




AD A 114027



Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Technical Report A-82-1	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A114027	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) SIMULATION FOR HARVESTING OF AQUATIC PLANTS	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final report	
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
7. AUTHOR(s) Eugene R. Perrier Anthony C. Gibson	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station Environmental Laboratory P. O. Box 631, Vicksburg, Miss. 39180	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Aquatic Plant Control Research Program	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U. S. Army Engineer District, Jacksonville Jacksonville, Fla. 32232 and Office, Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army Washington, D. C. 20314	12. REPORT DATE February 1982	
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 54	
	14. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Available from National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Va. 22151.		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Aquatic plants                      SHAP (Computer program) Computer programs                Simulation methods Computer simulation		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This report describes a computer program entitled "Simulation for Harvest- ing of Aquatic Plants (SHAP)," and provides instructions and guidelines in planning for mechanical harvesting of plant-infested areas. The model provides a stochastic simulation that evaluates the harvesting system. SHAP utilizes linear programming theory for network flow analysis and queuing theory and is designed for using minimal input data in a conversational manner; that is, the <span style="float: right;">(Continued)</span>		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

20. ABSTRACT (Continued).

user interacts directly with the program and receives output immediately. The model has been verified using field data collection records.

The terrain subroutine organizes irregularly shaped plant-infested areas to be harvested into a distance-flow network (grid). The harvesting subroutine directs the harvesting procedure. The harvester (Aqua-Trio Equipment Co.) mows the aquatic plants; the transporter loads the plants and takes them to the conveyor located on the shoreline. The plants are then transferred from the transporter, via the conveyor, onto a dump truck for disposal at a convenient location. When the mowing, transporting, and disposal operations are complete, the statistics of time and queuing operations for each component are computed. Operational costs are compiled for each component (default 1977 dollars), including labor, supplies, and power costs required by the harvesting system. No prior experience with computer programming is required since all commands necessary to use SHAP are presented in this report.

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

**PREFACE**

This study was conducted under the Aquatic Plant Control Research Program (APCRP) and is part of the continuation of research assistance to the U. S. Army Engineer District, Jacksonville, on improvement of mechanical control technology for aquatic plants. Funds for the project were provided under authorizations 96X3122 (Construction General) and 96X4902 (O&M General).

The project was conducted by the Environmental Engineering Division (EED) of the Environmental Laboratory (EL) at the U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES), under the general supervision of Dr. John Harrison, Chief, EL; Mr. Lewis Decell, Program Manager, APCRP; and Mr. A. J. Green, Chief, EED. The work was under the direct supervision of Dr. Raymond L. Montgomery, Chief, Water Resources Engineering Group (WREG), EED.

This report was written by Dr. Eugene R. Perrier and Mr. Anthony C. Gibson, WREG. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Thomas M. Walski of WREG for technical assistance and guidance in developing the study activities.

Commander and Director of WES during this study was COL Nelson P. Conover, CE. Technical Director was Mr. F. R. Brown.

This report should be cited as follows:

Perrier, E. R., and Gibson, A. C. 1982. "Simulation for Harvesting of Aquatic Plants," Technical Report A-82-1, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A	

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PREFACE . . . . .	1
CONVERSION FACTORS, U. S. CUSTOMARY TO METRIC (SI) UNITS OF MEASUREMENT . . . . .	3
PART I: INTRODUCTION . . . . .	4
Background and Purpose . . . . .	4
Model Operation . . . . .	5
PART II: SHAP USER'S MANUAL . . . . .	7
Model Definition . . . . .	7
Model Procedure . . . . .	9
PART III: MODEL VERIFICATION . . . . .	37
Orange Lake East . . . . .	37
Orange Lake West . . . . .	40
St. Johns River . . . . .	40
PART IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	47
Conclusions . . . . .	47
Recommendations . . . . .	47
REFERENCES . . . . .	49
TABLES 1-4	
APPENDIX A: COST BREAKDOWN OF BOEING COMPUTER SERVICES . . . . .	A1

**CONVERSION FACTORS, U. S. CUSTOMARY TO METRIC (SI)  
UNITS OF MEASUREMENT**

U. S. customary units of measurement used in this report can be converted to metric (SI) units as follows:

<u>Multiply</u>	<u>By</u>	<u>To Obtain</u>
acres	4046.856	square metres
feet	0.3048	metres
feet per hour	0.3048	metres per hour
inches	0.0254	metres
miles (U. S. statute)	1.609344	kilometres
pounds (mass)	0.4535924	kilograms
pounds (mass) per cubic foot	16.01846	kilograms per cubic metre
pounds (mass) per hour	0.4535924	kilograms per hour
tons per acre	0.22417	kilograms per square metre
tons (2000 lb, mass)	907.1847	kilograms

## SIMULATION FOR HARVESTING OF AQUATIC PLANTS

### PART I: INTRODUCTION

#### Background and Purpose

1. One method used for control of areas infested with aquatic plants is mechanical harvesting. Mr. S. J. Winfrey of the University of Florida at Gainesville developed a computer program (Winfrey 1977) for the U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES), Vicksburg, Miss., to simulate mechanical harvesting of aquatic plants. This program was developed to evaluate the operations and costs of the mechanical harvesting system. The purpose of this report is to provide a communication-type computer package to aid planners by simulating mechanical harvesting of aquatic-plant-infested areas. The computer model, SHAP, permits rapid evaluation of project design, operations, and methodologies, as well as economic evaluation of the site.

2. The data of Culpepper and Decell (1978a) (a field evaluation of the Aqua-Trio System for harvesting aquatic plants in Florida) were used to verify the model operations and cost analysis. The data of Perrier and Gibson (1979), which noted that, with particular mechanical plant harvester designs, a harvester with a draw of at least 2 ft\* could harvest only 25 percent or less of the infested areas, were also used in evaluating bathymetric and infested area data. They noted that 75 percent of the plant-infested areas were in water 0 to 2 ft deep, and 48 percent of the plant-infested areas were in water 1 ft or less in depth. However, effects of this type cannot be solved by the present version of SHAP and at this time only the Aqua-Trio system (2-ft draw) can be evaluated.

3. Mathematical modeling concepts deal with deterministic and

---

\* A table of factors for converting U. S. customary units of measurement to metric (SI) is presented on page 3.

stochastic variables. A deterministic variable is one whose temporal and spatial properties are known, i.e., it is assumed that the behavior of a variable is definite and its characteristics can be predicted without uncertainty. A stochastic variable is one whose properties are governed by purely random-time events and sequential relations, as well as functional relations with other variables. SHAP is a stochastic model that utilizes linear programming theory for network flow analyses and queuing theory. SHAP is designed for using minimal input data in a conversational manner; that is, the user interacts directly with the program and receives output immediately.

#### Model Operation

4. The terrain subroutine organizes irregularly shaped plant-infested areas to be harvested into a distance-flow network (grid). The harvesting subroutine directs the harvesting procedure. The harvester mows the aquatic plants; the transporter loads the plants and takes them to the conveyor located on the shoreline where the plants are transferred from the transporter, via the conveyor, onto a dump truck for disposal at a nearby site. When the mowing, transporting, and disposal operations are complete, the statistics of time and queuing operations for each component are computed. In addition, the operational costs are tallied for each component (default 1977 dollars), including labor, supplies, and power costs required by the system. The flowchart for the SHAP model is shown in Figure 1 for the model operation steps. The terrain and harvesting portion of the model developed by Winfrey has been modified to expedite model options, needs, and usage.




Figure 1. Generalized flowchart for the simulation model SHAP

## PART II: SHAP USER'S MANUAL

### Model Definition

5. The terrain model uses a labeling algorithm to locate the node/distance within the grid. These values are put into a table of 200 distances, which is randomly accessed by the transporters in the harvesting model. The terrain model has been modified so that two options may be expressed. If the harvest site has a relatively simple, rectangular geometry, only the boundary points will need to be entered. However, if the harvest site area has a more complex shape, then the interior points will have to be entered. Examples of the area geometry requirements will be delineated later in the report.

6. In the harvest model, the harvester (Figure 2) is set to mowing aquatic plants of a given density and at a specified velocity. When the storage of the harvester is filled it stops mowing and waits for the




Figure 2. Aqua-Trio harvester in waterhyacinth showing harvester operation

transporter to remove the stored plants. The harvester enters the program only in the sense of harvesting an area of aquatic plants and, when it has harvested the entire site, the program prints out only the time the harvester was in operation (including breakdowns). The exact location or position of the harvester in the grid network is not known at any time; however, it is assumed to be at the position and distance the transporter has traveled to unload the harvester.

7. When the harvester capacity has been filled, the transporter is notified, the distance that the transporter must travel is randomly selected (at the assumed harvester position), and the transporter goes to unload the harvester. When the transporter is loaded with aquatic plants, another randomly selected distance is obtained and the transporter goes to the conveyor. At this time, the harvester starts mowing plants again and the transporter waits to unload the weeds onto the conveyor and into the trucks for eventual disposal.

8. The program clock keeps the time of the total harvest operation, and each subroutine keeps the time required for each component. The total time also includes the number of equipment failures, which increase operation time. When the harvest, transport, conveyor, and disposal operations are complete, the statistics of time and the queuing operations for each component are printed out.

9. Economic input data are entered and stored in the data base so that consistent comparisons can be made between costs of various components of the harvest system. The Engineering News Record (ENR) operation costs are used for updating the costs for the harvest area under consideration. The operation cost includes the costs of all material, equipment, and labor needed to complete the harvesting project (Perrier and Gibson 1979). Overhead consists of profit and legal, fiscal, administration, interest, and engineering costs, and is a function of the operation. The labor required to operate and maintain the equipment is estimated in man-hours per day. By multiplying this value by the wage rate, the labor cost is calculated. All supplies and power costs necessary to run the harvesting system are included in this estimate.

Model Procedure

Log on/off

10. The steps to log on/off the Boeing Computer System (BCS)\* are shown in Figure 3, which presents the eight steps to log on the computer and one step to log off. A work sheet is presented in Figure 4 for the entry of site and equipment characteristics data necessary to run the model. Most computer input requests are self-explanatory. The computer terminal that the user is operating should be set to enter information using all CAPITAL LETTERS. Initially, the program prints a heading that details the title, name, and address of the authors and the telephone number to call for information about the program and to clarify problems if and when they arise.

```
*****
*****
*
*           SIMULATION FOR HARVESTING OF AQUATIC PLANTS (SHAP)
*
* THE WES VERSION OF THE MECHANICAL HARVESTING SIMULATION MODEL
*           FOR THE AQUA-TRIO SYSTEM
*
*****
*
*           WRITTEN BY
*     EUGENE R. PERRIER AND ANTHONY C. GIBSON
*
*           OF THE
*     WATER RESOURCES ENGINEERING GROUP
*     ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY
*     USAF, WATERWAYS EXPERIMENT STATION
*           P.O. BOX 631
*           VICKSBURG, MS 39180
*
*****
*
*     COPIES OF THE USERS MANUAL AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST
*     FOR CONSULTATION CONTACT AUTHOPS AT
*           (601) 634-3710
*
*****
*****
```

---

\* To obtain information on using BCS and for an account number and password (ID, PASSWORD), call 1-800-426-7676 and ask for EKS customer service (see Appendix A).

<u>STEP</u>	<u>OPERATION</u>
1	Turn on data terminal
2	Dial 1-800-426-7676 (if a local number is available, it is less expensive)
3	Ask operator for: EKS1, 30 CPS data line. (Company or Organization)
4	Put telephone handle in the handset muff
5	Wait for green light to come on (you are now on line), then <u>press</u> RETURN key
6	The computer system types:  USER NUMBER:  You type:  ID, PASSWORD ( <u>press</u> RETURN key)
7	The computer system types:  RECOVER/USER ID:  You type:  (your last name) ( <u>press</u> RETURN key)
8	The computer system types:  C>  You type:  -SHAP (- is a minus sign) ( <u>press</u> RETURN key)
At this point, the program prints a heading and begins to ask questions (see Example 1, paragraph 11) for subroutine options.	
9	When program is finished, the computer types:  C>  You type:  BYE ( <u>press</u> RETURN key) or repeat step 8 for reruns

Figure 3. Steps to log on/off BCS



Speed . . . . .	_____	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	_____	lb
Blade depth . . . . .	_____	ft
<b>Number of Transporters:</b> . . . . .	_____	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	_____	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	_____	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	_____	lb/hr
Speed . . . . .	_____	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	_____	lb
Distance to conveyor . . . . .	_____	ft
<b>Number of Trucks:</b> . . . . .	_____	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	_____	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	_____	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	_____	lb/hr
Speed . . . . .	_____	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	_____	lb
<b>Number of Conveyors:</b> . . . . .	_____	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	_____	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	_____	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	_____	lb/hr
<hr/>		
Cost of harvester . . . . .	_____	\$/hr
Cost of operator . . . . .	_____	\$/hr
Cost of transporter . . . . .	_____	\$/hr
Cost of operator . . . . .	_____	\$/hr
Cost of conveyor . . . . .	_____	\$/hr
Cost of truck . . . . .	_____	\$/hr
Cost of driver . . . . .	_____	\$/hr
Disposal cost . . . . .	_____	\$/hr
Mobilization fee . . . . .	_____	\$/hr
Distance to site . . . . .	_____	miles
Locale adjustment factor . . . . .	_____	
Engineering News Record (ENR) adjustment factor . . . . .	_____	

Figure 4. (Concluded)

Example 1

11. The following example illustrates the interaction that occurs between the program and the user to evaluate a hydrilla harvesting project in Orange Lake East, Fla. After the heading, the computer gives the following commands to input the data:

DO YOU WANT THE TERRAIN, HARVESTING, ECONOMIC, OR OUTPUT MODEL?

ENTER 0 FOP TERRAIN MODEL  
ENTER 1 FOP HARVESTING MODEL  
ENTER 2 FOP ECONOMIC MODEL  
ENTER 3 FOR OUTPUT OF ALL MODELS  
ENTER 4 TO STOP PROGRAM

I>0

The terrain model input data include the title, plot geometry, transporter outlet, plant characteristics, and distance truck must drive to the disposal site. The harvesting model input data include characteristics of the harvester, transporter, conveyor, and trucks. The economic model input data include hourly costs for equipment, equipment operators, disposal costs, mobilization fees, distance to site, and economic adjustment factors. The output model prints figures and tables of the input and simulated data. The title information is printed in the output for the user's interest only.

ENTER TWO STATEMENTS FOP REFERENCE PURPOSES:  
PROJECT TITLE, AND  
TODAY'S DATE.  
\*\*ENTER 1 VALUE PER LINE\*\*

I>OPANGE LAKE EAST, HYDRILLA  
I>15 AUGUST 1980

12. Note, the user must enter a word or value for each input prompt I>. After the word or value has been entered, the user must also press the RETURN key. In the event an error was committed when typing, i.e., ORANGE LAKE AEST (HYDRILLA), press and hold the CONTROL (CTRL) key,

and press the H key 14 times (14 backspaces).\* Then type EAST (HYDRILLA) to correct the spelling, and press the RETURN key.

```
I>ORANGE LAKF [AST ,HYDRILLA
I>15 AUGUST 1980
```

13. To correct an entire line error, the user may press the BREAK key and the computer will type \*DEL\*. Then the user should type in the correct message as shown:

```
I>ORANGE LAKE AEST,HYDRILLA *DEL*
```

```
ORANGE LAKE EAST,HYDRILLA
I>15 AUGUST 1980
```

14. At this point, the user inputs the data from the work sheet as shown in Figure 5 by answering the following commands:

```
ENTER TWO VALUES FOR THE PLANT DEPTH:
MEAN (FEET) AND
STANDARD DEVIATION (FEET)
**ENTER 1 VALUE PER LINE**
```

```
I>5
I>0
```

```
ENTER TWO VALUES FOR THE PLANT BULK DENSITY:
MEAN (POUNDS PER CUBIC FOOT) AND
STANDARD DEVIATION (POUNDS PER CUBIC FOOT)
```

```
I>.09
I>0
```

```
ENTER THE DISTANCE THE TRUCK DRIVES TO THE DISPOSAL SITE
(FEET)
```

```
I>1056
```

```
ENTER ONE SET OF VALUES FOR THE POSITION OF THE TRANSPORTER OUTLET (X & Y)
**ENTER 2 VALUES ON 1 LINE**
```

```
I>720 20
```

```
*****
```

```
INPUT POSITION OF TRANSPORTER OUTLET
X= 720.0 Y= 20.0
```

```
PLANT MEAN STD. DEV.
DEPTH 5.00 0.000
DENSITY .090 0.000
```

```
DISTANCE TRUCK DRIVES TO DISPOSAL SITE= 1056.00
```

```
*****
```

```
DO YOU WANT TO CHANGE ANY OF THE ABOVE VALUES?
(ANSWER YES OR NO)
```

```
I>NO
```

---

\* Some computer terminals use a different backspace command.

WORK SHEET

Simulation for Harvesting of Aquatic Plants (SHAP)

TITLE: Orange Lake East, Hydrilla

Transporter Outlet: X = 720 ft Y = 20 ft

Plant Depth: 5 ft

Standard deviation: 0 ft

Plant Density: 0.09 lb/cu ft

Standard deviation: 0 lb/cu ft

Truck distance to disposal site: 1056 ft

Number of boundary points: 6

Boundary Points		Interior Points	
X	Y	X	Y
0	0		
0	350		
1000	350		
1000	1400		
1400	1400		
1400	0		

Number of Harvesters: . . . . . 1  
 Breakdowns per unit time . . . . . 0.32 no./hr  
 Average repair time . . . . . 0.28 hr  
 Cutting bar width . . . . . 8 ft

Figure 5. Work sheet for Example 1 (Continued)

Speed . . . . .	<u>7866</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>6322</u>	lb
Blade depth . . . . .	<u>5</u>	ft
<b>Number of Transporters:</b> . . . . .	<u>2</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0.21</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0.24</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>101025</u>	lb/hr
Speed . . . . .	<u>9523</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>6322</u>	lb
Distance to conveyor . . . . .	<u>900</u>	ft
<b>Number of Trucks:</b> . . . . .	<u>2</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0.04</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0.17</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>379320</u>	lb/hr
Speed . . . . .	<u>25728</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>6322</u>	lb
<b>Number of Conveyors:</b> . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0.02</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0.17</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>65969</u>	lb/hr
<hr/>		
Cost of harvester . . . . .	<u>25.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of operator . . . . .	<u>12.80</u>	\$/hr
Cost of transporter . . . . .	<u>5.50</u>	\$/hr
Cost of operator . . . . .	<u>10.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of conveyor . . . . .	<u>4.50</u>	\$/hr
Cost of truck . . . . .	<u>10.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of driver . . . . .	<u>8.50</u>	\$/hr
Disposal cost . . . . .	<u>4.20</u>	\$/hr
Mobilization fee . . . . .	<u>11.75</u>	\$/hr
Distance to site . . . . .	<u>0.0</u>	miles
Locale adjustment factor . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Engineering News Record (ENR) adjustment factor . . . . .	<u>1</u>	

Figure 5. (Concluded)

After a portion of the terrain model data has been entered, the computer will print:

\*\*\*\*\* NOTICE \*\*\*\*\*

ALL DATA POINTS SHOULD BE ENTERED IN A CLOCKWISE DIRECTION  
(FEET)

\*\*\*\*\*

If any data have been input in error, it can be corrected at this time. If not, continue on to the next data entry. It is assumed that the size and shape of the area to be harvested are known; these distances will now be entered into the computer program. Note, all data points describing the area must be entered in a clockwise direction. The program assumes that the harvesters and transporters can travel anywhere within the site. The user must construct the site boundary to exclude areas of insufficient water depth (Aqua-Trio requires a 2-ft draw).

ENTER THE NUMBER OF BOUNDARY POINTS

I>6

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>0 0

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>0 350

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>1000 350

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>1300 1400

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>1400 1400

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>1400 0

\*\*\*\*\*

USER INPUT OF BOUNDARY POINTS IN FEET

X	Y
0.0	0.0
0.0	350.0
1000.0	350.0
1000.0	1400.0
1400.0	1400.0
1400.0	0.0

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

DO YOU WANT TO CHANGE ANY OF THE ABOVE VALUES?  
(ANSWER YES OR NO)

I>NO

15. Again, the computer asks if the values are correct. Also, the program asks if the harvest area has a complex geometry. For the given example, the answer is NO; however, a more complex geometry will be examined in a later example.

DOES YOUR HARVEST AREA HAVE A COMPLEX GEOMETRY?  
(ANSWER YES OR NO)

I>NO

16. This completes the entry of data into the terrain model; now the user proceeds to the harvesting model.

\*\*\*\*\*

END OF TERRAIN MODEL INPUT

\*\*\*\*\*

17. The user must now enter the information on the work sheet for the harvester:

ENTER THREE VALUES:  
NUMBER OF HARVESTERS  
BREAKDOWNS PER UNIT TIME (NUMBER/TOTAL HOUPS) AND  
REPAIR TIME (HOURS).  
\*\* 1 VALUE PER LINE \*\*

I>1  
I>.32  
I>.28

ENTER TWO VALUES:  
HARVESTER CUTTING BAR WIDTH (FEET) AND  
SPEED (FEET PER HOUR).

I>8  
I>7866

ENTER TWO VALUES:  
HARVESTER CAPACITY (POUNDS) AND  
BLADE DEPTH (FEET).

I>6322  
I>5

\*\*\*\*\*

INPUT OF HARVESTER VALUES	
NUMBER	1
BREAKDOWNS	.3200
REPAIR TIME	.2800
BAR WIDTH	8.0
SPEED	7866.0
CAPACITY	6322.0
BLADE DEPTH	5.00

\*\*\*\*\*

DO YOU WANT TO CHANGE ANY OF THE ABOVE VALUES?  
(ANSWER YES OR NO)

I>NO

\*\*\*\*\*

Then the user must enter the data for the transporter:

ENTER THREE VALUES:  
NUMBER OF TRANSPORTEPS,  
BREAKDOWNS (NUMBER/TOTAL HOURS) AND  
REPAIR TIME (HOUPS).

I>2  
I>.21  
I>.24

ENTER TWO VALUES:  
TRANSPORTER UNLOADING RATE (POUNDS/HOUR) AND  
SPEED (FEET PER HOUR).

I>101025  
I>9523

ENTER TWO VALUES:  
TRANSPORTER CAPACITY (POUNDS) AND  
DISTANCE TO CONVEYOR.

I>6322  
I>900

\*\*\*\*\*

INPUT OF TRANSPORTER VALUES	
NUMBER	2
BREAKDOWNS	.2100
REPAIR TIME	.2400
UNLOADING	101025.0
SPEED	9523.0
CAPACITY	6322.0
DISTANCE	900.0

\*\*\*\*\*

DO YOU WANT TO CHANGE ANY OF THE ABOVE VALUES?  
(ANSWER YES OR NO)

I>NO

\*\*\*\*\*

Now the user must enter the data for the truck operation:

ENTER THREE VALUES:  
NUMBER OF TRUCKS  
BREAKDOWNS (NUMBER/TOTAL HOURS) AND  
REPAIR TIME (HOURS).

I>2  
I>.04  
I>.17

ENTER THREE VALUES:  
TRUCK UNLOADING RATE (POUNDS PER HOUR)  
SPEED (FEET PER HOUR) AND  
TRUCK CAPACITY (POUNDS).

I>379320  
I>25728  
I>6322

\*\*\*\*\*

INPUT OF TRUCK VALUES

NUMBER 2  
BREAKDOWNS .0400  
REPAIR TIME .1700  
UNLOADING 379320.0  
SPEED 25728.0  
CAPACITY 6322.0

\*\*\*\*\*

DO YOU WANT TO CHANGE ANY OF THE ABOVE VALUES?  
(ANSWER YES OR NO)

I>NO

\*\*\*\*\*

And, finally, the user inputs the data for the conveyor, which completes the information on the work sheet for the equipment (Figure 5) and also completes the information required by the harvesting model:

ENTER TWO VALUES:  
NUMBER OF CONVEYORS AND  
BREAKDOWNS (NUMBER PER TOTAL HOURS).

I>1

I>.02

ENTER TWO VALUES:  
CONVEYOR REPAIR TIME AND  
UNLOADING RATE (POUNDS PER HOUR).

I>.17

I>65969

\*\*\*\*\*

INPUT OF CONVEYOR VALUES

NUMBER 1  
BREAKDOWNS .0200  
REPAIR TIME .1700  
UNLOADING 65969.0

\*\*\*\*\*

DO YOU WANT TO CHANGE ANY OF THE ABOVE VALUES?  
(ANSWER YES OR NO)

I>NO

18. After both the terrain and harvesting input data have been entered, it will be necessary to enter data into the economic model. If this information is not available, the user may desire to go directly to the output model. In this instance, the model will operate on 1977 default dollars values obtained from Culpepper and Decell (1978a). However, if information is available, the following entries could be made:

ENTER TWO VALUES:  
\*\*ENTER 1 VALUE PER LINE\*\*

COST FOR HARVESTER (\$/HOUR) AND  
COST FOR OPERATOR (\$/HOUR)

I>25  
I>12.8

ENTER TWO VALUES:

COST OF TRANSPORTER (\$/HOUR) AND  
COST FOR OPERATOR (\$/HOUR)

I>5.5  
I>10

\*\*\*\*\*

	HARVESTER	TRANSPORTER
COST	25.00	12.80
OPERATOR	5.50	10.00

\*\*\*\*\*

DO YOU WANT TO CHANGE ANY OF THE ABOVE VALUES?  
(ANSWER YES OR NO)

I>NO

ENTER COST OF CONVEYOR(DOLLARS/HOUR)

I>4.5

ENTER TWO VALUES:

COST OF TRUCK (\$/HOUR) AND  
COST FOR DRIVER (\$/HOUR)

I>10  
I>8.5

At this point, the program asks for the site distance, disposal costs,  
and adjustment factors:

ENTER THREE VALUES:

DISPOSAL COST (DOLLARS/HOUR),  
MOBILIZATION FEE (DOLLARS/MILE)  
AND DISTANCE TO SITE (MILES)

I>4.2  
I>11.75  
I>0

ENTER TWO VALUES:

LOCAL ADJUSTMENT FACTOR AND  
ENGINEERING NEWS RECORD (ENR) ADJUSTMENT FACTOR

I>1  
I>1

19. This completes the required data entry; the questions about  
output follow:

DO YOU WANT THE TERRAIN, HARVESTING, ECONOMIC, OR OUTPUT MODEL?

ENTER 0 FOR TERRAIN MODEL  
ENTER 1 FOR HARVESTING MODEL  
ENTER 2 FOR ECONOMIC MODEL  
ENTER 3 FOR OUTPUT OF ALL MODELS  
ENTER 4 TO STOP PROGRAM

I>3

SHAP output

20. The model prints out the economic values entered by the user:





\*\*\*\*\*

DO YOU WANT TO RETURN TO THE TERRAIN MODEL?  
(ANSWER YES OR NO)

I>NO

\*\*\*\*\*

21. The output for the harvesting model includes an echo printout of the input data:

HARVESTING INPUT

ORANGE LAKE EAST, HYDRILLA  
15 AUGUST 1980

	HARVESTERS	TRANSPORTERS	CONVEYORS	TRUCKS	
NUMBER OF	1	2	1	2	
BREAKDOWNS	.32	.21	.02	.04	NO./HR
REPAIR	.28	.24	.17	.17	HOURS
SPEED	7866.00	9523.00		25728.00	FEET/HR
CAPACITY	6322.00	6322.00		6322.00	POUNDS
UNLOAD RATE		101025.00	65969.00	379320.00	LBS/HR
HARVESTER CUTTING HEAD WIDTH	8.0		AND DEPTH	5.0	FEET

The input summary gives the total area harvested, the total time required for the entire operation, and a brief summary of the site characteristics:

INPUT SUMMARY

AREA HARVESTED .978272E+06 SQUARE FEET OR .225E-02 ACRES  
TIME REQUIRED .331281E+02 HOURS OR .414E+01 DAYS  
PLANT DEPTH MEAN .500000E+01 FEET  
STD. 0. FEET  
PLANT DENSITY MEAN .900000E-01 POUNDS/CUBIC FEET  
STD. 0. POUNDS/CUBIC FEET  
DIST. TO CONVEYOR .900000E+03 FEET  
DUMP SITE DISTANCE .105600E+04 FEET

22. The equipment summary gives a record of each equipment item, including busy time, the percent that the busy time represents of the entire simulation time, the number of times the item broke down in service, the number of events, and the loading/trip rate:

EQUIPMENT SUMMARY

HARVESTER NUMBER	BUSY TIME(HRS)	BUSY TIME(%)	EQUIPMENT FAILURES	NUMBER LOADS	LOAD * RATE(M/L)
1	.3284E+02	99.12	4	70	28.1
TRANSPORTER NUMBER	BUSY TIME(HRS)	BUSY TIME(%)	EQUIPMENT FAILURES	NUMBER TRIPS	TRIP * RATE(M/T)
1	.1921E+02	57.98	4	35	32.9
2	.1779E+02	53.71	2	37	28.9
CONVEYOR NUMBER	BUSY TIME(HRS)	BUSY TIME(%)	EQUIPMENT FAILURES	TRANS. UNLOADED	LOAD * RATE(M/L)
1	.6673E+01	20.14	0	70	5.7
TRUCK NUMBER	BUSY TIME(HRS)	BUSY TIME(%)	EQUIPMENT FAILURES	NUMBER TRIPS	TRIP * RATE(M/T)
1	.6811E+01	20.56	0	35	11.7
2	.6775E+01	20.45	0	35	11.6

\* M/L = MINUTES PER LOAD AND M/T = MINUTES PER TRIP

23. The service summary shows the operations of the truck, conveyor, and transporter service systems. It consists of the total number of service requests, total number of queue entries, maximum queue length, average queue length, and average waiting time:

SERVICE SUMMARY

SERVICE SYSTEM	TOTAL SERVICE REQUESTS	TOTAL QUEUE ENTRIES	MAXIMUM QUEUE LENGTH	AVERAGE QUEUE LENGTH	AVERAGE WAITING TIME(MIN)
TRANSPORTER	72	2	1	.00	.08
CONVEYOR	70	0	0	0.00	0.00
TRUCK	70	0	0	0.00	0.00

The total number of service requests represents the total number of times that service was requested for the particular system, whether or not it was immediately available. If the service was not available immediately, the request entered the respective queue and waited. The maximum queue length represents the maximum number of items in the queue at any time during the simulation. A large number would suggest a need for more units of this equipment item. The average queue length is the average length of the respective queue for the entire time of the simulation--including times when the queue was empty. This number is not influenced by time that the queue was empty. A large number here would suggest a need for additional units of this equipment item. However, a small number here could suggest that too many of these equipment items are on the plant-harvesting project.

24. The output model now prints out the economics summary, which includes the distance to the job site (miles) and the length of job in terms of the number of 8-hr days:

#### ECONOMICS SUMMARY

DISTANCE TO JOB SITE	0.000	MILES
LENGTH OF JOB	.414E+01	DAYS (8 HRS)

The total operation costs for the harvester, transporter, conveyor, truck, and operators are given below. The disposal cost, cost of the disposal site operations converted to a total time cost, and the mobilization fee, which includes transporting all of the equipment to the harvest area from some distance, are also included. Next, the total job cost is computed and converted to values of cost per ton and cost per acre. In addition, the total mass (tons) of aquatic plants harvested is given.

OPERATION COSTS

---

HARVESTER	\$	828.20
OPERATOR	\$	424.04
TRANSPORTER	\$	182.20
OPERATER	\$	331.28
CONVEYOR	\$	149.08
TRUCK	\$	331.28
DRIVER	\$	281.59
<hr style="width: 20%;"/>		
TOTAL	\$	2527.67
DISPOSAL COST	\$	139.14
MOBILIZATION FEE	\$	0.00
<hr style="width: 20%;"/>		
TOTAL JOB COST	\$	2666.81
COST PER TON	\$	12.12
COST PER ACRE	\$	118.75

---

TOTAL VOLUME HARVESTED 220.11 TONS

25. If the program session is completed, then the log off command BYE is typed at the next prompt.

ENTER -SHAP TO START NEXT RUN  
REMEMBER -- ALL INPUT DATA FILES ARE PERMANENT, OR

ENTER BYE TO LOG OFF COMPUTER SYSTEM

C>BYE

However, if the user would like to re-enter the simulation model, the user should enter -SHAP. At this point, the program heading would be reprinted and the beginning questions asked.

Example 2

26. As previously mentioned, the terrain model has two options as to the complexity of the area to be harvested. Example 1 presented a

relatively simple rectangular geometry. In this example, a harvest site area with a more complex shape will be discussed. The following computer program statements illustrate the interaction that occurs between the program and the user to evaluate a harvesting project with a complex geometry. Note, all data points describing both boundary and interior points must be entered in a clockwise direction.

MECHANICAL HARVESTING SIMULATION

DO YOU WANT THE TERRAIN, HARVESTING, ECONOMIC, OR OUTPUT MODEL?

ENTER 0 FOR TERRAIN MODEL  
ENTER 1 FOR HARVESTING MODEL  
ENTER 2 FOR ECONOMIC MODEL  
ENTER 3 FOR OUTPUT OF ALL MODELS  
ENTER 4 TO STOP PROGRAM

I>0

ENTER TWO STATEMENTS FOR REFERENCE PURPOSES:  
PROJECT TITLE, AND  
TODAY'S DATE.  
\*\*ENTER 1 VALUE PER LINE\*\*

I>LAKE WINFREY (EXAMPLE), HYDRILLA  
I>14 JUNE 1980

ENTER TWO VALUES FOR THE PLANT DEPTH:  
MEAN (FEET) AND  
STANDARD DEVIATION (FEET)  
\*\*ENTER 1 VALUE PER LINE\*\*

I>1.75  
I>0

ENTER TWO VALUES FOR THE PLANT BULK DENSITY:  
MEAN (POUNDS PER CUBIC FOOT) AND  
STANDARD DEVIATION (POUNDS PER CUBIC FOOT)

I>.005  
I>0

ENTER THE DISTANCE THE TRUCK DRIVES TO THE DISPOSAL SITE  
(FEET)

I>22500

ENTER ONE SET OF VALUES FOR THE POSITION OF THE TRANSPORTER OUTLET (X & Y)  
\*\*ENTER 2 VALUES ON 1 LINE\*\*  
-----

I>1000 250

27. Now the computer asks the user to enter the boundary points  
(two values per line prompt I>):

ENTER THE NUMBER OF BOUNDARY POINTS

I>10

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>1000 0

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>0 1000

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>1000 2000

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>2000 1500

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>1750 1250

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>1000 1750

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>500 1000

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>1000 250

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>1750 750

ENTER ONE SET OF BOUNDARY POINTS (X & Y)  
(2 VALUES PER LINE)

I>2000 500

\*\*\*\*\*

USER INPUT OF BOUNDARY POINTS IN FEET

X	Y
1000.0	0.0
0.0	1000.0
1000.0	2000.0
2000.0	1500.0
1750.0	1250.0
1000.0	1750.0
500.0	1000.0
1000.0	250.0
1750.0	750.0
2000.0	500.0

After the boundary points have been entered, the interior points have to be entered for a site with a complex geometry. It must be remembered that the program assumes that the equipment can travel anywhere within the site and that the area excludes insufficient water depth for the harvesters and transporters. In this instance, the user should draw a grid network plot of the site boundaries using rectangular coordinates as shown in Figure 6. Convenient straight lines and distances to boundary points should be added to the plot. The boundary coordinates should represent actual ground distances (feet). The interior points for this example were set at 50 ft within the site from the boundary point. If the graph of the terrain is distorted, then the interior grid points should be increased to 100 ft within the site from the boundary point. The program output includes a graph of the harvest area; any need for additional or different internal points will be immediately obvious and the program can be rerun.

DOES YOUR HARVEST AREA HAVE A COMPLEX GEOMETRY?  
(ANSWER YES OR NO)

I>YES




Figure 6. Grid network plot of proposed aquatic plant harvest area

```

ENTER ONE SET OF INTERIOR POINTS (X & Y)
I>1000 50

ENTER ONE SET OF INTERIOR POINTS (X & Y)
I>50 1000

ENTER ONE SET OF INTERIOR POINTS (X & Y)
I>1000 1950

ENTER ONE SET OF INTERIOR POINTS (X & Y)
I>1950 1500

ENTER ONE SET OF INTERIOR POINTS (X & Y)
I>1750 1300

```

ENTER ONE SET OF INTERIOR POINTS (X & Y)

I>1000 1800

ENTER ONE SET OF INTERIOR POINTS (X & Y)

I>450 1000

ENTER ONE SET OF INTERIOR POINTS (X & Y)

I>1000 200

ENTER ONE SET OF INTERIOR POINTS (X & Y)

I>1750 700

ENTER ONE SET OF INTERIOR POINTS (X & Y)

I>1950 500

\*\*\*\*\*

USER INPUT OF INTERIOR POINTS (FEET)

XI	YI
1000.0	50.0
50.0	1000.0
1000.0	1950.0
1950.0	1500.0
1750.0	1300.0
1000.0	1800.0
450.0	1000.0
1000.0	200.0
1750.0	700.0
1950.0	500.0

28. In the output model, the following questions are asked and a graph of the terrain is printed out:

DO YOU WANT A GRAPHICAL DISPLAY OF THE TERRAIN TO BE HARVESTED?  
(ANSWER YES OR NO)

I>YES

THE HARVEST AREA IS INDICATED BY ZEPOS  
THE TRANSPORTER EXIT POSITION IS INDICATED BY X.  
IF ENTIRE AREA OF INTEREST IS NOT ZERO FILLED,  
RE-RUN AND USE COMPLEX GEOMETRY OPTION



example, if an area is very long and narrow, the best solution might be to harvest one end and then move the entire operation to the other end to finish the job. If an area is extremely large, it might be subdivided into several smaller areas for harvest (Winfrey 1972).

### PART III: MODEL VERIFICATION

29. Verification of the SHAP model was accomplished using four studies from the field tests of Culpepper and Decell (1978a, b). Verification of the model with field data was done to test the reasonableness between the model output and the actual system performance. The four sites evaluated were entitled:

- a. Orange Lake East, Hydrilla.
- b. Orange Lake West, Hydrilla.
- c. St. Johns River, 2AT-13B4, Hyacinth.
- d. St. Johns River, 2AT-13B5, Hyacinth.

The time and operational equipment data for these study sites are described in detail by Culpepper and Decell (1978a, b). For verification purposes, only initial estimates of the input parameters were used.

#### Orange Lake East

30. This site was located in the southeast corner of Orange Lake, Fla. About 70 percent of the harvest area was covered with topped-out hydrilla and 30 percent with hydrilla that was 1 to 2 ft below the water surface (10 tons/acre). The water depth in the harvest area was 4 to 6 ft. The transporter traveled 900 ft to the conveyor and the truck route was 0.2 mile in length. The equipment and site data are presented on the work sheet in Figure 7.

31. The comparison of the SHAP output to the field test data (Culpepper and Decell 1978b) is shown in Table 1. In general, the values compare favorably. The field data collection does not measure exactly the same values as the simulation model, so some discrepancy can be expected. The model harvested the area in a shorter time than was recorded by actual field operations. This time difference probably occurred in the description of the plant density as the total mass harvested was about 70 tons greater for the field test than for the simulation. Also, the transporters were busy fewer hours and traveled at a faster rate than the model estimated. The output for both methods suggests that only

WORK SHEET

Simulation for Harvesting of Aquatic Plants (SHAP)

TITLE: Orange Lake East, Hydrilla

Transporter Outlet: X = 1400 ft Y = 720 ft

Plant Depth: 5 ft

Standard deviation: 0 ft

Plant Density: 0.09 lb/cu ft

Standard deviation: 0 lb/cu ft

Truck distance to disposal site: 1056 ft

Number of boundary points: 6

Boundary Points		Interior Points	
X	Y	X	Y
0	0		
0	350		
1000	350		
1000	1400		
1400	1400		
1400	0		

Number of Harvesters: . . . . . 1  
 Breakdowns per unit time . . . . . 0.32 no./hr  
 Average repair time . . . . . 0.28 hr  
 Cutting bar width . . . . . 8 ft

Figure 7. SHAP work sheet for Orange Lake East (Continued)

Speed . . . . .	<u>7866</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>6322</u>	lb
Blade depth . . . . .	<u>5</u>	ft
Number of <u>Transporters</u> : . . . . .	<u>2</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0.21</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0.24</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>101025</u>	lb/hr
Speed . . . . .	<u>9523</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>6322</u>	lb
Distance to conveyor . . . . .	<u>900</u>	ft
Number of <u>Trucks</u> : . . . . .	<u>2</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0.04</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0.17</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>379320</u>	lb/hr
Speed . . . . .	<u>25728</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>6322</u>	lb
Number of <u>Conveyors</u> : . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0.02</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0.17</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>65969</u>	lb/hr
<hr/>		
Cost of harvester . . . . .	<u>25.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of operator . . . . .	<u>12.80</u>	\$/hr
Cost of transporter . . . . .	<u>5.50</u>	\$/hr
Cost of operator . . . . .	<u>10.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of conveyor . . . . .	<u>4.50</u>	\$/hr
Cost of truck . . . . .	<u>10.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of driver . . . . .	<u>8.50</u>	\$/hr
Disposal cost . . . . .	<u>4.20</u>	\$/hr
Mobilization fee . . . . .	<u>11.75</u>	\$/hr
Distance to site . . . . .	<u>0.0</u>	miles
Locale adjustment factor . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Engineering News Record (ENR) adjustment factor . . . . .	<u>1</u>	

Figure 7. (Concluded)

one transporter and one truck were needed to complete the job efficiently, thus saving considerable costs.

#### Orange Lake West

32. This site was located on Samsons Point in Orange Lake, Fla. The harvesting area was covered with topped-out hydrilla and extended 2300 ft into the lake from the shore (13 tons/acre). The average water depth of the area was 10 to 12 ft. Strong winds with heavy rains frequently blew across the large, open lake and prevented efficient operation of the harvester and transporter. The equipment and site data are shown in the work sheet in Figure 8.

33. The comparison of the SHAP output to the field test data (Culpepper and Decell 1978b) is shown in Table 2. In this data set, some of the time data were missing, which gave low values for the busy time of the field data. The number of equipment failures did compare favorably. The total mass of hydrilla was not measured at the field test and no data were available for the trucks. However, once again, the conclusion could be reached that to accomplish the harvest only one transporter and one truck would be required.

#### St. Johns River

34. Sites 2AT-13B4 and 2AT-13B5 were on a series of small, connecting canals forming a residential waterfront community. The canals were 65 to 80 ft wide and 750 and 1250 ft long. The average water depth was 6 ft and, at the time of the harvesting operation, there were a few floating logs in the water. Plants in these canals had stem and leaf heights of 13 to 31 in. and root lengths of 16 to 31 in. (84 tons/acre - B4, and 110 tons/acre - B5).

35. The comparison of the SHAP output to the field test data (Culpepper and Decell 1978b) is shown in Tables 3 and 4. The equipment and site data are shown in the work sheet in Figures 9 and 10. The tabular data show that the model and field data compare quite favorably for these two sites. The truck and, therefore, the total mass harvested data were not available for these data sets.

WORK SHEET

Simulation for Harvesting of Aquatic Plants (SHAP)

TITLE: Orange Lake West, Hydrilla

Transporter Outlet: X = 10 ft Y = 10 ft

Plant Depth: 5 ft

Standard deviation: 0 ft

Plant Density: 0.12 lb/cu ft

Standard deviation: 0 lb/cu ft

Truck distance to disposal site: 2112 ft

Number of boundary points: 8

Boundary Points		Interior Points	
X	Y	X	Y
0	0		
0	1025		
650	1025		
650	825		
1100	825		
1100	350		
1700	350		
1700	0		

Number of Harvesters: . . . . . 1  
 Breakdowns per unit time . . . . . 0.06 no./hr  
 Average repair time . . . . . 0.32 hr  
 Cutting bar width . . . . . 8 ft

Figure 8. SHAP work sheet for Orange Lake West (Continued)

Speed . . . . .	<u>6061</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>5000</u>	lb
Blade depth . . . . .	<u>5</u>	ft
<b>Number of Transporters:</b> . . . . .	<u>2</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0.27</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0.03</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>108303</u>	lb/hr
Speed . . . . .	<u>6818</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>5000</u>	lb
Distance to conveyor . . . . .	<u>450</u>	ft
<b>Number of Trucks:</b> . . . . .	<u>2</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>300000</u>	lb/hr
Speed . . . . .	<u>41480</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>5000</u>	lb
<b>Number of Conveyors:</b> . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0.04</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0.34</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>88370</u>	lb/hr
<hr/>		
Cost of harvester . . . . .	<u>25.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of operator . . . . .	<u>12.80</u>	\$/hr
Cost of transporter . . . . .	<u>5.50</u>	\$/hr
Cost of operator . . . . .	<u>10.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of conveyor . . . . .	<u>4.50</u>	\$/hr
Cost of truck . . . . .	<u>10.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of driver . . . . .	<u>8.50</u>	\$/hr
Disposal cost . . . . .	<u>4.20</u>	\$/hr
Mobilization fee . . . . .	<u>11.75</u>	\$/hr
Distance to site . . . . .	<u>0.0</u>	miles
Locale adjustment factor . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Engineering News Record (ENR) adjustment factor . . . . .	<u>1</u>	

Figure 8. (Concluded)

WORK SHEET

Simulation for Harvesting of Aquatic Plants (SHAP)

TITLE: St. Johns River Site 2AT-13B4, Hyacinth

Transporter Outlet: X = 40 ft Y = 10 ft

Plant Depth: 2 ft

Standard deviation: 0.17 ft

Plant Density: 0.77 lb/cu ft

Standard deviation: 0.085 lb/cu ft

Truck distance to disposal site: 5808 ft

Number of boundary points: 4

Boundary Points		Interior Points	
X	Y	X	Y
0	0		
0	750		
65	750		
65	0		

Number of Harvesters: . . . . . 1  
 Breakdowns per unit time . . . . . 0.26 no./hr  
 Average repair time . . . . . 0.54 hr  
 Cutting bar width . . . . . 8 ft

Figure 9. SHAP work sheet for St. Johns River site 2AT-13B4 (Continued)

Speed . . . . .	<u>1530</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>5000</u>	lb
Blade depth . . . . .	<u>2</u>	ft
<b>Number of Transporters:</b> . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>205560</u>	lb/hr
Speed . . . . .	<u>7980</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>5000</u>	lb
Distance to conveyor . . . . .	<u>665</u>	ft
<b>Number of Trucks:</b> . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>240000</u>	lb/hr
Speed . . . . .	<u>52800</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>5000</u>	lb
<b>Number of Conveyors:</b> . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0.70</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0.18</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>112997</u>	lb/hr
<hr/>		
Cost of harvester . . . . .	<u>25.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of operator . . . . .	<u>12.80</u>	\$/hr
Cost of transporter . . . . .	<u>5.50</u>	\$/hr
Cost of operator . . . . .	<u>10.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of conveyor . . . . .	<u>4.50</u>	\$/hr
Cost of truck . . . . .	<u>10.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of driver . . . . .	<u>8.50</u>	\$/hr
Disposal cost . . . . .	<u>4.20</u>	\$/hr
Mobilization fee . . . . .	<u>11.75</u>	\$/hr
Distance to site . . . . .	<u>0</u>	miles
Locale adjustment factor . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Engineering News Record (ENR) adjustment factor . . . . .	<u>1</u>	

Figure 9. (Concluded)

WORK SHEET

Simulation for Harvesting of Aquatic Plants (SHAP)

TITLE: St. Johns River Site 2AT-13B5, Hyacinth

Transporter Outlet: X = 40 ft Y = 10 ft

Plant Depth: 2 ft

Standard deviation: 0.17 ft

Plant Density: 0.77 lb/cu ft

Standard deviation: 0.085 lb/cu ft

Truck distance to disposal site: 5808 ft

Number of boundary points: 4

Boundary Points		Interior Points	
X	Y	X	Y
0	0		
0	1150		
80	1150		
80	0		

Number of Harvesters: . . . . . 1  
 Breakdowns per unit time . . . . . 0.16 no./hr  
 Average repair time . . . . . 0.05 hr  
 Cutting bar width . . . . . 8 ft

Figure 10. SHAP work sheet for St. Johns River site 2AT-13B5 (Continued)

Speed . . . . .	<u>1822</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>6270</u>	lb
Blade depth . . . . .	<u>2</u>	ft
<b>Number of Transporters:</b> . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0.05</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0.02</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>103186</u>	lb/hr
Speed . . . . .	<u>10754</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>6270</u>	lb
Distance to conveyor . . . . .	<u>1080</u>	ft
<b>Number of Trucks:</b> . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>240000</u>	lb/hr
Speed . . . . .	<u>105600</u>	ft/hr
Capacity . . . . .	<u>6270</u>	lb
<b>Number of Conveyors:</b> . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Breakdowns per unit time . . . . .	<u>0.49</u>	no./hr
Average repair time . . . . .	<u>0.01</u>	hr
Unloading rate . . . . .	<u>113000</u>	lb/hr
<hr/>		
Cost of harvester . . . . .	<u>25.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of operator . . . . .	<u>12.80</u>	\$/hr
Cost of transporter . . . . .	<u>5.50</u>	\$/hr
Cost of operator . . . . .	<u>10.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of conveyor . . . . .	<u>4.50</u>	\$/hr
Cost of truck . . . . .	<u>10.00</u>	\$/hr
Cost of driver . . . . .	<u>8.50</u>	\$/hr
Disposal cost . . . . .	<u>4.20</u>	\$/hr
Mobilization fee . . . . .	<u>11.75</u>	\$/hr
Distance to site . . . . .	<u>0</u>	miles
Locale adjustment factor . . . . .	<u>1</u>	
Engineering News Record (ENR) adjustment factor . . . . .	<u>1</u>	

Figure 10. (Concluded)

## PART IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusions

36. The computer program entitled "Simulation for Harvesting of Aquatic Plants (SHAP)" has been developed for simulating the operation of mechanical harvesting (Aqua-Trio system) of aquatic plants. This program permits the user to evaluate the harvesting operation as to equipment efficiency and cost analyses of the proposed project. SHAP is designed for using minimal input data in a conversational manner; that is, the user interacts directly with the program and receives output immediately. After SHAP has completed the initial run, the input and data files will be fixed and permanent. At this time, the user can repeat step 8 of Figure 3 and make countless runs without re-entering data for the total model. Various scenarios of aquatic plant harvest designs can be run for a particular site to obtain the most efficient and cost-effective plan.

37. The verification of SHAP showed that the model compared favorably with the field test data (Culpepper and Decell 1978a, b). However, it pointed out some of the weaknesses of the model to input the same type of data collected in the field.

### Recommendations

38. An increase in the number of statistical variables is needed; that is, the running vehicles (harvester, transporter, conveyor, and truck) do not operate at a constant velocity. A provision could be made in SHAP to allow for a standard deviation and for a normal distribution (Markovian process) of velocity. Similar modifications to loading and unloading operations would permit SHAP to better represent actual field practices.

39. Default data for a particular type of equipment and aquatic plant should be added to estimate normal equipment and harvesting operations. However, in SHAP, the user would have the option to override all

default values. When estimates of harvesting operations are not known, default values would permit the planner to better understand and estimate actual field-tested conditions.

40. SHAP should be modularized to permit simulation of other aquatic plant harvesting systems and techniques besides Aqua-Trio, Inc. The use of modules would permit the user to select (and partially design) the specific equipment needs along with any harvesting peculiarity that is required to complete a project. Modularization would also permit the user of SHAP to evaluate specific chemical spray equipment systems as to methodology, application efficiency, and cost-effectiveness.

41. A critical path analysis package should be added to SHAP to permit the user to observe the most efficient harvesting or spraying path to follow to minimize gaps and overlaps. Critical path analysis could be used to direct the position of the harvester as well as the transporter. This package would present the user with the most energy-efficient, work-efficient, and cost-effective plan for harvesting an aquatic plant site.

42. The SHAP should be modified to accept digitized data from a graphics tablet of a map of the area to be harvested. These data could be entered into the terrain model for any variety of complex field geometries. This modification would permit the user to "draw-up" the surface area shape of a harvest site, including bathymetric data (Perrier and Gibson 1979), and enter it directly to the model from the graphics tablet. Therefore, a more complete evaluation of the various harvester designs could be performed by the planner/user. For example, is there adequate boat draft, is the harvester or cutting head designed for shallow water areas, and what are the peripheral equipment requirements to complete the project within the proposed time span?

#### REFERENCES

Culpepper, M. M., and Decell, J. L. 1978a. "Mechanical Harvesting of Aquatic Plants; Rpt 1, Vol I," Technical Report A-78-3, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1978b. "Mechanical Harvesting of Aquatic Plants; Rpt 1, Vol II," Technical Report A-78-3, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.

Perrier, E. R., and Gibson, A. C. 1979. "Terrain Analysis for Mechanical Harvesting of Aquatic Weeds in the St. Johns River, FL," Letter Report, Environmental Laboratory, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.

Winfrey, S. J. 1977. "An Aquatic Weed Harvesting Simulation Model," MS Degree, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.

Table 1  
Comparison of SHAP Output to Field Data\* for Orange Lake East

Function	Harvester		Transporter 1		Transporter 2		Conveyor		Truck 1		Truck 2	
	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field
Busy time												
Hours	32.7	42.0	19.1	11.2	17.7	14.5	6.7	5.1	6.8	6.2	6.7	13.1
Percent	99.1	75.0	58.0	20.0	53.7	25.9	20.1	9.1	20.6	10.9	20.5	23.4
Equip. failures	4	18	4	8	2	4	0	1	0	2	0	0
No. of loads	70	88	35	31	37	57	70	88	35	25	35	68
Load rate, m/L**	28.1	25.0					5.7	3.5				
Trip rate, m/T†			32.7	21.7	28.7	15.3			11.7	14.9	11.6	11.6
Area harvested, acres	22.5	20.0										
Time required, hr	33.0	56.0										
Total mass harvested, tons	220.1	289.8										

\* From Culpepper and Decell (1978b).

\*\* m/L = minutes per load.

† m/T = minutes per trip.

Table 2  
 Comparison of SHAP Output to Field Data\* for Orange Lake West

Function	Harvester		Transporter 1		Transporter 2		Conveyor		Truck 1		Truck 2	
	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field
Busy Time												
Hours	69.3	38.9	39.7	24.8	41.4	11.4	8.8	5.9	13.8	--	13.7	--
Percent	99.4	81.7	56.9	31.0	59.4	23.6	12.7	12.4	19.8	--	19.6	--
Equip. failures	2	5	7	7	7	7	0	2	0	--	0	--
No. of loads	257	132	83	80	84	48	157	128	79	--	78	--
Load rate, m/L	26.5	17.7					3.4	2.8				
Trip rate, m/T			28.7	11.1	29.6	14.1			10.5	--	10.5	--
Area harvested, acres	29.9	28.6										
Time required, hr	69.7	47.7										
Total mass harvested, tons	391	--										

\* From Culpepper and Decell (1978b).

Table 3  
 Comparison of SHAP Output to Field Data for St. Johns River Site 2AT-13B4

Function	Harvester		Transporter		Conveyor		Truck	
	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field
Busy time								
Hours	7.4	6.8	5.6	5.9	1.0	1.4	5.1	--
Percent	95.3	39.0	72.4	33.6	12.4	8.2	65.4	--
Equip. failures	0	2	0	2	1	1	0	--
No. of loads	17	38	17	33	18	33	18	--
Load rate, m/L	26.0	10.7			3.2	2.6		
Trip rate, m/T			19.7	13.1			16.8	--
Area harvested, acres	1.3	1.1						
Time required, hr	7.7	17.5						
Total mass harvested, tons	44.0	--						

\* From Culpepper and Decell (1978b).

Table 4  
 Comparison of SHAP Output to Field Data for St. Johns River Site 2AT-13B5

Function	Harvester		Transporter		Conveyor		Truck	
	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field	SHAP	Field
Busy time								
Hours	13.6	7.4	12.7	8.1	2.7	1.7	6.4	--
Percent	97.5	31.9	91.2	35.0	19.3	7.2	45.7	--
Equip. failures	0	2	0	14	1	1	0	--
No. of loads	25	34	27	27	28	27	28	--
Load rate, m/L	32.6	13.1			5.8	3.8		
Trip rate, m/T			28.2	18.0			13.6	--
Area harvested, acres	2.3	2.1						
Time required, hr	13.9	23.1						
Total mass harvested, tons	78.3	--						

\* From Culpepper and Decell (1978b).

APPENDIX A: COST BREAKDOWN OF  
BOEING COMPUTER SERVICES

1. There are three cost parameters associated with Boeing Computer Services (BCS): connect, storage, and central computer unit costs. The costs included in this appendix are for the Ciber 175 computer system, which is the computer used by the authors of this report at the U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station.

2. The connect cost occurs during the interactive mode. This cost is \$8.50 per hour for the 30 characters per second printed.

3. Disc and magnetic tape are the two types of storage costs. The disc storage cost is \$0.007 per day for the first 8,000 sectors; for 8,001 to 16,000 sectors, the cost is \$0.005 per day; for 16,001 to 24,000 sectors, the cost is \$0.0035 per day; for 24,001 to 50,000 sectors, the cost is \$0.0025 per day; and for 50,001 sectors and up the cost is \$0.0015 per day. The magnetic tape cost for the first 200 sectors is \$0.20 per day for Government users. The next 200 sectors are \$0.15 per reel per day. Over 400 sectors, the cost is \$0.10 per reel per day.

4. The computer charging units (CCU) costs depend on the mode interactive or remote batch. The interactive process during prime time is \$0.20 per CCU. The CCU cost for the remote batch process for 0.5 hr is \$0.15 per CCU; for 1 hr, \$0.125 per CCU; for 4 hr, \$0.10 per CCU; for 8 hr, \$0.085 per CCU; for 16 hr, \$0.075 per CCU; and for 48 hr, \$0.06 per CCU.

5. The costs presented above are given without the Government discount (30 percent).

In accordance with letter from DAEN-RDC, DAEN-ASI dated 22 July 1977, Subject: Facsimile Catalog Cards for Laboratory Technical Publications, a facsimile catalog card in Library of Congress MARC format is reproduced below.

Perrier, Eugene R.

Simulation for harvesting of aquatic plants / by Eugene R. Perrier and Anthony C. Gibson (Environmental Laboratory, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station). -- Vicksburg, Miss. : The Station ; Springfield, Va. : available from NTIS, 1982.

54 p. in various pagings ; ill. ; 27 cm. -- (Technical report ; A-82-1)

Cover title.

"February 1982."

Final report.

"Prepared for U.S. Army Engineer District, Jacksonville and Office, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army."

At head of title: Aquatic Plant Control Research Program.

Bibliography: p. 49.

1. Aquatic plants. 2. Computer programs. 3. Computer simulation. 4. SHAP (Computer program) 5. Simulation

Perrier, Eugene R.

Simulation for harvesting of aquatic plants : ... 1982.  
(Card 2)

methods. I. Gibson, Anthony C. II. United States. Army. Corps of Engineers. Jacksonville District. III. United States. Army. Corps of Engineers. Office of the Chief of Engineers. III. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station. Environmental Laboratory. IV. Title V. Series: Technical report (U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station) ; A-82-1.  
TA7.W34 no.A-82-1