoint (<i>c</i>) levels to determine the optimum value.	30
3.17	Extent of independent “test” area	33
4.1	Classification tables for the stepwise logistic regression procedure (Selected samples)	40-41
4.2	Observed groups and predicted probabilities for the final step in the logistic regression model	43
4.3	Probability surface for Union Civil War fortifications (Michler map 38)	45
4.4	Map illustrating predicted site and non-site locations in relation to the 0.62 cut-point value	46
4.5	Frequency distributions of sites and non-sites along the site-presence probability gradient with cut-point value (0.62) highlighted in blue	47
4.6	“Test” predictive probability surface of Union fort/battery locations	48
4.7	Map illustrating predicted site and non-site locations for the “test” surface in relation to the 0.62 cut-point value.	48
4.8	Frequency distributions of sites and non-sites along the site-presence probability gradient for the test model with cut-point value (0.62) highlighted in blue	49
4.9	Extent of Michler Map 38 and the “test” coverage in relation to one another	50